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Abstract

The goal of my research was to contribute to the decolonization of education by demonstrating how the practice of Indigenous storywork, according to Principles of Indigenous Storywork: Educating the Heart, Mind, Body and Spirit by JoAnn Archibald, Q’um Q’um Xiiem (2008), can be used as a pedagogical tool. For this study, I have focused on the Mi’kmaw People of Atlantic Canada and their traditional Mi’kmaw territory known as Mi’kma’ki.

The Indigenous storywork approach opens the door for non-Indigenous people to become allies with Indigenous Peoples by “restorying,” or retelling from an Indigenous perspective, the historical narratives that have dominated the official view of the region’s history. This technique introduces decolonizing space to make room for the inclusion of the history and narrative of the L’nu or Mi’kmaw People (Regan, 2010). For this research, general historical Mi’kmaw and settlers (non-Indigenous people who settled Mi’kmaw territory) versions of a specific Eurocentric oral narrative known as “The Island with The Bloody Hand” have been collaboratively shared and analyzed. Through this Indigenous storywork, a truer, more balanced, and just story has emerged.

My investigation has demonstrated how specific components of Eurocentric traditions, as well as stereotypical perceptions of Indigenous Peoples, are heavily tied to the roots of colonization in Canada (Regan, 2010). My work included an examination of the myths and stereotypes common in the 18th century, as perpetuated by Europeans, who portrayed the Mi’kmaq as savage warriors in need of civilizing by benevolent settlers (Paul, 2008). As with Battiste (2013, p. 92), my ultimate objective was to provide a basis for “educational reform that synergistically combines Mi’kmaw and Eurocentric epistemologies, ontology, methodology, and axiology.
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Introduction

This new academic chapter in my life has led me to explore the origins of my settler history and its impact on Indigenous Peoples, specifically the Mi’kmaq of Atlantic Canada. My work included a critical examination of my own colonial roots in the Town of Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, and the surrounding area. It involved questioning the historical Eurocentric viewpoints and beliefs that are deeply embedded in Euro-Atlantic Canadian culture. These Eurocentric perspectives are based on chronicled and commemorated colonial accounts that have been written intentionally for the benefit of European colonization at the devastating cost of the Mi’kmaq (Battiste, 2013).

The overall goal of my research was to demonstrate the inherent racism in colonial systems of education. My studies addressed the decolonization of Eurocentric-based education, which has historically helped and currently continues to help support the power of the status quo while firmly keeping other societal groups subject to systems of oppression.

My autoethnographic account of this journey, explores my lifelong personal and educational experiences and their connection to wider cultural, political, and social meanings. My self-reflection has been focused on my recent return to Graduate Studies in Lifelong Learning at Mount Saint Vincent University, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

For this study, the term Indigenous Peoples is used as a collective term for people who lived in a particular place since prior to colonization. The use of peoples as plural is used as a way of recognizing the existence of numerous distinct nations. Upper-case letters are used with both words to emphasize and recognize the original inhabitants (Mi’kmaw Resource Guide, 2007). In addition, as defined by Ruth Whitehead (2015) in Niniskamijinaqik, Ancestral Images,
the Mi’kmaq and Mi’kmaw spellings are used as the non-adjective and adjective forms, respectively.

My project centres on the use of Indigenous storytelling as an important pedagogical intervention that creates more socially just narratives. With the advent of the recent education agreement between the Nova Scotia provincial government and the Mi’kmaw People, I believe that the possibility of effective outcomes from my research has real potential and that my research will make it feasible for curriculum at all educational levels to change and provide a better reflection of the true narrative of the Mi’kmaq of Atlantic Canada.

The Nova Scotia Treaty Education Initiative is a partnership between the Nova Scotia Department of Education, Mi’kmaw educators and other interested parties. It is a formal commitment, across all levels of education which I am a member. Its purpose is to increase knowledge and understanding of treaties and the treaty relationships that exist as well as the roles these treaties played in the development of Atlantic Canada.

From an educational perspective, I believe this study supports conversation about shared treaty relationship among the Mi’kmaq and settlers and their collaboration for the future prosperity of the province. Ultimately, I hope to develop educational content and experiences that are mindful, ethical, and culturally relevant and that create space for a change in the mainstream consciousness of both Nova Scotians and all Canadians.
Chapter One

Literature Review: Decolonizing Education, Stereotypes & Myths

1. Overview

Paulo Freire (2000, p.24) believes that “the educator has the duty of not being neutral.” I believe it is imperative that adult educators consider social action as a part of pedagogy. Like Battiste (2013) I also refuse to accept any situations that place any human in positions of marginalization, violence and powerlessness. This literature review will explore this theme in a way that supports my interest in creating new narratives between the Mi’kmaq and non-Indigenous Nova Scotians as initial steps toward reconciliation. The review was conducted from the perspective of linking theory and practice in order to explore the pedagogical potential of storytelling and the reconciliation process. Consideration has been given to the importance of the use of truth telling by settler/non-Indigenous people as a starting point for decolonizing education. Connections have been made to a more ethical approach to learning through the mobilization of holistic Mi’kmaw epistemologies as deep platforms for viewing academia as social action.

2. The Term “Settler” and Its Implications

Slotkin (1992, p.2) suggests that “[t]he term settler has most often been used to describe a pioneering individual who leaves their homeland with the intention of starting a new life living in a new place;” they were “immigrants who have moved to the frontier, a geographical space which was considered wilderness and vacant of other people.” Traditionally, in North America, the word settler has had an attached nostalgic connotation of new inhabitants who were responsible for the “founding and building” of Canada and the United States. My research challenges this mythical and sentimental perspective of the term and its meaning. Instead I
suggest using “settler” to include current-day descendants and other non-Indigenous Canadians. In this way, it will constitute a pedagogical tool for instilling a better understanding of the colonial ontology of the relationships of power, the beneficiaries of colonization, and the systems of oppression inherent in colonization (Regan, 2010). My use of the term settler is intended to help myself and others broaden our understanding of who we really are rather than who we claim to be (Regan, 2010).

I use “settler” as a way of more fully comprehending the 21st century Canadian perception of colonization. This is in keeping with Barker and Lowman (2015), who remind us that both the past and present use of the term “settler” is heavily tied to the notion of land. Elder Paul (2017) and Elder Billy Lewis (2017) remind us that North American land was considered by Europeans to be free for the taking, and now is claimed to be owned either by the state or by individuals. In contrast, from an Indigenous perspective, settlers are foreigners who stole Indigenous land, broke treaty obligations, and implemented other measures of “law” in order to maintain control of their land and their resources. These settler actions severely impacted Indigenous Peoples, such as the Mi’kmaq, with devastating effects that are still experienced today.

By taking a long, difficult look at the term “settler” through an Indigenous lens, those who would describe themselves as descendants of settlers can begin to see both their ancestors and themselves in a different light. As Marie Battiste emphasizes, “Through an Indigenous perspective, settlers can come to understand how contemporary colonization is linked to relationships, structures and processes in Canada that are complicit in systems of violence and dispossession towards Indigenous Peoples (2013, p. 97). Battiste (2013) highlights examples of the modern negative impact of colonization such as inherent stereotypes, pervasive racism,
marginalization of Indigenous Peoples which has resulted in their loss of connection and reverence to land, culture, and way of life.

Battiste (2016) also reminds today’s settlers of the ongoing government policy of ignoring Mi’kmaw treaty rights and of the constant land disputes that are occurring between the Mi’kmaq and the government or resource-extraction businesses. For example, in Nova Scotia, for more than two years, the Mi’kmaq and Alton Gas (Luck, 2016) have been engaged in a dispute regarding the storage of natural gas on the banks of the Shubenacadie River. Covering the story for the CBC News, reporter Michael Gorman (2016) reported several concerns expressed by the Mi’kmaq. Gorman (2016) expressed from the Mi’kmaw perspective, Alton Gas is trespassing on Mi’kmaw territory without permission. Gorman (2016) also communicated that the Mi’kmaw communities are deeply concerned about the serious environmental impacts of this project that have yet to be addressed and have been exercising their treaty rights to address their worries. Gorman (2016) says that the Mi’kmaq are asking for further research to be conducted regarding the environmental impacts on the various ecosystems of the river.

Paulette Regan (2010) offers yet another cutting-edge approach to understanding the term “settlers” as it relates to colonization and power. Regan (2010) has vast experience documenting the culturally genocidal Canadian Indian Residential School system, as well as the Truth and Reconciliation process in Canada. Unsettling the Settler within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada (2010) was written when she was Director of Research for the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. In this work, Regan offers insight into the challenges related to resolving contemporary conflicts between Indigenous Peoples and non-Indigenous Canadians as a result of the colonization of Canada.
A critical and unique aspect of Regan’s (2010) work is that she considers herself a settler and places her own privileges at the heart of her research. By following Regan’s lead, other “settlers” can also begin to make this new ethical shift with respect to the term and its meaning. Regan (2010) states that tackling decolonization requires settlers to acknowledge the hard truth that their identity is not one of benevolent peace keeper as they have surmised. Instead the Canadian identity is linked to the perpetration of violence against Indigenous Peoples which has been kept hidden from view.

By using critical theory, comparative analysis, and ethics, Regan’s (2010, p.17) research methodology focuses on “the synergy of truth telling, as a pedagogical tool, by the settler to create counter-narratives which will dismantle the historical colonial legacy.” Her research perspective requires “authenticity and reciprocity from settlers as they begin to witness firsthand the present-day struggles of Indigenous Peoples, such as those of the Mi’kmaq, that are tied to colonialism.” Today’s settlers must genuinely listen to the different Mi’kmaw narratives that are associated with colonization and its detrimental impact.

This divergent narrative, challenges that of the benevolent peace-loving settlers that was written from a Eurocentric standpoint in order to obliterate the Mi’kmaq. Regan’s (2010) position is that when today’s settlers earnestly become true allies with Indigenous Peoples, the potential for transformation is possible for everyone. Lilla Watson (Ablett et al.,2014, p.7), an Indigenous Australian, visual activist, and academic, defined this ideology when she said, “If you are coming to help me you are wasting your time. But if your liberation is bound up with mine then let us work together.” Many social activist groups have since used this phrase to emphasize the point that the liberation of oppression should not be viewed as a charitable act but rather as an emancipatory process for all. Watson (Ablett et al.,2014) “prefers to credit the
collective process of the Aboriginal Activist Group of Queensland in 1970 with the origin of this quote.’

Today’s settlers may begin to understand the interrelatedness of the benefits they and their ancestors have reaped from colonization and the continued oppression of Indigenous Peoples (Regan, 2010). For example, many Canadians are unaware of the linkages between murdered and missing Indigenous Canadian women and resource extraction. Battered Women Support Services (Hunt, 2015) in Vancouver, British Columbia states that “Aboriginal women in Canada are five times more likely than other women of the same age to die as the result of violence, and the connection to resource extraction is overwhelming.” Regan (2010, p.20) reminds today’s settlers that when they “begin to understand themselves as the problem, there is potential for social, political and cultural change. Transformational learning will occur when settlers speak hard truths, remain mindful and challenge the false innocence they understand as their history.”

3. Decolonizing Education

Battiste (2013) offers a theoretical framework for decolonizing education. Drawing on her extensive Indigenous (especially Mi’kmaq) knowledge, lived experiences, and the works of other Indigenous scholars, she documents the nature of Eurocentric education models and their tendency to annihilate Indigenous knowledge. Her scholarly book Decolonizing Education, Nourishing the Learning Spirit (Battiste, 2013) demonstrates how racism is inherent in colonial systems of all education. Adult educators may perpetuate common stereotypes of Indigenous Peoples and others, or view their own race, upbringing, and style of education as superior to those of others. Battiste (2013) instead introduces Indigenous epistemologies as a creative model for beginning the process of decolonizing adult education.
Like Regan (2010), Battiste (2013) asks non-Indigenous and Indigenous Canadians to take initiative and demand education that is socially just. In a culture in which bias exists in the mainstream history taught at all levels of Canadian education (Silver, 2014), Battiste (2013) offers a novel vision that can further advance radical educational reform in Canada. Battiste (2013), Regan (2010), Barker and Lowman (2015) all request that any Canadian citizen who reaps the benefits and privileges of colonization at the expense of Indigenous Peoples must take responsibility for decolonizing this detrimental legacy.

Like Battiste (2013), Regan (2010) also invites today’s settlers to take responsibility by becoming involved. Regan (2010) affirms that it will be the settlers’ ability to embrace their colonial legacy as an initiative for change which will create new knowledge. She predicts that this shifted mindset will keep the status quo of colonizers and their benefits in tact or encourage settlers to take initiative in supporting decolonization as they become inspired by the need for social equality and justice for all.

Battiste (2013) concludes that if settlers help to mobilize decolonization, the result will be that there is a better likelihood that they will become active initiators of social change, and support Indigenous ways of knowing. Battiste (2013) believes that in order for power relations to change, mainstream must believe in the power of Indigenous epistemologies.

4. Living Treaties: A Mi’kmaw Perspective for Educational Reform

In her latest book, Living Treaties, Narrating Mi’kmaw Treaty Relations, Battiste (2016) provides an up-to-date account of different understandings of the 19th century “Peace and Friendship” treaties, which were originally between Britain and the Mi’kmaq and have now been, bound over to Canada. She uses contemporary narratives from Mi’kmaw People and Indigenous allies to challenge the Crown’s version of the treaty interpretations and obligations.
and demonstrates the many layers of tension surrounding the treaties, such as the controversy over land control, rights, and ownership. She also recounts a variety of ways in which first the British and now the Canadian federal government have not lived up to the terms of the original treaty commitments and have broken numerous promises.

Battiste (2016) has collected stories from a variety of authors and their families in order to weave an intimate storytelling tapestry that conveys the constant dispute between the government and the Mi’kmaq concerning aspects of the treaties. Her current research clearly illustrates the constitutional significance of the original treaties signed between Indigenous Peoples, such as the Mi’kmaq, and the British Crown. With respect to Nova Scotia, for example, she sets out the fine points of the 1752 Peace and Friendship Treaty, which has been used as the central focus in a number of recent court cases. Under this treaty, specific clauses guarantee Aboriginal hunting and fishing rights throughout the Mi’kmaw territory. Chief Gerard Julian (2013, p.3) referred to this and the other Peace and Friendship Treaties during his presentation to the United Nations. He stated, “In 1999 the Supreme Court of Canada found in the Donald Marshall case that the Mi’kmaq, as guaranteed in the 1760-61 Treaties, have a right to fish for a Moderate Livelihood.” In his address, Chief Julian (2013, p.1) points out that “the Mi’kmaq are holders of the covenant chain of treaties and rights included in the Peace and Friendship Treaties of 1725 and 26, 1749, 1752 and 53, 1760 and 61.” He also speculates “there may be other treaties yet to be discovered or disclosed.”

As both Chief Julian (2013) and Battiste (2016) have demonstrated, understanding the relevance of the treaties in Canadian contemporary life is important for all Canadian citizens. Treaty Education and its implications are critical for opening up space for conversations to begin
not just between non-Indigenous Canadians and the Mi’kmaq, but also between all Indigenous Peoples and other Canadians.

5. Indigenous Stereotypes and the Canadian Myth

Regan’s (2010) scholarship presents an excellent case that reveals the hidden agenda of mainstream Eurocentric Canadian colonial history as it relates to stereotypes and myths. Through her research, Regan (2010) points out the negative influence of Indigenous racial stereotypes and exposes the intentional reasons behind the fabricated creation of the myth of the peace-loving Canadian. Regan (2010, p.11, p.213) has shown how settlers deliberately use myths such as “the benevolent peace-keeping Canadian” and stereotype of “the Indigenous warrior” as a means of deriving values and worth from colonial history. She further exposes the role of myths and stereotypes that help maintain the benefits of colonization for the status quo at the expense of Indigenous Peoples.

Regan (2010) suggests that the origins of the popular “benevolent peace-loving Canadian myth” began with the colonization of Canada. She shows that this term was intentional and was used to create a façade that makes the settler appear to be peaceful and not perpetrators of violence. She makes a distinct connection to the tremendous hidden power of the benevolent peace-loving myth that reinforces Canada’s celebratory colonial narrative. For example, the colonization of Canada, especially as it is juxtaposed to the overt colonial violence’s of the United States, has traditionally been portrayed as a relatively peaceful process and intentionally excludes the purposeful violent injustices done to the Indigenous Peoples such as the Mi’kmaq. Regan (2010, p.11) argues “a purpose of this benevolent peacekeeping myth is to create a positive national image, which helps to deflect the hidden realities, which are the systems of oppression placed on the Indigenous Peoples in order for colonization to work.”
Like the benevolent peacekeeping myth, the purpose of the Indigenous warrior stereotype is multifaceted. Since the foundation of Canadian colonization was based on colonizers stealing land and resources from Indigenous Peoples, such as the Mi’kmaq, there was bound to be conflict. The conundrum facing the settlers was the huge reverence and respect that the Indigenous Peoples had for maintaining peace at all costs. For example, in an effort to maintain peaceful relations between the colonizers of North America and the Indigenous Peoples, the Indigenous ceremony known as “Burying the Hatchet” was often performed (Battiste, 2016). This sophisticated Indigenous ceremony was steeped in tradition and had significant purpose and meaning with respect to keeping the peace. Battiste (2016) reminds us that part of the treaty negotiation process between the Mi’kmaq and the British included the “Burying the Hatchet” ceremony. This Mi’kmaw custom helped conclude the end of a war that had been going on for over seventy-five years and solidify the reverence of peace, neutrality, conciliatory practices between the Mi’kmaq and the English. Battiste (2016) affirms, that the British, other settlers, and, more recently, the Canadian Government, have often ignored these treaties. Instead of peace signified by “Burying the Hatchet”, there have been many cases of violence toward the Mi’kmaq including actions that nearly exterminated them.

Vital to my research pursuits is trying to create an awareness regarding this contrast between the settlor view and the Indigenous view of Canada’s history. Both Regan (2010) and Battiste (2016) describe this contrast and the inherent hidden perception of violence that forms the foundation of Indigenous-settler relations. Like Regan (2010, p.12), I am interested in understanding the “role that myth, stereotypes, ritual, and history play in perpetrating violence” against Indigenous Peoples. My emphasis will be on the ways that deeply rooted patterns of perpetrator/victim behaviour, colonizer over the Mi’kmaq for example, are connected to
intentional narratives about colonial history. It is through myths and stereotypes such as the
benevolent peace lover and Indigenous warrior that settlers can justify taking over land and
resources.

6. Research Challenges

All over the world, scholars have discussed the problems of structural change associated
with symbolic patterns of violence, which are embedded in the history of Indigenous settler
relations (Regan, 2010). John Lederach (2001) expresses concerns in “Five Qualities of Practice
in Support of Reconciliation Processes”, that breaking free from these cycles of inherent violence
will be a challenge of authenticity and ethical cognition for both non-Indigenous and Indigenous
people with respect to determining how to transcend from the past, present and into the future.

The decolonization of Atlantic Canadian history is an excellent starting point for critical
analysis that will challenge the personal privileges, belief systems, assumptions, and biases that
are deeply embedded in current culture and history (Battiste, 2013). As Regan (2010) has argued,
the real challenge will be the ability for today’s settlers to truly remove their mainstream lens and
look at life critically. When the current non-Indigenous Canadian population questions the moral
foundation of settler society they will have two options. One choice is to continue to deny the
hidden violent colonial conflict that was directed towards Indigenous Peoples and its impacts
today. The other is to question the myths and stereotypes that they have come to understand as
their history. By taking a decolonizing approach, settlers have an opportunity to transform the
current relationship between themselves and Indigenous Peoples and develop a relationship that
is more diplomatic and peaceful in nature.

Even though today’s settlers believe that they are looking at their own colonial history in
a different way, their ontology will always be clouded by their own inherent beliefs, biases, and
experiences (Regan 2010). Lederach states (2001) that in order for the settler’s conscience to welcome this new mindset, they must embrace the possibility of change and not be fearful of what may transcend as a result.

For most people, this is easier said than done. For example, it is one thing for a twenty-first century settler to acknowledge that Nova Scotia is considered unceded Mi’kmaw territory, according to the Peace and Friendship Treaty of 1752, but what are the contemporary ramifications of genuinely living up to this statement?

As suggested by Dion, Johnston, and Rice (2010) the concept of decolonization sounds like a wonderful term for the achievement of Indigenous resurgence and self-determination. However, upon deeper reflection, they state that, it becomes obvious that this will be an uphill battle until non-Indigenous Canadians become actively and genuinely involved in true social action. In agreement with Regan (2010), I think challenging one’s own belief system is a trying and distressing process because of the difficulty of acknowledging that our origins are tied to the alienation and degradation of Aboriginal Canadians, African Canadians, immigrants, and others (Battiste, 2013).

As stated by Le Baron (2003), for settlers to become Indigenous allies they must consider how their own cultural biases will affect the outcomes of intercultural struggles for how reconciliation will come about. This means that by choosing to become Indigenous allies, today’s settlers must freely embrace the journey as emancipatory and transformational for both themselves and Indigenous Peoples.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission reveals that more than 67% of Canadians believe they have a role to play in reconciliation (Regan, 2010). However, Regan (2010, p.20) also notes “when the legal consideration is removed, the emphasis for reconciliation is placed on
Indigenous Peoples to heal themselves and reconcile with non-Indigenous people so that Canada can put this history behind and move forward.” This viewpoint is evidence of the influence of the mainstream lens and mythology that sees as a viable solution an overemphasis on closure, moving on, and the glossing over of Canada’s violent colonial past.

Val Napoleon’s (2004) research reveals that “if genuine social justice is going to occur for Indigenous Peoples, the dialogue must move beyond rhetoric and include considerable change[s] in Canadian society that contend with disproportionate power relations, illegal land occupation, and use of natural resources. Napoleon (2004) concludes that such a shift will require those who are the beneficiaries of colonization to challenge their own interpretation of colonial history and to choose to act differently, which may impact their future privileges.
Chapter Two
Research Methodology

1. Indigenous Research Paradigm

In this chapter I will outline the research methodology used to collect information and data surrounding the thesis concern. Since my research is directed at creating space for Mi’kmaw narratives as they relate to educational reform it was important that I followed an Indigenous Research Paradigm. I saw this process as an initial step in reconciliation as defined by the Truth and Reconciliation Committee (TRC). Using this approach meant that Indigenous ways of being, knowing, and doing, and emphasizing Mi’kmaw ways of understanding formed the underlying principles and protocol for my research (Wilson, 2008).

I completed the requirements established by the Mi’kmaw Ethics Watch council located at the University of Cape Breton: “Mi’kmaw Research Principles and Protocols: Conducting Research with and/or Among Mi’kmaw People.” In addition, I completed the Tri-Council ethics tutorial as part of the ethics clearance process required by Mount Saint Vincent University Research Ethics Board (UREB) for conducting personal interviews. My work encompassed an understanding of, and respect for, Indigenous research as ceremony and was built on relationships on all levels (Wilson, 2008), including fostering links with others who were interested in my research as well as with those associated with my research ideas. My investigation was also conducted in a way that recognized the ceremony of maintaining accountability to all of these relationships and to others that develop along the way (Wilson, 2008).

Historically, Indigenous paradigms have not been given much merit and agency in mainstream academia (Battiste, 2013). As Wilson (2008) has shown, an Indigenous research
paradigm is often seen as entertaining and creative, usually just tolerated, and not often elevated to the status of being equivalent to other types of research. It is very different from traditional scientific protocol, which requires the researcher to remain neutral and objective. As noted by Wilson (2008, p.40) “Key to the Indigenous research paradigm is that the researcher is subjective, builds [a] relationship with the research, and views research as [a] ceremony of maintaining accountability to these relationships.” Integrating what I am researching and being accepted by the dominant education system is, ironically, the essence of my research.

1.1 Indigenous Storywork Principles

My research paradigm was shaped according to Principles of Indigenous Storywork: Educating the Heart, Mind, Body and Spirit by JoAnn Archibald Q’um Q’um Xiiem (2008). As explained by Archibald (2008), Indigenous storywork is an Indigenous pedagogical tool, which uses the power of oral narratives as a tool for deep learning. Archibald’s (2008 p.129) seven Indigenous storywork principles of “respect, responsibility, reciprocity, reverence, holism, interrelatedness, and synergy” are used in my work, as a basis for recognizing the importance of my accountability when conducting Indigenous research. This accountability includes many aspects of my research such as being accountable to Mi’kmaw Elders, Mi’kmaw scholars, my relationship with my research choices, such as the selection of data collection methods and analysis forms, and the presentation of my findings (Wilson, 2008). Following an Indigenous research paradigm, I carefully respected the guidance of Mi’kmaw Elders Nancy Whynott, Daniel Paul, Alan Syliboy, and Roger Lewis, Billy Lewis and Ellen Hunt as they provided wisdom about and insight into my research.
1.2. Two-Eyed Seeing

This study also relied on the Two-Eyed Seeing (Etuaptmumk) methodology created by Albert Marshall in 2004 as a guiding principle for integrating Indigenous and mainstream research frameworks (Institute for Integrative Health and Science, 2004). This methodology is a type of Mi’kmaw epistemology that celebrates an integrative co-learning journey between the Mi’kmaw People and myself. According to Marshall (Institute for Integrative Health and Science, 2004), Two-Eyed Seeing (Etuaptmumk) is a gift of multiple perspectives treasured by many Aboriginal Peoples which is a requisite for genuine transcultural, trans-disciplinary and collaborative work to occur between the Mi’kmaq and non-Indigenous people. Marshall (Institute for Integrative Health and Science, 2004, np.) distinguishes this way of knowing as “learning to see from one eye with the strength of Indigenous knowledge and ways of knowing, and from the other eye with the strength of mainstream knowledge and ways of knowing for the benefit of all.”

The use of this Indigenous pedagogical tool is an important component of my research. It enabled me to understand the multiple perspectives of the complex relationships between the Mi’kmaq, British and French during the Atlantic Canadian settlement. This deeper connection to my history allowed other narratives to foster about the founding of Nova Scotia that were genuinely transformational, and socially just. By adhering to this Mi’kmaw epistemology, I was also able to integrate mainstream and Indigenous research more easily.

An example of Two-Eyed Seeing (Etuaptmumk) was the incorporation of Archibald’s (2008) analytical and theoretical oral storytelling tools with qualitative personal interviews. Building on Archibald’s (2008) seven principles, I used an Indigenous oral narrative pedagogy as an important research source while conducting personal interviews with my interviewees.
Applying the *Indigenous storywork* principles in these interviews enabled me to work closely with Mi’kmaw Elders, local Mi’kmaw scholars, and storytellers as they shared their understanding and personal life experiences as they relate to my research journey.

2. Qualitative Research

Qualitative research approaches (Richards & Morse, 2013) were employed as a means of acquiring an understanding of the underlying rationales, opinions, and motivations behind Atlantic Canadian historical narratives and myths and of learning about other perspectives such as those of the Mi’kmaq. Qualitative research methods were used as a starting point for the process of decolonizing education. The qualitative research approach involved document analysis, personal interviews, and autoethnography.

My project relied on document analysis of popular historical texts, current news, scholarly works and personal interviews with Mi’kmaw Elders, amateur historians, scholars, and non-Indigenous people, in order gain a better insight into different versions of “The Island with The Bloody Hand” story, the South Shore colonial narrative about the fate of the Payzant settler family discussed in Chapter Three, which served to justify genocide, seizure of land, and resource extraction (Layton, 2008). I explored this common local myth that others and I have come to know and that represents the general perspective of European settlers. I also researched Mi’kmaw points of view, which offered different versions of the same story, one that emphasized rather than hid the realities of colonial impositions in Nova Scotia (Battiste, 2016). Next, I used an autoethnography research approach as a basis for critical reflection, an exploration of my personal experiences as they connected with my own settler/colonial identity, history, and culture, and an examination of what I learned from my research.
2.1. Document Analysis (Secondary Sources)

To investigate both Mi’kmaw histories and European colonial narratives and myths related to Lunenburg County, I used the document analysis social research method for collecting data. I analyzed and interpreted data acquired from an examination of documents and records relevant to my research interests. The purpose of this research method was to uncover underlying stories hidden within largely amateur historical accounts of place. Mi’kmaw scholars and professional historians who have been working to contest the colonial European slant so that more accurate and just narratives emerge also helped me discover contrasting narratives.

2.2 Exploratory Informal Interviews (Primary Sources)

My research included interviews with subjects associated with the topic. I used an audio tape recorder to record the responses of the interviewees, and then for analysis purposes, I transcribed the data into written form. The audiotapes were erased after transcription. Participants had the option of withdrawing at any time.

The primary sources for my research consisted of personal interviews that followed exploratory, less-structured, informal interviews as a preliminary step in my research process. These initial meetings helped to build relationships with the interviewees and then to uncover and explore their viewpoints about different Atlantic Canadian colonial accounts of history. Practicing Archibald’s (2008) Indigenous storywork principles as my research method provided the interviewees with an opportunity for intimate conversation about their ontology as it connected with my research interests. Questions tended to be more open-ended because I wanted their opinions and narratives to be expressed openly during the informal interview. One specific reason for conducting these personal interviews was that I was interested in what the interviewees understand about The Covey Island raid and other colonial narratives related to
Lunenburg County and also in their reactions to this and other stories. In some cases, I used the experiences from the informal interviewing process to help me develop clear questions for a follow up semi-structured interview.

2.3 Follow-Up Interview Questions

If necessary, I followed up with more probing-style questions to either help clarify what was said earlier or to facilitate a more in-depth discussion between the interviewee and myself. This process was designed to encourage the emergence of richer and more meaningful data (Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. 2011). Follow-up questions also constituted a respectful way for me to be attentive, which enabled the interviewee to take the lead in the discussion so that hidden stories within a story surfaced and were expressed.

2.4 Names and Backgrounds of Interviewees

- **David Corkum** is a retired high school teacher and a local amateur historian who has conducted extensive research with respect to both the colonial history and the Mi’kmaq along the South Shore.

- **Cameron Jess** is a local author, amateur historian and relative of the Payzant family who has done extensive research on the intriguing history, origins and background of his family.

- **Dr. John Reid** is a history professor at St Mary’s University whose academic focus is early “modern north-eastern North American history prioritizing imperial-Indigenous concerns in Acadia/Nova Scotia and Northern New England (St. Mary’s University, 2016).”

- **Elder Ellen Hunt** is from Lunenburg and has conducted extensive research in Lunenburg County related to the history and origins of the Mi’kmaq.
• **Elder Dr. Roger Lewis** is a curator of Ethnology at the Nova Scotia Museum in Halifax, Nova Scotia. He specializes in Nova Scotia Mi’kmaw archeology, knowledge practices and historical narratives connected to the Mi’kmaw use of land and resources, and the holistic Mi’kmaw relationship to cultural objects (Nova Scotia Museum, 2016).

• **Elder Billy Lewis** is a community activist who focuses on urban Indigenous issues as well as agricultural sustainably. He is also a Dalhousie University Elder who provides support and guidance to Dalhousie students who may need his counsel (Dalhousie University, 2016).

• **Elder Dr. Daniel Paul** is an author, columnist, and human rights activist whose interests are exposing Atlantic colonial history from the Mi’kmaw perspective.

• **Elder Alan Sylibo** is both a musician and Indigenous artist. He receives his artistic inspiration from the Mi'kmaw petroglyph tradition.

• **Elder Catherine Martin** is an independent film producer, director, writer, facilitator, communications consultant, community activist, and educator. She is the Nancy’s Chair in Women's Studies, at Mount Saint Vincent University.

### 2.5 Autoethnography

The goal of my research was to create a pedagogical tool that will create space for socially just educational narratives to emerge between Mi’kmaq and non-Indigenous people. For this reason, it was important that, as part of the research process, I began this educational reform with myself to challenge my own colonial-shaped ontology. I accomplished this objective by using a qualitative autoethnographic research approach, which is a combination of autobiography and ethnography. As noted by Ellis, Adams, & Bochner (2011, np.), “The purpose of
autoethnography challenges mainstream ways of doing research and representing others and treats research as a political, socially-just and socially-conscious act.”

As Ellis, Adams, & Boucher (2011, np.) state about this process, “I used critical self-reflection and writing to explore my personal experiences to connect my autobiographical story to wider cultural, political, and social meanings and understandings.” This style of analysis helped me begin to build a relationship with my research findings.

Specifically, I used autoethnographic research tools to reflect on my concept of self, identity, and personal history as it related to examining my own colonial and cultural roots in the town of Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, and the surrounding area. I also use an autoethnographic research approach to question my historical Eurocentric viewpoints and beliefs, which I believe supports settler ideology and continues to have negative impacts on the rights of Indigenous Peoples such as the Mi’kmaq.
Chapter Three
My Own Settler Narrative and “The Island with The Bloody Hand”

1. Setting the Context

From the outset, my return to university has felt like a homecoming. I have always had an interest in social justice, and my recent academic journey has led me to a better understanding of my role as an adult educator with respect to fostering social justice through the application of emancipatory practices as they relate to the Mi’kmaq (Lange, 2013). For one of my courses, I had the good fortune of being introduced to a variety of scholarly Indigenous works. This helped me to become aware of the negative impacts of European colonization in Canada on Indigenous Peoples including the Mi’kmaq. More startling was the realization that many benefits I take for granted, as a non-Indigenous Canadian, are replaced with racism, poverty and inequity for many Canadian Indigenous Peoples. Mi’kmaw scholar Marie Battiste (2013) notes that these similar effects are still present and at work today.

I was dumbstruck as I began to understand the profound and numerous connections between the economic and social issues that currently affect Indigenous Peoples and the long-term European colonization project of Canada. Events of more than 400 years ago continue to negatively shape the lives of First Nations, Inuit, and Métis Peoples today. As Battiste (2013) notes, the devastating effects of colonization on Canadian Indigenous Peoples are still evident in such things as perpetuated systemic racism. The denial of treaty rights, attacks on Indigenous culture, heritage and languages, the legacy of Indian Residential Schools, the ongoing tragedy of missing Indigenous women and girls, the continued loss of Indigenous land, and coercive and assimilative policies all continue to exist, through the Indian Act, and remain a force in Canadian law.
Intellectually, spiritually, and emotionally, I wrestled with my new revelations about Canada’s origins and history. My early education had led me to believe that Canada and my home Nova Scotia had been terra nullius (Latin for “nobody’s land”), free for the taking. The Indigenous Peoples inhabiting the land, including the Mi’kmaq in eastern Canada, were regarded as ancient, barbaric, and in need of being civilized. How could the mythically kind and caring nation of Canada deliberately support systems of oppression at the expense of First Nation, Inuit and Métis Peoples (Battiste, 2013)?

As a result, I became interested in the Mi’kmaq of Atlantic Canada, and their experiences prior to colonization. For the remainder of my courses and assignments for my Graduate Studies in Lifelong Learning program, I concentrated on finding out about whatever I could that was related to the Mi’kmaq. I have come to understand that, as with the “birth” of Canada as a nation, the colonial settlement of the Atlantic Provinces was based on resource extraction connected to the invasion, dispossession, and subjugation of the Mi’kmaq who were living here prior to European colonization. I now view the colonizer-colonized relationship between the Maritime settlers and the Mi’kmaq as unequal and beneficial for the colonizer at the expense of the colonized. I have also gained significant insight into, and an understanding, of the heart of the positions taken by some Canadian citizens in relation to colonization and their unwillingness to unpack the privileges associated with whiteness, race, and Eurocentric doctrine (Battiste, 2013).

Through my studies, I have also become enamoured of the sophisticated epistemologies of Indigenous Peoples as deep platforms for both learning and educational reform in Canada. I believe these ancient knowledge-based systems have the potential to raise the level of consciousness of all Canadians and to set a transformational pathway toward a more just society.
2. Colonial History of Lunenburg and Lunenburg County: The Settler Narrative

The purpose of beginning my research with my own personal settler narrative is to acquire a better understanding of the origin, significance, and roots of popular Atlantic Canadian history and its relationship to my own settler identity. My focus in this study was the town of Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, where I was born and raised, as well as the surrounding area. If one looks at Lunenburg’s colonial heritage from the perspective of the Mi’kmaq, how would it differ from the colonists’ version? Which aspects of the settler narrative mattered and which might be challenged? Is it possible to arrive at a narrative that helps us understand our past that more accurately defines the relationship between the European colonizers and the Mi’kmaq both past and current day?

Because I was born to a settler family and raised in Lunenburg, the settler narrative was fully ingrained in my upbringing. This research therefore takes me on a journey that is having a profound personal impact on my understanding of the history of my family, my town, and my roots. For example, when I walk the streets of Lunenburg I not only see the colonial town built by Protestant settlers but I also wonder where did the Mi’kmaq and Acadians live for hundreds of years before the so-called founding of Lunenburg. As I delve more deeply into my research, one of my questions was how the colonial history that Lunenburgers (those born and raised in Lunenburg) celebrate was made possible only through the displacement of the Mi’kmaq, who had lived in Nova Scotia for more than 10,500 years prior to the arrival of my ancestors.

As stated by Mathers Des Brisay (1980, p.21) in The History of the County of Lunenburg, “The town [of Lunenburg] was settled four years after the creation of Halifax, Nova Scotia [1749], and was one of the first British attempts to settle Protestants in Nova Scotia.” Like many Lunenburgers, I can link my ancestry directly to some of the original European colonizers who
were the first settlers responsible for of this British settlement, and I have come to understand Lunenburg’s history as a reflection of the original European colonization of Canada. Lunenburg is promoted as a town steeped in European settler history, as evidenced by its historic buildings, unique architecture, and seafaring life, culture, and people (Parker, 1999). Lunenburgers’ pride in their history is widely celebrated.

On June 8, 1753, my four-times-great-grandfather, Johann Konrad Knickle, arrived on the ship “The Gale” as one of the first European citizens of the new settlement. Like many other Lunenburg settlers, Johann came from the Palatinate and Upper Rhine region of Germany (Cuthbertson, 1996). Like most Lunenburgers, I was taught that Lunenburg became a successful settlement rich in heritage and culture due to German ingenuity, enterprising ability, and connections that created solidarity (Cuthbertson, 2002). The result was that, over time, the people of Lunenburg became accomplished farmers, shipbuilders, fishermen, and businessmen who celebrated their strong entrepreneurial spirit. The fortitude acquired from living next to the abundant resources of the Atlantic Ocean led to the creation of a variety of businesses connected to fishing and the sea. In fact, Lunenburgers have boasted that at one time it was home to the largest fishing fleet in the world (Parker, 1999). During the 19th century, the town claimed to have more than 178 ships anchored in the harbour (Zwicker & Schaffenburg, 1993). Parker (1999) notes that a common saying was that “Lunenburg was home to wooden ships and iron men!!” Throughout my education, I was never taught that this colonial town was built on unceded land claimed unquestioningly by my ancestors, and that their successes often came at the expense of that of the Mi’kmaq, who were pushed by Lunenburgers to the margins of their own territory.
As well it can be observed that like many colonial stories, the influence of women in Lunenburg’s settlement is missing. Per usual, this narrative reflects the well-ingrained western perspective of this historic town’s success, cast in terms of men’s work.

Lunenburg’s initial Protestant settlement helped to facilitate the dwindling of the Mi’kmaq population. Parker (1999) notes that by 1861, just 38 Mi’kmaq were recorded as living in Lunenburg County. While the accuracy of European enumeration of a mobile Mi’kmaq population is questionable, it nevertheless points to a downward trend of the Mi’kmaq People in Lunenburg County during this period. Parker (1999) suggests that the initial decline occurred because of a smallpox epidemic and forced relocation of some the Mi’kmaq People to less desirable geographical locations. Neglected by colonial officials and left to exist at the margins of European society, Parker (1999, p.113) stated “the Mi’kmaq were described as generally living in rude dwellings leading a life in a great degree incompatible with the desires natural to their race.”

Initially, many of the early settlers were farmers, but their proximity to the plentiful resources offered by the Atlantic Ocean attracted them to the sea as a new way of life (Zwicker & Schaffenburg, 1993). A variety of successful businesses connected to all aspects of the fishing industry were established (Parker, 1999). One example of such a fishing business is Adams and Knickle Ltd., which was founded by my great-grandfather, Captain Alexander Anderson Knickle, and Harry Adams in 1897 and which has played a significant role in the economic success of Lunenburg. In its early years, the company was an exporter of salt fish, but when the salt fishery died, the company began to harvest deep-sea scallops (Russell, 2016). During the 1980s, the back of the Canadian $100 bill featured an image of the scenic Lunenburg front
harbour (Zwicker & Schaffenburg, 1993). The red buildings of Adams and Knickle Ltd. prominently figure in the colour version of this now iconic image of the town.

Whether it is the creation of one of the first Canadian European settlements, or the respect and reverence for a hard life at sea, many Lunenburgers recognize and celebrate their settler roots. Layton (2003) states that there is an established community sense of colonial birthright, which constitutes an integral factor that supports the town today and which was reinforced in 1995 when the colonial town received the status of a UNESCO World Heritage site. This is a designation which Nova Scotia, Canada (2016) says serves to protect the 18th century architecture and is an excellent example of the intentional British colonial settlement project in Canada.

These celebratory narratives of colonial Lunenburg omit the Mi’kmaq, choosing to exclude an important context of the town’s founding. Lunenburg was founded in the shadows of a colonial war that pitted the English, against the French and allied Mi’kmaq for control over Nova Scotia and was part of a larger war known as the War of the Spanish Succession. As noted by historian William Wicken (2002) in Mi’kmaq Treaties on Trial, History Land and Donald Marshall Junior on April 11, 1713 at Utrecht in the Netherlands, the “Treaty of Utrecht” was an agreement signed between Britain and France, which resulted in major concessions, by France to Britain in North America during this period of conflict. Geoffrey Plank (2003) has demonstrated in An Unsettled Conquest, The British Campaign Against the Peoples of Acadia, that a major fallout of the Treaty of Utrecht required France to hand over the part of Mi’kma’ki that is currently mainland Nova Scotia. The Mi’kmaq were very displeased at this outcome in part because they felt France had betrayed them by giving away their land, something to which they would never have agreed. Centuries old Mi’kmaw settlements such as Mirlegueche (present day
Lunenburg) were included in these relinquishments of land control and occupation being handed over to the British. As noted by Wicken (1993) in “26 August 1726: A Case Study in Mi’kmaq – New England Relations in the Early 18th Century”, Mirlegueche was one of many well established Mi’kmaw coastal villages during the 17th and 18th centuries along the eastern shore of Mi’kma’ki. Wicken (1993) also states that during the summer months, the population of Mirlegueche would have been upwards of over 300 Mi’kmaw residents.

Further to the point, Wicken (2002) clearly demonstrates the Mi’kmaq interpretation of the many treaties that they signed with the British. Wicken (2002) states that the Mi’kmaq and other Indigenous Peoples understood the “Peace and Friendship” treaties of the 18th century to be formal documents embodying the agreements between themselves and the British which were associated with peace, friendship, alliance, land, commerce and trade.

John Reid (2009) notes in “Empire, the Maritime Colonies, and the Supplanting of Mi’kma’ki/Wulstukwik, 1780-1820” that the Mi’kmaq were well versed in understanding the intricacies of the treaty process and its negotiations. Reid (2009) states that the Mi’kmaq were drawing on over two hundred years of diplomatic relationships and experience that they had with Europeans when formulating treaty negotiations. From the perspective of the Mi’kmaq, a series of treaties, included those they themselves negotiated, signaled their continued sovereignty over their territory. Plank (2003) argues that the Treaty of Utrecht of 1713, signed between the French and the British, strongly shaped the perspectives of the Mi’kmaq during this era. He argues that the Mi’kmaq in no way felt obligated to be bound by the terms of the Treaty of Utrecht (and to this day do not) because they were excluded in the ratification process of the treaty. This perspective fueled Mi’kmaq resistance to British imperial efforts to build settlements throughout Mi’kma’ki. The Mi’kmaw Peoples’ own treaties with the British reaffirmed their entitlement to
their territory. These 18th century treaties, which included the Peace and Friendship Treaty of Boston of 1725, ratification of the 1725 Treaty in 1726, the Treaty of 1725 renewed by Governor Cornwallis with Wolastoqiyik (Maliseet) in 1749, and the Treaty of Articles and Peace and Friendship renewed in 1752, as well as two additional attempts to formulate further peace and friendship negotiations with the British in 1754 and 1755, reaffirmed for the Mi’kmaq a firm recognition that that while they conceded to a British presence in their territory, they did not ceded their territory to the British.

This era also saw the Mi’kmaw People lose as allies in their homeland a French Acadian population that had peacefully resided in Mi’kmak’i since the start of the 17th century. Beginning in 1755 and continuing to 1764, the British, again as part of an effort to Anglicize and command control over Nova Scotia/Mi’kmak’i, forcibly removed via deportation more than ten thousand French-speaking Acadians whose presence in Nova Scotia was viewed by the British as impediments to its imperial objectives. As a testament to the affinity of the Mi’kmaq for their French neighbours who by 1755 shared with the Mi’kmaq a Roman Catholic faith and many family connections, as well as evidence of Mi’kmaw resistance of British policy, the Mi’kmaq helped to harbour from British officials their longtime Acadian allies (Plank, 2003).

As demonstrated by Reid (2004) by virtue of these treaties, the Mi’kmaq and other Indigenous Peoples had an understanding of their rights that they had worked out with the British. The Mi’kmaq saw the treaties as agreements, which allowed the British to use their territories, and in return the Mi’kmaq could maintain self-governance, customary rights to Mi’kmak’i, Mi’kmaw culture and resources. In particular, the Mi’kmaq saw these treaties, during this time-period, as a way for them to maintain power. Plank (2003) suggests that the Mi’kmaq would not have concluded that treaty negotiations with the British were considered as a sign of
defeat. The Mi’kmaq saw these complex agreements to be steeped in assisting them in retaining authority and dominion in Mi’kma’ki. Plank (2003) has shown, for example that these treaties stated there were no restrictions regarding where the Mi’kmaq could hunt, fish and live, and they were able to continue governing themselves autonomously. It was the Mi’kmaw People’s strong sense of how they interpreted these documents that gave them an empowering sense of their rights to Mi’kma’ki, for which they continue to fight today.

As the Mi’kmaq virulently opposed British claims to their territory and its efforts to expand its holdings in Mi’kma’ki, the British responded in kind, using their military power to forcibly displace the Mi’kmaq. Mi’kmaw historian Elder Helen Hunt, (personal communication, February, 20, 2017) contends that prior to the British-sponsored settlement of Lunenburg, the area was inhabited by the Mi’kmaq and, for a much shorter time, by the French (Dawson, 1996). Elder Hunt (2017) states that since it was in the Mi’kmaw People’s nature to be friendly, they initially would have welcomed the British, as they had the French. However due to the forceful ways and colonizing agenda of the British, Hunt (2017) states that Mi’kmaq vehemently attempted to defend their territory. They resisted British-sponsored settlement, and conflict and violence erupted between the Mi’kmaq and Anglo-sponsored settlers whose very presence embodied offensive British incursions into Mi’kma’ki.

So, resistant were the Mi’kmaq to British claims to Mi’kma’ki, that Britain struggled to establish a foothold by populating it with Anglo settlers. For this reason, Britain had to “settle” for German settlers who formed the nucleus of Lunenburg society. This land was settled by British policy, very much in spite of the Mi’kmaw People’s opposition to it, and despite the fact that the Mi`kmaq never ceded their lands, and have never received compensation for territories taken from them (Battiste, 2016).
In keeping with a wider historical trend in the understanding and teaching of history in Canada, the history of Lunenburg is portrayed from the perspective of the Eurocentric colonizer. Canada was a place for European settlers in North America to explore, settle, and develop freely. In the history of Lunenburg and Lunenburg County, the Mi’kmaq were, like all Indigenous Peoples across Canada, errantly called “Indians” and were often portrayed as the enemy of European colonization. Traditionally, historically references to them have been few and reflect the European view of them as barbaric savages in need of help to become civilized (Tattrie, 2013). As noted by Layton (2003), historically settlers believed that [the Mi’kmaq] seemed to take pride and pleasure in the element of surprise, when killing, scalping and looting.

3. Local Oral Narratives That Help to Sustain European Colonial History

One settler narrative that both reflected and embedded the European colonial fear of the Mi’kmaq and their alleged barbarism was the story known as “The Island with The Bloody Hand.” Even before the story is heard, the name conjures up an image of savage violence that is stereotypically associated with “Indians.” It is clearly a pejorative story, one of the purposes of which is to portray the Mi’kmaq in a very demeaning light. Like members of many Lunenburg families, my father, my grandfather, and my earlier ancestors have handed down this story orally to other family members and friends. It is a story that continues to be handed down today (Layton, 2003). As with most folktales, connecting with the listeners and heightening their senses of fear are important. The following is a summary of the story as I learned it and as it is told from my settler’s perspective.

The story dates to 1756, when the British were seeking to control the North American territory known by the Mi’kmaq as Mi’kma’ki, and by the French as Acadia, which was inhabited in relative peace by both groups. Unable to persuade English-speaking Britons to settle
the contested land, the British, in an act of desperation, sponsored the emigration of European Protestants from Germany, Switzerland, and France. The conundrum for the British was that the most numerous inhabitants of this area were still the Mi’kmaq and French Catholics (Grenier, 2014). In an attempt to gain a dominant Protestant presence and stronghold, the British ignored earlier treaties they had signed with the Mi’kmaq and created settlements including Halifax (1749) and Lunenburg (1753). At the same time, the Acadian population, some of whom were regarded as allies of the Mi’kmaq were beginning in 1755 to be deported after having lived uneasily under British rule since 1713 (Reid, 2010).

The 1756 experience of the Payzant family on Coveys Island occurred in the turbulent context of ongoing Mi’kmaw resistance to a British presence, the so-called Mi’kmaq War (Des Brisay, 1980) and at the height of the Acadian deportation. Not surprisingly given the dramatic context in which it was born, the story was subject immediately to embellishment. It was May 8, 1756, almost three years after the founding of the Protestant settlement of Lunenburg. The tale, as told by settlers (and using their language), begins with Louis Payzant, his wife Marie Anne, their children, and their servants fleeing from religious persecution in France to settle in British-claimed North America. They first settled in Lunenburg in August of 1753 but in 1755 the family moved to Payzant Island (now known as Coveys Island), north of Lunenburg in Mahone Bay. They were living in a small temporary log cabin until the building of their permanent home was completed (Layton, 2003). The language and colonial renderings that have been used when telling the oral tale about the Payzant family tragedy will also be included for this study.

4. **The Island with The Bloody Hand**

   Around midnight, the household was awoken to dogs barking. Louis picked up his musket, which he kept close by because he and his family were perennially worried about an
Indian attack (Layton, 2003). He unbolted and opened the door, stepped outside, and fired his musket. The Indians came charging through and instantly killed him. In an attempt to save him, Marie Anne ran to his side but was greeted with his dying words: “My heart is growing cold. The Indians!” He then, the dramatic story tells, fell dead at her feet (Des Brisay, 1980, p.495).

Des Brisay’s (1980, p.495) written account of the story emphasizes the allegedly bloodthirsty character of the Indians: “Next came the war whoop cries from the Indians as they rushed like tigers inside the log cabin.” The family, we are told, then watched on as Louis was scalped a scenario emphasized in Des Brisay’s (1980, p.495) version where he recounts “The ‘savage’ braced his knee against their father’s shoulders and with a huge tug ripped the scalp off the skull and continued right to the nape of his neck.” The native wielded the bloody trophy, proof of the assailant’s prowess, and cried out in wild outbursts as he fastened the scalp, dripping with fresh human blood, to his belt, alongside the other scalps of his enemies (Layton, 2003).

When Marie Anne heard the savage howling cries of the Indians, she dashed back inside and barred the door. The attackers, however, were preparing to set her home on fire so Marie Anne directed her son Philip to unlock the door (Des Brisay, 1980). Trying as best as he could to protect his frightened mother, sister Mary, and younger brothers John and Lewis, nine-year-old Philip jumped up on the table and shook his fists at the intruders (Layton, 2003).

Before landing on Coveys Island, the Indians had stopped at another island known as Rous (about one mile away) and captured a young boy to act as a guide to Coveys Island. Unfortunately, he was also scalped in the violent frenzy, and they killed the servant, Mrs. Riovant, and her infant as well. Some of the natives filled their canoes with looted merchandise and other belongings, and they then set both the log cabin and the new home on fire. Everything was engulfed in scorching flames.
Since the Indians knew they could receive a handsome ransom for live prisoners, they spared the lives of Anne Marie and her children, who were then forced into the canoes. Stunned and shocked, the surviving Payzant family members departed mournfully as their home blazed deep into the night (Layton, 2003). Marie Anne and her children were captured and taken by canoe to present day New Brunswick where Marie Anne and her children were separated. Marie Anne continued to Québec City where she gave birth to a baby girl (Layton, 2003). Eventually Marie Anne and her children were reunited and they remained in Québec City until 1760. They then returned by boat to Halifax, Nova Scotia, and eventually settled in Falmouth in 1761. Anne Marie still claimed ownership of Coveys Island, but could not bear to return there Layton (2006).

Legend has it that the father, Louis, put his hand on a wound that was bleeding heavily and then pressed his hand on a large rock, where it left an imprint (Creighton, 1950). The flames from the fire generated so much heat that his bloody handprint was permanently imprinted onto the stone (Curley, 2013). If you go hiking on Coveys Island today, you can still see the remains of the rock foundation of the Payzant homestead and legend contends that a faint outline of Louis’ blood hand, which gives the title to a common version of the story, remains visible (Curley, 2013).

The historical context of major events in Atlantic Canadian history is important to include when understanding “The Island with The Bloody Hand” narrative. The tragedy of the Payzant family occurred during the North American French and Indian Wars (1754-1763). Anderson (2007) describes this major conflict as part of the worldwide Seven Years’ War (1756-1763) between the French and the English. “The Story of the Bloody Hand” would have been heavily connected with the ongoing violent conflict between Britain and the French, and the
Indigenous Peoples over the control of New France and the British Colonies (present day north eastern United States and eastern Canada).

5. Eurocentric Versions of The Coveys Island Raid

The influence of “The Island with The Bloody Hand” story can be confirmed if an individual searches the Internet for information about the Payzant family tragedy on Coveys Island. Whether the document is scholarly, presented as historical fiction, or is written as folklore, interested parties will discover many versions, accounts and records about this piece of Nova Scotia history. Like most Atlantic colonial chronicles, “The Island with The Bloody Hand” narrative has been and still is written from a Eurocentric perspective that fixes or frame images and perceptions about Nova Scotia’s past. As a result, this inaccurate portrayal, which ignores the Mi’kmaw and Acadian viewpoints, becomes the excepted truth that continues to celebrate the mythic colonial slant and emphasizes negative stereotypes about Indigenous Peoples even today.

For example, there are several written historical accounts that mention the event. Nova Scotia: A Brief History, was written by Phyllis Blakeley (1955), as the Grade seven history book used from the 1950s-1970s in Nova Scotia. That the story was given its own chapter called The Story of Louis Payzant is evident that it was considered to be important. Two illustrations that accompany this story in the textbook are particularly noteworthy. These classic images are examples of how the settler myth and Indigenous stereotypes were inaccurately depicted. Both images and related text are representative of how Indigenous Peoples and settlers were commonly perceived. From the pictures, one gets a sense of the desperate, vulnerable, innocent settler family who is threatened and often put in in grave danger from the menacing ferocious natives. More importantly, one must consider what the influence of these images, combined with
the narrative, was over time, as students, parents and educators continually witnessed these prevalent misrepresentations of reality.

The story is also mentioned in *History of the County of Lunenburg*. Written by Mathers Des Brisay (1980), this book “provides a detailed historical account of the colonization and development of Lunenburg County from the time of European settlement up to 1895.” *Heroes of the Acadian Resistance: The Story of Joseph Beausoleil Broussard and Pierre II Saturette 1702-1765* by Diane Marshall (2011) mentions the Payzant family incident in connection with valiant guerrilla campaign by the British against the Mi’kmaw/Acadian resistance in 18th century Nova Scotia. *Foreign Protestants and the Settlement of Nova Scotia* by Bell Winthrop (1990) also mentions this piece of colonial history. The *Nova Scotia Historical Society*, various collections at the *Nova Scotia Archives and Records Management (Journal and Letters of Colonel Charles Lawrence)* and the influential *Dictionary of Canadian Bibliography* also have documented the event.

Some of the ancestors of the Payzant family have done extensive research and created narratives of their tumultuous family past. *Amateur* historian Linda Layton for example, who is a descendant of Marie, researched and wrote *Passion for Survival* (2003). This work is a detailed account of Marie Payzant’s life that includes a Eurocentric perspective on the raid on Coveys Island and Marie’s and her children’s time spent in Quebec City during The French Indian War until their release in 1761. Cameron Jess who is a descendant of Lisette Payzant (the infant that was born when Marie was in French captivity), wrote a historical fiction known as *The Chosen Seed*. Jess (2003) used his family history to write a newfangled tale that includes many fictional twists and turns such as using the history and mythology of the Knights of Templar as the central plot in connection with the raid on Coveys Island. Other amateur historians who felt compelled

Modern Canadian authors have even been drawn to the Payzant family tragedy as a significant topic to write about. Renowned Canadian author Margaret Atwood (2009) for example felt the story carried enough merit and wrote a two-page spread in the Globe and Mail called “We Have Been Given Up as A Lost Cause.” Written as a secret journal of Marie Payzant to her children of when she was a prisoner in Quebec City, Atwood (2009) wrote a fictionalized account of Marie Payzant’s life. This article is heavily laden with negative terms used to describe Indigenous Peoples and serves as an example of how colonization becomes justified through narrative stories and literature. In addition, Canadian novelist, playwright and journalist Ami McKay (2007) mentions Marie Payzant in her novel and recent national bestseller, The Birth House. In addition, “The Payzant Story” is a version of “The Island with The Bloody Hand”, which was published in 2013 by Trudy Curley in The Bluenose Coast, a South Shore publication in Nova Scotia whose articles often praise as proud the traditions, adventures, history and local folklore connected to European colonization.

An integral feature of Lunenburg County culture is its oral folklore tradition, which has supported the Eurocentric view of the region’s culture and history (Fraser, 2007). Works by Helen Creighton, a well-known folklorist, brought up in Nova Scotia, are excellent examples of how “The Island with The Bloody Hand" and other local stories have been passed orally from generation to generation (Croft, 2009). Creighton (1957, 2004) used the Coveys Island raid to create an entertaining Nova Scotia mythical ghost story in Folklore of Lunenburg County and Bluenose Ghosts. However, Creighton’s (1957, 2004) folklore legacy is not without judgment. In
The Quest of the Folk: Antimodernism and Cultural Selection in Twentieth-Century Nova Scotia, historian Ian McKay (1993) heavily criticizes the way the work of folklore artists such as Creighton (1957, 2004) was used for promoting the hidden economic, political, and cultural agenda in Atlantic Canada.

Many of the folktales support the Eurocentric perspective of colonial interests at the expense of the Mi’kmaq. Since the conception of “The Island with The Bloody Hand” many narrative twists and various forms of literature have been created of the tale to help justify settler mentality and ideology. The story has been expressed in one form or another for over 260 years and continues into the 21st century.
Chapter Four

Elder Responses from Personal Interviews

Critical to my research, was following Archibald’s (2008) *Indigenous storywork* guidelines while conducting personal interviews with various Mi’kmaw Elders and Atlantic Canadian historians in the area. By honouring Archibald’s (2008) seven storywork principles, I was able to listen respectfully and carefully, as they unveiled many lessons that were integral to my research. My important time spent with these astute individuals had little to do with unveiling a Mi’kmaw counter narrative of “The Island with The Bloody Hand” story in part because the Mi’kmaw Elders were unfamiliar with this colonial tale. Instead what I began to grasp was how the process of *Indigenous storywork* truly works as a pedagogical tool.

Elder Roger Lewis

Mi’kmaw ethnologist and curator of the Nova Scotia Museum in Halifax, Elder Roger Lewis (January 13, 2017, personal communication) supports the proposition that the Mi’kmaq were a well-established autonomous people with a specialized social structure. Elder Lewis (2017) bases this on the physical, geographical and cultural landscapes, such as the extensive watersheds and river systems in Nova Scotia, which he states provided an equitable distribution of resources for many independent settlements to occur. Elder Lewis (2017) states that Mi’kmaw settlement patterns and land use were attracted to, and determined by, the abundant river systems throughout Mi’kma’ki.

Elder Lewis (2017) highlights that the Mi’kmaq were both a riverine and agrarian society. Elder Lewis (2017) says the Mi’kmaq were fundamentally peaceful in nature. There was no need for conflict with other people living in Mi’kma’ki since there were sufficient resources for everyone to live in a self-sustainable way.
Elder Lewis (2017), drawing on Mi`kmaw ways of knowing, also signifies the importance of understanding the term “warrior.” He states that the Mi`kmaw foundation of a “warrior” was protection and not the contemporary Eurocentric understanding of warriors as initiators of violence and war. When European colonization began, Elder Lewis (2017) states that the Mi`kmaw became warriors in the sense that they were protectors of their river systems, resources, people, culture, land and way of life.

Elder Lewis (2017) states that it is significant that the attack on Coveys Island took place during the North American French and Indian Wars (1754-1763). Elder Lewis (2017) describes this major conflict as part of the worldwide Seven Years’ War (1756-1763) between the French and the English. Elder Lewis (2017) suggests that “The Story of The Bloody Hand” would have been heavily connected with the ongoing violent conflict between Britain and the French, and the Indigenous Peoples over the control of New France and the British Colonies (present day north eastern United States and eastern and central Canada).

**Elder Daniel Paul**

Mi`kmaw historian Elder Daniel Paul (February 7, 2017, personal communication) adamantly asserts that in order for self-determination for the Mi`kmaw and other Indigenous Peoples to happen, their perspectives of colonial history must be widely acknowledged and legitimized. Elder Paul (2017), Battiste (2016), Regan (2010) and other scholars affirm that for genuine reconciliation to occur, mainstream must understand, accept and embrace other world views of European colonization in North America.

Elder Paul (2017) states that many Canadians are not aware of the inherent violence of European colonization, nor do they understand its interrelatedness to their assumed benefits and the destruction it caused the original inhabitants. From the beginning, Elder Paul (2017) says
Colonial myths and stereotypes have been used to reinforce negative images of Indigenous Peoples to reinforce a Canadian history told from a predominantly Eurocentric perspective.

Elder Paul (2017) says that all his endeavours have been to shed light on this hidden violence perpetrated by the British towards the Mi’kmaq and challenges how Atlantic Canadian history is told. Elder Paul’s (2017) says that his work reveals the contradictions between Mi’kmaq views and the British view of early foreign Protestant settlement in Mi’kma’ki. The Mi’kmaq see themselves as the victims of cruel and barbaric acts committed by the British. They were defending against the British warfare that was attempting to take over and control their ancestral homeland.

Elder Paul (2017) asserts that, from the beginning, British European colonization was based on military force and intimidation that dramatically altered Indigenous Peoples’ culture, heritage and way of life. Elder Paul (2017) says that when British settlers arrived in the early 1700’s there was less negative influence by the English attempts to occupy Mi’kma’ki. It was not until around the 1760s, four years after the Coveys Island raid, when the Mi’kmaq began to feel a real threat by the British.

Elder Paul (2017) states that factors such as European exploration, European countries laying claim Indigenous territory and their eventual colonization all had drastic impacts on the Mi’kmaq and other Indigenous Peoples’ ways of life. Elder Paul (2017) asserts that during European colonization, the British attempted genocide, aiming to eliminate the Mi’kmaq as a people and as a cultural entity. Even though the Mi’kmaq resiliently survived and are still here today, Elder Paul (2017) states they were not left unscathed by the ultimate influences of brutal British dominance and occupation.
Elder Paul (2017) said that European colonization severely limited the Mi’kmaw lifestyle of seasonal migration. For example, Elder Paul (2017) states that land encroachment from European settlement destroyed the crucial animal habitats and undermined the hunting and fishing resources upon which the Mi’kmaq relied on. This major Mi’kmaw food supply was under stress since the Mi’kmaq were competing for resources with the colonizers and the emphasis on sustainability was compromised. As well, Elder Paul (2017) remarks that the missionaries strongly encouraged Indigenous Peoples to give up their spirituality and to instead follow Christianity. Later, institutions such as churches, residential schools and the government continued to destroy Indigenous culture and language so that many Indigenous Peoples including the Mi’kmaq have lost who they are as a people (Paul, 2017).

Elder Paul (2017) explains that Eurocentric historical narratives such as “The Island with The Bloody Hand”, became a source of entertainment and were not understood within the context of the time-period. Elder Paul (2017) reminds us that the Payzant family were part of the intentional British influx of European Protestant immigrants to Nova Scotia which was an attempt to usurp both the Mi’kmaq and the French and the Acadians. Elder Paul (2017) suggests that the Payzant family and many others were part of the overall British strategy of occupation during the constant warfare against the Indigenous Peoples and the Acadian allies for control over North America.

Elder Paul (2017) puts forward his version of European colonization from a Mi’kmaw perspective that offers a very different lens through which to view European settlement in Atlantic Canada in general, and the Covey Island story in particular. Elder Paul (2017) stresses that he has demonstrated the staggering evidence of many of the horrific acts committed by the British against the Mi’kmaq in an attempt to gain control over Mi’kma’ki and its resources. Elder
Paul (2008) challenges how history has been portrayed by the mainstream and offers a strong critique of negative Indigenous stereotypes. Elder Paul (2017) believes that his work *First Nations History: We Were Not the Savages*, is an Indigenous example of the type of critical literary discourse needed so that a more socially just historical account can emerge about European colonization in Atlantic Canada.

Although he disagrees with the general view of documents as being regarded as more factual and reliable than other sources, Elder Paul (2017) said that he still chose to use textual European documents that showed evidence of the many atrocities committed by the British against the Mi’kmaq. Even though scholarly discourse has been regarded in this way, which adds to the persistence of European accounts of events over Indigenous version. Elder Paul (2017) expresses that in order for his historical perspective to be recognized in academia and in mainstream culture he had to go this route. Elder Paul (2017) emphasized that, since he is trying to influence mainstream academia, he intentionally used “white man's documents”, so it cannot be said that he twisted the facts in his findings. Elder Paul (2017) affirms that what the Europeans did to the Mi’kmaq and other Indigenous Peoples is far worse than the standard Eurocentric barbaric portrayal of the Mi’kmaq. Based on his findings Elder Paul (2017) attests that the British are the ones who should be considered “honourless savages” and not the Mi’kmaq. When examining this stance from the Mi’kmaw perspective it shows the serious complexities for restoring and building relationships between the Mi’kmaq and settlers and presents a conundrum indeed.

The purpose of Elder Paul’s (2017) work, such as his book, up-to-date website, lectures and constant social action efforts, is to expose the inherent inaccuracies of Atlantic Canadian history and show its racist foundation. Elder Paul (2017) suggests that for different reasons it is
important for both Indigenous Peoples, such as the Mi’kmaq, and settlers to understand the other historical perspectives of Canada.

Elder Paul’s (2017) remarks made it clear that European colonization so drastically impacted the Mi’kmaq that as a result today many do not understand their own legacy, history and influence as a Nation. Through his work, Elder Paul (2017) hopes to support self-determination among Indigenous Peoples such as the Mi’kmaq.

Elder Paul (2017) argues that part of the problem is the inherent, invisible racism and ignorance on the part of the settlers that is prevalent throughout Canada including, especially, Nova Scotia. Elder Paul’s (2017) belief is that once settlers understand their tainted colonial legacy they will become involved in the reconciliation process needed for any type of transformation to occur for Indigenous Peoples.

To enact any real change, educational reform across the board is key, Elder Paul (2017) states. Although it has been a long process, Elder Paul (2017) notes that he has seen small changes. For example, Elder Paul (2017) expressed that the Nova Scotian education system is portraying the Mi’kmaq in a more favourable way by small changes made in history books, up to date literature, celebrating Mi’kmaw history during the month of October and plans development of Nova Scotia Treaty education as part of the curriculum.

**Elder Billy Lewis**

Elder Billy Lewis (February 14, 2017, personal communication) observed that I was unable to find the Mi’kmaw perspective of “The Island with The Bloody Hand”. Elder Lewis (2017) underlines that part of the problem is that settler documentation defines Atlantic Canadian history and greatly underscores Mi’kmaw perspectives. Elder Lewis (2017) asserts that since I have only found the colonial Eurocentric version of the story I must be very wary of its accuracy.
Elder Lewis (2017) emphasizes that just because a story has been documented and has been written down does not mean that there are no other pieces to the story, which are hidden from view and have yet to emerge. For example, Elder Lewis (2017) surmises that although the Wolastoqiyik (or Maliseet, people whose home territory includes New Brunswick and eastern New England) were supposedly the central Indigenous Peoples involved, the Mi’kmaq would have known about the event since it occurred on their territory. Perhaps, as some versions of the story suggest, the Mi’kmaq were specifically involved; at the very least, Mi’kmaw knowledge of the landscape, particularly regarding the specific location of Coveys Island and the Payzant’s, would have been drawn upon by those involved. Regardless, Elder Lewis (2017) affirms that I should be suspicious of the veracity of any Eurocentric narratives, such as “The Island with The Bloody Hand,” that include the Mi’kmaq but have no corresponding Mi’kmaw version of the story as well. Elder Lewis (2017) found it very thought provoking that this story is vividly remembered, memorialized, and affirmed in various forms by settlers, but unknown by the Mi’kmaq.

Elder Lewis (2017) emphasizes the importance of recognizing how this era was one in which the Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik were defending their territory and livelihoods against the British. As Elder Lewis (2017) notes, it was just one year before the Coveys Island raid that British commander William Shirley had ordered the expulsion of the French Acadians from Acadia. Between 1755 and 1763, thousands of Acadians, longtime allies of the Mi’kmaq, were removed from Mi’kma’ki. The Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik, who were also being driven from their territories, stood with the Acadians in solidarity. It is recorded that the French in Quebec City ordered the Coveys Island raid against this British-supported settlement precisely because of the threat posed to French (and Mi’kmaw) interests by the expulsion order.
Elder Lewis (2017) stated that although the Mi’kmaq, Acadians and French were allies together working against the British, it is important to recognize that both groups had their own agendas. The Mi’kmaq acted independently of the Acadians and French and sought to establish these alliances not because they were French pawns in the British North American conflict, but because they saw their own value in doing so. All parties, insists Elder Lewis (2017) were affected by the imperial endeavors and were fighting the English for different reasons.

Elder Lewis (2017) said this context is important because when the “The Island with The Bloody Hand” is divorced from it, it portrays the raid as a random act of barbaric savagery by the Mi’kmaq or Wolastoqiyyik. It was neither. It was a concerted act of war, probably ordered and organized by the French against their English enemies. In their capacity as allies to the French and Acadians, and with the goal of further preventing the expansion of British control over their territories, the Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyyik participated.

Elder Lewis (2017) reminds us that both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people have used oral storytelling to convey meaning and pass down important information and lessons from one generation to the next. Elder Lewis states (2017) that oral stories have been universally used as a tool for deep learning. Elder Lewis (2017) highlights that what is important in all storytelling is what the listener/learner personally takes away from the story and then does with this new outlook and revelation.

Elder Lewis (2017) likes the idea of Indigenous Peoples and settlers working together to create more balanced narratives that support educational reform. However, he cautions that the principles of *Indigenous storywork* and *Two-Eyed Seeing* must be honoured to ensure that the dominant worldview does not continue to control how new perspectives are created. Elder Lewis (2017) asserts that re-storying is not just about making a place for Mi’kmaw perspectives, but
rather it is about both sides working collaboratively as they discover together more balanced and socially just narratives.

Part of the problem with mainstream history, says Elder Lewis (2017), is the reliance on written texts, which creates the perception of history as being fixed, or static. Elder Lewis (2017) raises concerns that recorded documents are often perceived as the absolute and unchangeable truth. Instead, suggests Elder Lewis (2017), the epistemology of oral Indigenous storytelling emphasizes the importance of narrative to be dynamic and influx. This means that there is energy to oral narrative that is capable of continuously changing and evolving.

The significance of *Indigenous storywork*, as Elder Lewis (2017), suggests is to demonstrate how stories are not static but very much alive. Even though “The Island with The Bloody Hand,” as my research suggests, was used to portray the Mi’kmaq in a negative way, it is a prime example of settler oral history that has been passed down since its origin. Elder Lewis remarks that “The fact that I have chosen to take this one story and use it as a basis for my research 260 years later is an example of living history.” Elder Lewis (2007) believes that despite the colonial past that is embedded “The Island with The Bloody Hand,” this story, if told in an Indigenous way, can have power and influence that can be used for settler truth telling, which will in turn support the beginning steps to reconciliation.

Elder Lewis (2017) states it is the individual perspective (which in this case is my research) that the listener passes on. Elder Lewis (2017) states that by following Indigenous protocols such as Archibald’s (2008) storywork principles, my research helps to support a new story, which will become the teacher of new lessons. My research of “The Island with The Bloody Hand” Elder Lewis (2017) says is an excellent example of how a story has life and is not fixed can take on new meaning and have a new purpose.
Elder Ellen Hunt

Local Mi’kmaw historian Elder Ellen Hunt (February 20, 2017, personal communication), was unaware of “The Island with The Bloody Hand” story until she read Layton’s (2003) historical account *Passion for Survival*. Elder Hunt (2017) agrees with Elder Billy Lewis (2017) and says to use discretion about the accuracy and integrity of the story since it has been predominately told from a Eurocentric perspective and especially since there are no oral Mi’kmaw accounts. Like Elder Billy Lewis (2017), Elder Hunt (2017) agrees that this was a significant tragedy that happened on Mi’kmaw territory so it would only be natural that the Mi’kmaq would have been informed about the event. Elder Hunt (2017) suspects that there is another scoop to the story, which has yet to be uncovered.

Lunenburg County has an enormous Indigenous legacy, states Elder Hunt (2017), however it is difficult to draw on and reflect on it because of the dominance of foreign Protestants who do not want to acknowledge this history. Elder Hunt (2017) says that an example of history that is silenced and hidden are the surrounding Mi’kmaw burial grounds in the Town of Lunenburg – a site of which the public is unaware. Despite her attempts to bring this knowledge to the public forum, Elder Hunt (2017) has met with great resistance from town officials. Elder Hunt (2017) says that part of the problem is the inherent colonial racist attitude that exists towards the Mi’kmaq. Elder Hunt (2017) says that ingrained ignorance entitles settlers to stay in the dark and ignore the Mi’kmaw existence that was present in Lunenburg before European colonization. Elder Hunt (2017) reiterates that therefore it is important to bring to light the other truths about history and why she believes there is another perspective that has not been included in “The Island with The Bloody Hand” story.
Elder Hunt (2017) agrees that the use of the story to inappropriately portray the Mi’kmaq or Wolastoqiyyik as ruthless barbarians reinforces this inaccurate stereotype of Indigenous Peoples in general. Elder Hunt (2017) says that the net effect is the stereotyping, mistrust and mistreatment of Aboriginal Peoples and the resulting strain and conflict. If light was shed on Indigenous perspectives such as is described above, then the stereotypes of the Mi’kmaw and Wolastoqiyyik might be given less merit and indeed and efforts taken to clarify or perhaps question such stories.

Elder Hunt (2017) reminded me of what Layton’s (2003) research had uncovered. Elder Hunt (2017) said that missing from this local tale and vital to comprehending the context was that the order for this horrific onslaught came from the Governor General of New France, Pierre Francois de Rigaud. The Governor ordered Deschamps de Boishebert et de Raffetot, the head of the French militia in what is now central New Brunswick, to send a Wolastoqiyyik raiding party to Coveys Island. The Wolastoqiyyik militia was living at the nearby encampment of Aukpaque in New Brunswick.

Interestingly says Elder Hunt (2017), it was the Mi’kmaq who helped the French establish a settlement at Port Royal after their failed attempt on St Croix Island in 1604, where lacking resources and scurvy decimated many settlers. Elder Hunt (2017) reminds us that if it were not for the aid of the Mi’kmaq, their second attempt of the French at settlement may also have failed. Elder Hunt (2017) suggests that the settlers in Port Royal survived in large measure because of the support of the Mi’kmaq. Elder Hunt (2017) said for example, that the Mi’kmaq showed the early French and Acadians how to fight scurvy by teaching them how to make spruce tree tea that is rich in Vitamin C.
Elder Alan Syliboy

Elder Alan Syliboy (January 18, 2017, personal communication) views the decolonizing process of settlers as an important step to reconciliation between First Nations, Métis and Inuit and non-Indigenous people in Canada. Elder Syliboy (2017) believes that Indigenous storytelling is an integral Mi’kmaq learning tool, and is it an excellent venue to begin to educate settlers about Mi’kmaw culture, past, traditions and ways of life.

Elder Syliboy (2017) says that it has been through his own storytelling ability as a visual artist, songwriter, and musician that he has synergistically explored his own Mi’kmaw spirituality, culture and heritage. Elder Syliboy (2017) articulates that using these interrelated art forms he has been able to artistically express what he has learned and then share with others. Elder Syliboy (2017) says that initially he took on the responsibility of creatively using the Mi’kmaw petroglyph traditions to teach other Mi’kmaq about the heritage of his people. However, he sees his work as a way to revolutionize relationships between settlers and the Mi’kmaq. Elder Syliboy (2017) says that it is through his many creative Indigenous storywork expressions that he communicates to both the Mi’kmaq and non-natives the rich holistic Mi’kmaw legacy that exists here in Mi’kma’ki.

Hand painted drum by Elder Syliboy, September 2016
Testimony of *Indigenous storywork* that is creating space for the integration of Mi’kmaq narratives with settlers’ stories is the beautifully painted hand drum that artist Mi’kmaq Elder Syliboy recently made for me. From our discussions, and his vast knowledge about Mi’kmaq oral history, culture and petrography, Elder Syliboy created a story that helps to represent my Master’s thesis on the face of a hand drum.

Elder Syliboy (2017) explains that he used the colours red, black, yellow and white because of their significance to Mi’kmaq ways of knowing, such as the four directions and medicine wheel. Elder Syliboy states (2017) that the cross is representative of the four directions which symbolizes the honouring of all mankind and all that is. In the middle of the artwork is the painting of the “Round Dance”, accompanied by a group of singers all striking hand drums in unison. Elder Syliboy (2017) notes that the dancers join hands to form a large circle. This part of the artwork exemplifies the equality of all people in the circle or in the case of my research suggests Elder Syliboy (2017) that there are no dominant narratives. Like my research the “Round Dance” also reflects the possibility of the renewal of relationships and sense of community among Indigenous Peoples and settlers. Finally, Elder Syliboy (2017) adds, that over all, this work of art and others are affirmation of Indigenous ways of celebrating and teaching the deep Mi’kmaq culture, history, heritage and identity that exists in both the past and present with in an Indigenous realm.
Chapter Five
Coveys Island Raid: Mi’kmaw Perspectives

1. Understanding the Mi’kmaw Presence in Mi’kma’ki for over 10, 500 Years

When reading *Nova Scotia, a Pocket History* by John Reid (2009), one easily gets a sense of the Mi’kmaw People as part of a well-established society, whose presence and breadth in present day Atlantic Canada spanned many millennia. Elder Paul (2008) confirms archeological records that show evidence of the Mi’kmaq inhabiting the area, known as Mi’kma’ki, for over 10, 500 years. Like Elder Paul (2008), Reid (2009, p.7) articulates that the Mi’kmaq were a peaceful people whose culture and livelihood centered on “the constraints imposed by the climate and environment.” Elder Paul (2008) also describes the Mi’kmaq as a great, noble, courageous people. The interview with Elder Roger Lewis (2017) confirms the impression of this deep-rooted, well ingrained Mi’kmaw civilization heavily based on connections to land and place.

Elder Paul (2008) demonstrates that, prior to European colonization, the Mi’kmaq lived a transient lifestyle as a cooperative community in a territory that was vast and plentiful. Elder Paul (2017) and Elder Roger Lewis (2017) both explain that to navigate between their summer fishing coastal villages and inland communities during the winter, the Mi’kmaq used the “complex ecosystem system of rivers, streams and lakes” throughout Mi’kma’ki. Elder Paul (2008) and Elder Roger Lewis (2017) state that since the Mi’kmaq had a great respect and reverence for, and relationship with, the sustainability of the environment, they were extremely careful not to over hunt or over fish an area. As a result, they did not leave much of an imprint.

Elder Paul (2008) suggests that to begin to understand the Mi’kmaw People’s well-established society, one must look at the style of egalitarian civic institutions they used for
governing their people and their land. Reid’s (2010) research acknowledges that Mi’kma’ki was a self-conducting nation divided into seven traditional districts: Kespukwitk (Annapolis Valley, Nova Scotia), Sipekni’katik (South Shore of Nova Scotia), Eskikewa’kik (Eastern Shore of Nova Scotia), Unama’kik (Cape Breton), Epekwitk (Prince Edward Island) aq Piktuk (Pictou, Nova Scotia), Siknikt (Cumberland County, Nova Scotia and southern New Brunswick), and Kespek (Northern New Brunswick and parts of the Gaspe, Quebec). The Mi’kmaw Resource Guide (2007) states that the leaders of the original seven districts were committed to encouraging a democratic society. Each territory set up an independent government, which was governed by a district chief and a council. The Mi’kmaw Resource Guide (2007) explains that the community chose community members such as Elders and others who exhibited leadership qualities, to serve on the council. As mentioned by the Mi’kmaw Resource Guide (2007), the district council was responsible for presiding over government business that included regulation and enforcement of law, upholding justice throughout Mi’kma’ki, monitoring fishing and hunting areas and maintaining peace with other nations.

The Mi’kmaw Wagmatcook First Nations (2016) mentions the centre point of this aspect of governance, which was known as the Grand Council, or Santé Mawiómi. They were responsible for conducting political, geographical and spiritual business as well as mediating any disputes among other nations. As indicated by the Mi’kmaw Wagmatcook First Nations (2016, p.1), this governing body included “District Chiefs, Elders, the Putús (Wampum belt readers and historians, who also dealt with the treaty relations with the non-Indigenous people such as the British, and other Indigenous Peoples), the Women’s council, and the Grand Chief.” As well, Rachel Bryant’s (2014) research, on First Nations, describes the Mi’kmaq as being a member of a larger alliance of four other Algonquian-language nations called the Wapnáki Confederacy. The
nations that made up the Wapnáki were the Mi’kmaq, the Abenaki, the Penobscot, the Passamaquoddy, and Wolastoqiyik. The territory of the allied nations ranged from present-day New England in the United States, parts of Gaspé in Quebec, the Maritime Provinces of Canada and parts of Newfoundland.

Reid (2009) notes that, in the early years of European settlement, the settlers relied heavily on the Mi’kmaq to teach them how to live and survive; during this time, the Mi’kmaq were still very much in control of Mi’kma’ki. Elder Paul (2008) concludes that if it were not for the Mi’kmaw Peoples deep sense of respect and reverence for others, as well as their hospitable ways, most early attempts at settlement by the Europeans, such as Port Royal, would have perished. As noted during the personal interview with Elder Hunt (2017), the Mi’kmaq often welcomed both native and non-native people into their community, and in fact, still do today. Elder Hunt (2017) says that it would only be natural that the Mi’kmaq shared their deep knowledge of natural medicines with the French and other foreigners such as the rich vitamins, minerals and other nutrients found throughout the local environment.

Reid (2017) states that, initially the Mi’kmaq felt minimal land encroachment by European settlement in Mi’kma’ki. The Mi’kmaq were still very much a sovereign nation and felt they were in control of their territory. In fact, despite the original British and French claims of sovereignty over Mi’kmaw territory, the Mi’kmaq still consider Mi’kma’ki as unceded territory today. Battiste’s (2016) research validates that the Mi’kmaw Peoples’ recorded oral history and numerous treaties signed with the British prove that Mi’kma’ki was never surrendered, relinquished or handed over in any way.

Reid (2009) does suggest however, that early on there were negative consequences for the Mi’kmaq as the result of European settlement. Reid (2009) exposes various disastrous
ramifications of European colonization on the Mi`kmaq, which are de-emphasized in mainstream history. As Reid (2009, p.18) indicates, various damaging factors of European colonization on the Mi`kmaq included: “the kidnapping of men, women and children for enslavement and public display; unpredictable acts of violence by settlers; sexual aggression towards the women; devastating impacts on animal populations due to the European insatiable demand for fur; and bringing disease such as small pox and influenza.”

All of Plank (2003), Reid (2009), Elder Paul (2017) and Elder Billy Lewis (2017) state that up until the Loyalist influx to the region in the early 1780s, the Mi`kmaq maintained political autonomy and control throughout Mi`kma’ki. In “Pax Britannica or Pax Indigena? Planter Nova Scotia (1760-1782) and Competing Strategies of Pacification,” Reid (2004) demonstrates that the Mi`kmaq very much diplomatically and militarily in control of Mi`kmaw territory until the late eighteenth century and were not under the influence of the French as many scholars have suggested. Reid (2004) concludes that this can be observed in the inability of the British to subordinate the Mi`kmaq of Mi`kma`ki during this time-period.

2. Bias in Atlantic Canadian Colonial History

Like most European colonization history, the story of the Payzant family on Coveys Island has been told from the perspective of European settlers. What is not accounted for is the view of the story through the lens of the Mi`kmaq, who were desperately caught up in a joint war with their French and Acadians allies against the British invasion and Protestant colonization of Atlantic Canada (Reid, 2010). For example, Des Brisay (1980) recorded that French military orders, which made the Payzant family a target of violence in the ongoing struggle between the French/Mi`kmaq and the British, came from Québec City, New France over a thousand miles away.
Leigh Patel (2015) suggests in “National Narratives, Immigration and Colonality”, that settler origins are deeply rooted in European capitalistic interests in Canada at the expense of First Nations, Inuit, and Métis Peoples. Patel (2015, p.1) asserts that from the outset, European colonization across Canada has been governed by an “intentional hidden objective of the dehumanization of Indigenous Peoples wrought by the insatiable settler capitalist project.” Patel (2015) argues that European settlement of Canada was driven by a need for territorial expansion and exploitation by Europeans with little respect for the rights of Indigenous groups to the same land and resources.

From the beginning and through generations to follow, Lunenburg’s history has been intentionally portrayed from the colonizers’ perspectives. The effect of this perspective was to obliterate the evidence of any Mi’kmaw settlements pre-existing the building of the British town. This has served to justify British claims to Mi’kmaw land and resources. The historical legacy of Lunenburg wiped the slate clean of previous human inhabitants prior to the arrival of the European settlers on June 6, 1753.

Des Brisay (1980) has documented that Rous Brook, an area on the eastern edge of Lunenburg, was the first place where the European settlers landed. The importance of Rous Brook and Lunenburg as British colonial landmarks has even been stressed by the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire (IODE). Katie Pickles (2002), validates the origin of this politically active charitable organization for British women loyal to the Empire is rooted in support of British colonial patriotism and imperialism in a variety of ways. For example, in 1924, a Canadian chapter of the organization donated a large granite rock with a plaque as an ancestral commemorative at Rous Brook. In upper case lettering, the plaque states:
Although it was indeed settled by Europeans in 1753 another part of the narrative is missing. Much less known is the long occupation of that space by the Mi’kmaq, and the existence for over a century there of French settlers. Prior to 1753, the French and Mi’kmaq knew it by a version of its Mi’kmaw name, Mirlegueche (Dawson, 1996). At times, individual French colonists had also built homes. In fact, in 1604, when Champlain led his first expedition to Mi’kma’ki, he intended to land in Mirlegueche Bay, but missed it by a few miles and landed instead at La Have. He eventually made Port Royal his permanent base (Dawson, 1996). As noted earlier it was the Mi’kmaq who helped the French establish a settlement at Port Royal after their failed attempt on St Croix Island in 1604 and where many settlers were decimated by lacking resources and scurvy (Reid, 2009, Hunt, 2107).

As mentioned by Elder Hunt (2017), the success of Port Royal by the French was largely because of the support they received from the Mi’kmaq. Elder Hunt (2017) stated that the early colonists heavily relied on the knowledge, resourcefulness and expertise of the Mi’kmaq. Elder Hunt (2017) said that the Mi’kmaq taught the settlers many survival skills and how to persevere, in what the French considered was an extremely harsh and intolerable environment.
Local historian David Corkum explains that “Mirlegueche originally was a Mi’kmaw encampment and clam-harvesting site known as āseedik (personal communication, December 23, 2016). Corkum (2016) further notes, that during French exploration it became a Mi’kmaw/Acadian village for over a hundred years. As Dawson’s (1996) research revealed, the Mi’kmaq and Acadians settled amicably together in the Mirlegueche area and established kinship and trade relations with each other from the 1600’s into the eighteenth century. Dawson (1996) also makes note that when [a] census was taken in 1688, it indicated that eleven Mi’kmaq and ten Europeans inhabited the Mirlegueche area. The inhabitants shared one wooden house and two wigwams as their dwellings and had cultivated over half an acre of land. Layton (2003) notes that in 1745, there were reported to be only eight settlers remaining in the village of Mirlegueche. Layton (2003) also notes that when Cornwallis visited Mirlegueche four years later, he reported that there were several French and Mi’kmaw families living together. He observed that they were living in comfortable houses made from timber and appeared to be doing well.

While some historical records, such as Des Brisay’s History of Lunenburg County (1980), do account for the Mi’kmaq in the Lunenburg area, the historical bias rests in minimal consideration of who they were, with a tendency to display them negatively. For example, early European accounts of Nova Scotia, like their counterparts across the continent, emphasize the alleged savagery of Indigenous Peoples and are especially fixated on scalping (Layton, 2003).

A less-discussed component of Lunenburg history was the intentional reason for the founding of the British settlement in 1753. During his research, Marston (2002) found that Britain’s main purpose for the settlement at Mirlegueche was to populate the land with European Foreign Protestants. The goal for the settlement that would become Lunenburg was to shore up a
British hold over the territory and undermine both the Mi’kmaq hegemony over their traditional territory as well as the settlement of Acadians, who had by that time been sharing the space with the Mi’kmaq for over a century.

Patel (2015) suggests that the symbolism of the European settler narrative (which in this case would be the Payzant family tragedy and the stereotypes and myths it created) is connected to a malignant fiction. Patel (2015) affirms that most Canadian history is a story that was deeply needed to sustain the systemic structures that oppressed the original inhabitants for the benefit of the colonizer. The iconic settler representation in Lunenburg is an example of narratives that help to cover up, as Patel (2015) states Britain’s desire to claim land as a form of property, which is controlled by a small proportion of people. Battiste (2016) emphasizes that these practices stretched across all Atlantic Canada and had a negative impact on Indigenous Peoples such as the Mi’kmaq. This obscured widespread violence of European colonization can be seen as an ongoing backdrop for the entirety of Atlantic Canadian history, which continues still today.

This violence has been made possible through narratives such as the raid on Coveys Island that contort, erase, remix, and re-present the brutal realities. The classic image of European immigrants building Lunenburg County through industrious demeanour, folksy determination, and ingenuity, literally erase from view the true nature of the settler projects. As suggested by Patel (2015, p.2), “If someone is hard working there is an appearance that access to material wealth is both possible and somehow equally available to all.” This type of perspective was supported by Joseph Howe, a cherished Nova Scotian journalist, politician and the first “Indian” Commissioner appointed to Nova Scotia. Cuthbertson, (2002, p.6&7) states that Mr. Howe remarked that Lunenburgers exemplified “the virtues of steady perseverance and systematic economy.”
Patel (2015, p.2) reminds us that since “the individual immigrant of European colonization narratives is male, (devoid of female ingenuity, relevance, and importance), revised, and whitened over time, he is lauded for being a hero of conquest, manifest destiny, and patient lawfulness.” Patel (2015, p.2) further defines this white settler hero as “one who has followed a manifest destiny and conquered savage lands and people – who is the figurehead for fantasies of equitable social mobility based on lawfulness and hard work.” The Coveys Island story certainly supports this perspective and affirms Patel’s (2015, p.2) contention that myth can “intertwine with colonial purpose to accrue and protect property for white settlers and for Indigenous Peoples to be in competition with each other for the façade of available property ownership.”

Missing from this local tale and vital to comprehending the context was that the order for this horrific onslaught came from the Governor General of New France, Pierre Francois de Rigaud. The Governor ordered Deschamps de Boishebert et de Raffetot, the head of the French militia in what is now central New Brunswick, to send a Wolastoqiyik raiding party to Coveys Island. The Wolastoqiyik militia was living at the nearby encampment of Aukpaque in New Brunswick (Layton, 2003). The local myth makes no mention of the origin of the planned raid, nor does it reference the Wolastoqiyik. Some versions use the generic term “Indians” and other versions reference the Mi’kmaq or Wolastoqiyik. This inaccurate portrayal of the raid as being rooted in the local Mi’kmaq community reinforces the idea that the raid was spontaneous and random; it suggests that it was part of how the Mi’kmaq behaved. It surely is much different that the raid was ordered and planned by the French and the operation involved Indigenous Peoples who travelled from a long way away for some specific purpose known to the French allies who ordered the raid. Elder Billy Lewis reminds us (2017) that the Mi’kmaq were part of the conflict
over the control of North America between the Indigenous Peoples, French and British and were valiantly fighting for the maintenance of their traditional territory that was over 10,500 years old.

As Reid (2009) asserts, Britain’s intent in this war was to become the dominant colonial power in eastern North American. The Mi’kmaq were vehemently defending their families, communities and a territory, which from a Mi’kmaw perspective, was over 10,500 years old. The timing of these major struggles over the European domination of what the Europeans considered the “New World” is important because the raid on the Payzant family happened at the crossroads in the long series of hostilities such as the Seven Year’s War, the Expulsion of the Acadians, and the British intentions to takeover and control the occupation of Mi’kma’ki as the Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik were defending their territory and ways of life against the British.

One element of Des Brisay’s (1980, p. 498) account that seems to reinforce this orientation of the story, happened many years later when a son of Lewis Payzant was working as a clerk in Halifax. Des Brisay (1980) states that one afternoon, when “Indians” entered the store, Lewis recognized one of those who had killed his father. When he confronted the “Indian” to ask whether he was the one who had committed the brutal act, he replied, “I am, but it was war then.” The statement appears to challenge the colonial narrative, which suggests that the attack on Coveys Island was a random attempt to acquire scalps for money and material goods and depicted the Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik as mercenary instigators of a senseless and arbitrary crime that was rooted in “Indian” cruelty and not a by-product of their struggle to survive.
Chapter Six

Analysis of Indigenous Stereotypes & European Colonization

This chapter will scrutinize the creation and use of stereotypes of Indigenous Peoples, which were used to support the European efforts of Atlantic Canadian colonization. Elder Paul’s (2017) work demonstrates how European colonizers of Atlantic Canada incorrectly stereotyped the Mi’kmaq with many derogatory terms referring to them as their scalping enemies evidenced as being savage, uncivilized, violent warriors and barbaric. Elder Paul (2017) further asserts that this extreme negative image of the Mi’kmaq served the purpose in the long term of justifying colonization efforts.

Elder Paul (2017) has shown that the use of these damaging images about the Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik are reinforced in oral narratives such as “The Island with The Bloody Hand.” Elder Paul (2017) states that the purpose of this uncomplimentary image of the Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik in the story was to intentionally foster inherent racism amongst the colonizers. Elder Paul (2017) asserts that the continual use of these degrading constructs about the Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik was needed in order for the early European settlers to rationalize the oppression of the original inhabitants. Narratives such as “The Island with The Bloody Hand” used these types of constructs, Elder Paul (2008) says, to support and maintain racial stereotypes of the Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik. This portrayal allowed the colonizers to turn a blind eye and ignore their own brutality and subjugation of the Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik. Over time, these stereotypes became the norm for how history such as the European version of the Payzant family’s tragedy was told. The influence of these stories is evident by that fact that this story is still very much alive today as it was when it was first created over 260 years ago.
1. Stereotype-Savage

The Merriam-Webster dictionary (2016, p.1) defines the term “savage” to mean any living creature, including humans, “that inspire terror because of their wild and menacing aspect or fury in attack.” It is any human or animal who is perceived as “fierce, ferocious, barbarous and cruel, showing fury or malignity in looks or actions.” Elder Paul’s (2008) work illustrates the input of this collective term, savage and others on the impact on the Mi’kmaq, both past and present.

According to Elder Paul (2008), European greed was the reason for the creation of narratives such as “The Island with The Bloody Hand,” which used stereotypes such as savage to brand the Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik in a negative image. Elder Paul (2008) discerns that by using terms such as “savage” the British made the Mi’kmaq look like the initiators of terror so that they could deflect, deny and justify, the inhuman crimes that they themselves committed against the Mi’kmaq.

2. Stereotype-Uncivilized

The Merriam-Webster dictionary (2016) defines the term uncivilized to include both place and people that are not considered “socially, culturally, or morally advanced.” Synonyms include: “uncouth, rough, boorish, vulgar, uneducated, uncultured, unsophisticated, and bad mannered.” When applied to humans the dictionary definition (2016) includes someone who does not show concern for the wellbeing of others. When used to define a society or a place, the term resonates with social system, which are said to which to not have “advanced” technologies.

Through the use of stereotypes, “The Island with The Bloody Hand” story conjures up images of the Mi’kmaq and the Wolastoqiyik as being uncivilized. Crawford (1998) suggests that overtime this process of depicting Indigenous Peoples using negative stereotypes such as
savage, barbaric and uncivilized provided justification for colonizing as the colonizer could claim that they were civilizing a primitive culture. As Elder Paul (2008) notes, using stereotypes to label the Mi’kmaq as savage, barbaric and uncivilized helped in the overall British attempts to support subordination of the original inhabitants.

Elder Paul’s (2008, p.8) extensive work demonstrates how “the subjugation of Indigenous Peoples, like the Mi’kmaq, by the English Crown was accomplished with the use of great barbarity that has been ignored hidden and downplayed” and instead casts the violent actions primarily on the Mi’kmaq. For example, even though Elder Paul’s (2008) research drew on colonial French and English documents that proved that the Mi’kmaq and other Indigenous Peoples were intentionally hunted down, this startling revelation still is not part of the history narrative today.

Elder Paul (2008, 2017) notes that even though early European scholars documented that the Mi’kmaq had a sophisticated form of government, which included such values as democracy, sustainability and human rights, they were not perceived in this manner in the public domain. Instead Elder Paul (2008, p.1) states the “European colonizers justified the horrors that would soon commence” by labeling the Mi’kmaq with negative terms such as “barbaric and savage” and by denying the presence among them of a legitimate system of governance. Elder Paul (2008, p.1) exclaims that this creation of them as “uncivilized,” was created to nullify the settler “consciences when the slaughter of the Mi’kmaq and the dispossession homeland and its resources began.” Paul (2017) states that it may also have served as a legal purpose as well. In refusing to acknowledge the existence of the seven Mi’kmaw districts in Mi’kmawi, the authority of Mi’kmaw chiefs and the legacy of Mi’kmaw People, the British could also undercut the Mi’kmaw claims to their land.
3. Stereotype-Scalping

Of all the Indigenous stereotypes, none has been more readily absorbed into Eurocentric history as the innate propensity of Indigenous Peoples to scalp adversaries. It has been suggested that Indigenous Peoples were the original perpetrators of this act, a theme revealed by Layton’s (2003) commentary regarding the expeditions of Champlain and Cartier. However, Axtell and Sturtevant’s (1980) extensive research, “The Unkindest Cut, or Who Invented Scalping” provides a mind-boggling perspective on the controversial portrayal of the origins of scalping as an Indigenous practice. They suggest it is unclear whether scalping started with the Indigenous Peoples of North America or the European settlers. Even if it were an Indigenous practice, why is it alone, of all the violent acts of war, singled out as especially barbaric? Does its meaning change within different cultural contexts when trying to comprehend different cultural frameworks, wherein it is imbued with cultural, spiritual and political significance?

Axtell and Sturtevant (1980) argue that scalping as a cultural practice by Indigenous Peoples preceded the Europeans, however they note that the Europeans were quick to promote its use especially when it related to monetary ventures such as bounties for scalps. Axtell and Sturtevant (1980) and Elder Paul (2008) suggest that when Europeans (especially the British) arrived in North America they actively used the practice of scalping as part of their strategy to exterminate the original inhabitants. Axtell and Sturtevant (1980) assert that the English took and maintained the lead in promoting the scalping of Indigenous Peoples as both an economic and genocidal enterprise. In their more recent work Rethinking Columbus: The Next 500 Years, Bigelow and Peterson (1998) state that it was not until European colonizers introduced this cruel concept that Indigenous Peoples began scalping for economic reasons. Ironically, “The Island
with The Bloody Hand” narrative does not suggest a specific purpose for the raid only of the possible intention of Indigenous Peoples interest in collecting scalps for money.

Bigelow and Peterson (1998) agree that most fictional documentation accuses Indigenous Peoples of using scalping as their main method dealing with enemies. On the other hand, the European colonizers’ prolific use of scalping to reduce the Indigenous populations tended to go unnoticed. For instance, there are several examples where the British issued scalping proclamations specifically directed towards the Mi’kmaq such as in 1753 by Governor Lawrence, in 1749 by Governor Cornwallis and by Governor Shirley of Massachusetts in 1744. Elder Paul (2008) has demonstrated how these accounts, although well documented, are not recognized in the story of the colonization of Nova Scotia by the British.

Plank (2003) recorded that the British showed no mercy when trying to gain a stronghold in Mi’kma’ki during their war against the Mi’kmaq. Plank (2003) states that in the summer of 1749, the English set their sights on reclaiming the prosperous fishing village of Canso where a community of Mi’kmaq had been residing. When the English discovered that the men were away hunting and fishing they deliberately attacked and brutally killed the remaining twenty innocent women and children.

The military unit known as Gorham’s Rangers perpetrated the most notorious, but little known example of intentional British frontier warfare aimed at the Mi’kmaq. Elder Paul (2008) asserts that John Gorham commanded and trained this organized militia to use cutthroat tactics such as violent killing and scalping with the specific purpose of eliminating the Mi’kmaq and their Acadian allies. The Dictionary of Canadian Biography entry, for John Gorham, written by John Krugler (2016) includes a biography about John Gorham and his rangers that states that integral to the British takeover of Mi’kma’ki were the brutal mercenaries known as Gorham’s
Rangers. One of the most infamous accounts of the Rangers’ appalling attacks was the October 1744 brutal massacre of a small Mi'kmaw community near Annapolis Royal. The family dwellings were ransacked, pillaged and set on fire. The women and children were killed and two women (who were pregnant) were found with their bellies ripped open.

Axtell and Sturtevant (1980) claim that scalping has Indigenous roots however they suggest that key to understanding why scalping has been so heavily portrayed as solely Indigenous is because most documentation about scalping has been written and examined from a European perspective. The creation and continual use, for generations, of narratives such as “The Island with The Bloody Hand” help to vividly reinforce the incorrect assumption that the Mi’kmaq Wolastoqiyik and other Indigenous Peoples alone used scalping and that the Europeans were the hopeless victims. Over time, narratives such as “The Island with The Bloody Hand” have reinforced the incorrect perception that Indigenous Peoples were the main perpetrators of this act, ignoring the role of Europeans in perpetuating it’s use. In fact, the use of this stereotype as a main theme in the story deflected the fact that the British were at least as prolific in this aspect of warfare.

4. Stereotype-Warrior

The Merriam-Webster dictionary (2016) defines the term warrior as a person who is “engaged or experienced in warfare.” The term implies “a person who is known for having valiant courage and tremendous skill when fighting in battles.”

Regan (2010) and Saul (2008) both make the interesting observation that North American history is well documented when it comes to the discussion of violence and struggle however the many acts of peace, friendship and unity go quietly unnoticed. Regan (2010) and Saul (2008) note that even though the roots of peacemaking are Indigenous, history in general ignores this
significant component of Indigenous culture and way of life. Instead historians have created the stereotype that Indigenous Peoples were savage warriors whose primary interest was cruel violence.

Alfred and Lowe (2005, p.6) examined the meaning of the term “warrior” in various Indigenous communities and found it carried a significant spiritual reverence, which represented an individual’s duty to “carrying the burden of peace.” Further to the point, Gail Valaskakis’ (2005) research, Indian Country: Essays on Contemporary Native Culture, exemplifies that an Indigenous “warrior’s” priority was to utilize their own culturally specific understanding of diplomacy and peaceful ways to protect the people, the lands and water at all cost. “Warriors” had the responsibility of being, and were revered as, sacred protectors practicing the philosophy of peace with the sole purpose to diffuse violence. An example of how Indigenous Peoples continue to use peace when resolving conflict today is the continual practice of peaceful protests in their attempts to non-violently protect the environment.

Reid (2010) has shown that during early European exploration, trading and settlement in Atlantic Canada, the Mi’kmaq exemplified a reciprocal, amenable and friendly relationship with early settlers and they were neither vengeful or bloodthirsty. In fact, both Reid (2010) and Elder Hunt (2017) affirm that early Europeans in present day Nova Scotia heavily relied on the expertise and camaraderie that was displayed by the Mi’kmaq in order to survive the harsh elements of the Acadian climate and environment. Although the French have documented the relationship between the Acadians and the Mi’kmaq, it would be interesting to understand the link between the cooperation and connections of the Mi’kmaq and French from the Mi’kmaw perspective as well.
Alfred and Lowe (2005) assert that Indigenous Peoples in Canada have overwhelmingly chosen to practice their spiritual and ceremonial commitment to peace when attempting to resolve conflict with settler populations. Alfred and Lowe (2005, p.56) state, “that in every instance where Indigenous Canadians have met with conflict, the violent interaction has always been initiated by police, other government officials or local non-Indigenous interests who are against Indigenous People.” What is interesting in the Payzant family tragedy narrative is that Louis Payzant was the first one to instigate violence by firing his rifle randomly into the night, a component that has always been considered as an act of self-defense.

Despite the evidence that supports Indigenous Peoples as having been exemplars of peace, narratives such as “The Island with The Bloody Hand” story have produced images to the contrary. Like other readily accepted narratives it perpetuates negative characterizations of Indigenous Peoples via unflattering stereotypes. Central to the story’s theme is the appearance of the Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik as violent warriors who took pleasure in committing murderous and cruel acts against the European newcomers. When stories such as “The Island with The Bloody Hand” are told over and over for generations from a Eurocentric lens, it is easy to discern their influence on how settlers across generations viewed the Mi’kmaq. When history is written and stories are created that portray the Mi’kmaq in an undesirable fashion such as violent warriors, over time this becomes the ontology of the mainstream.

Valaskakis’ (2005) work confirms that when settlers continually view Indigenous Peoples, in a negative manner, it creates confusion, which hinders the ability of the settler to understand the ways in which Indigenous Peoples were keepers of peace and instead reinforces them as being murderous and cruel. Valaskakis (2005) recognizes the complexities of settler perception when trying to comprehend what the term “warrior” means in Indigenous cultures. At
a very core level, the Indigenous Peoples work in harmony with nature and with each other; peaceful interaction is fundamental to their view of the world. This combination of a “warrior” being first and foremost a peace keeper and being a combatant only as a last resort for protection, can be confusing to the settler as it is a different perspective from Eurocentric cultural understanding of the term “warrior,” which emphasizes only the latter.

Told in isolation, “The Island with The Bloody Hand” portrays the Mi’kmaq as savage warriors, irrationally motivated. The Mi’kmaq, though, as Elder Paul (2017) reminds us, were under attack from the British who broke treaties, raided their communities, stole their land, disrupted every essence of who they were and tried to exterminate them. Allied with the French, the Mi’kmaq were attempting to save their way of life (J. Reid, personal communication, January 26, 2017). Reid (2017) suggests that the Mi’kmaq and French lived in relative harmony for over a century before the conflict with British. Reid (2017) states that even though the Mi’kmaq were the dominant force, they felt it necessary to work with the French and Acadians in an effort to thwart the British intentions of controlling Mi’kma’ki. What is interesting is that the initiation of the raid on the Payzant family was communicated to the Wolastoqiyik by French officials from far away Quebec City. Elder Roger Lewis (2017), Elder Billy Lewis (2017), Cameron Jess (personal communication, January 7, 2017), John Reid (2017), and others, all wonder what is the story behind the Payzant family being specifically targeted by the French in what would have been considered enemy territory over one thousand miles away.

If the raid on Coveys Island story is understood within the context of war between the Mi’kmaq, Acadians, French, and the British, a different perspective emerges. This was an era in which the British used violent acts of warfare against the Mi’kmaq, Acadians, French and other
Indigenous Peoples to gain control over and occupy the entire Northeast of what is present day North America.

Elder Paul (2017) notes that the reciprocal violent actions by the Mi’kmaq must be understood from their own perspective. Their land, and way of life, were under serious threat by foreign British invasion. Elder Paul (2017) insists that the Mi’kmaq were not the initiators of warfare, and if given the chance, would have lived amicably with the British as they had been doing with the Acadians for over a century. Elder Hunt (2017) reminds us that the Mi’kmaq were a friendly people who would never cause or initiate aggression unless they were provoked for some serious reason.

Elder Paul (2008) reminds us that because of the British capitalistic mentality and interests in resource extraction, they felt it necessary to destroy thriving civilizations of any Indigenous Peoples that stood in their way such as Mi’kmaq in Mi’kma’ki. Natural resources such as abundant fishing grounds, an established profitable fur trade, lumber for shipbuilding, and land were examples of highly sought after interests during this time of conflict. Elder Paul (2006, 2017, p.1) asserts that today the British choice of warfare tactics would be considered “crimes against humanity” where scalping and other barbaric acts were used in extermination attempts of the Indigenous Peoples such as the Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik. Tattrie’s (2013) confirms that the British master plan for absolute control was the total destruction of the Mi’kmaq and they would stop at nothing to achieve this goal.

Jocelyn Boyd’s (2004) work known as Racism Whose Problem: Strategies for Understanding and Confronting Racism in Our Communities emphasizes that stereotypes create an instantaneous permanent visual representation of a group of people. Boyd’s (2004) work investigates how racism has been fostered in Atlantic Canada across a variety of contexts. She
states that the key to the success of a stereotype is when the majority believe in this stereotype, and this includes the people who are being stereotyped. Over time stereotypes such as savage, barbaric and uncivilized helped to diminish the Mi’kmaq in the eyes of the colonizers as well as themselves.

Emma LaRocque’s (2011) scholarly work known as *When the Other Is Me: Native Resistance Discourse*, exposes the unequal colonizer/colonized relationship that still exists in Canada. Her research interests are evidence of the overwhelming use of negative Indigenous stereotypes and inherent racism that is pervasive throughout Canadian historical narrative. LaRocque’s (2011) work validates how stereotypes of Indigenous Peoples as savage, uncivilized, scalpers and violent warriors have an important function in the maintenance of racism. LaRocque (2011) maintains that in present day North America these terms were used by Europeans to support the rationalization for the occupation of Indigenous Peoples lands and their displacement. LaRocque (2011) asserts that dispossession and its legacy have created a powerful-powerless relationship between settlers and Indigenous Peoples. LaRocque’s (2011) research shows that to maintain this power structure, new stereotypes of native peoples are created. For example, LaRocque (2011) asserts that during European colonization of Mi’kma’ki, the settlers’ overly suspicious and fearful opinions regarding the Mi’kmaq helped to justify land dispossession and occupation as well as their resource extraction interests.

Elder Paul (2017) states it was easy for the British colonizers to create falsehoods about the Mi’kmaq since they chose in general not to become friends and get to know them. Elder Paul concluded that by keeping a distance from the Mi’kmaq and being fueled with their European white supremacist racist beliefs, British settlements fostered the white supremacist attitudes (2017). The result today, states Elder Paul (2017), is inherent, invisible, systemic racism towards
the Mi’kmaq that is prevalent in Nova Scotia. I believe that the bias that persists in stories like “The Island with The Bloody Hand” supports the racism that exists today in Nova Scotia.

When the historical context of “The Island with The Bloody Hand” is viewed from the perspectives of the Mi’kmaq/Wolastoqiyik, a very different understanding develops as to why the Wolastoqiyik killed the settlers on Coveys Island in this specific manner. The order for the raid came from the French in faraway Quebec City; it was not a random attack. The Payzant family were, for some reason, specifically targeted. Was it relevant that they were persecuted French Huguenots fleeing from Europe or was the Payzant family tragedy just part of a series of causalities during the war between the French and the English over the control of Mi’kma’ki. Or is there still another story hidden within this tale that has yet to surface?
Chapter Seven

Analysis of Colonial Myths & European Colonization

In this chapter I will demonstrate how the use of colonial myths were used to support European colonization of Atlantic Canada at the expense of the Mi’kmaq. The Merriam-Webster dictionary (2016) describes a myth as a traditional story of “ostensibly historical events, which serve to unfold part of the worldview of a people.” Like stereotypes, myths also helped to support the Europeans as benefactors of colonization at the expense of Indigenous Peoples such as the Mi’kmaq. Examples of settler myths during European colonization that promote European colonization and that are central to “The Island with The Bloody Hand” include: the Peaceful settler, Uninhabited land /Terra incognito and White superiority.

Margaret D. Jacobs (2011) examined how the use of myth and stereotypes in historical accounts created a negative perception of Native Americans in the western United States and Aboriginal Peoples of Australia. Jacobs (2011) asserts how these colonizer constructs have been used to justify European colonization in her compelling book White Mother to a Dark Race: Settler Colonialism, Maternalism, and the Removal of Indigenous Children in the America West and Australia, 1880-1940. Even though Jacobs’ (2011) analysis is concerned with colonization of Indigenous Peoples in the Unites States and Australia, her findings can be applied to other Indigenous Peoples such as the Mi’kmaw and Wolastoqiıyik in Atlantic Canada.

Jacobs’ (2011) work has shown that by using stereotypes and myths in narratives, settler colonialism was able to gain control over Indigenous territory, resources and control of the Indigenous People. Jacobs (2011) asserts that settler narratives and associated myths helped to obscure the colonizers as the perpetrators of the displacement of Indigenous Peoples by European settlers. These narratives, like that of the Payzant family, became local folklore and
myth which portrayed nations such as the Mi’kmaq in a negative manner to help justify European colonization as a natural process of civilization. Jacobs (2011) shows how European accounts of history have used myths of Indigenous Peoples to unintentionally justify the benefits of continuing colonization that mainstream population receives. This is true of accounts of Mi’kmaw and Wolastoqiyik Peoples.

1. Peaceful Settler Myth

As noted by Jacobs (2011) European settlers considered North America to be an unknown and unexplored world that they came to from their countries of origin to start a new life. This perspective has become a hallmark of the historical legacy of early colonizers. Critics such as Regan (2010) and Elder Paul (2008) point out that the European settlement of Atlantic Canada is not exempt from this peaceful settler myth. Visit any historical museum in Nova Scotia (Port Royal, Fort Louisbourg, Lunenburg Fisheries Museum or the Citadel in Halifax, for example) and you will witness countless accounts that exemplify a proud colonial heritage of hardworking, diligent settlers, and seafarers who are said to have forged the success of Nova Scotia and what it is today.

Jacobs (2011) and Regan (2010) assert that included in the peaceful settler myth was the notion that colonizers were generally pacifists in nature. Jacobs (2011) and Regan (2010) further explain that settlers considered themselves non-aggressive and innocent when hostility broke out with the original inhabitants such as the Mi’kmaq. “The Island with The Bloody Hand” narrative certainly supports Jacobs’ (2011) and Regan’s (2010) suggestions that settlers, such as the Payzant family, conceived of themselves as victims and not agents of violence during the conquest of land and domination of the Mi’kmaq. Jacobs (2011) conjectures that settler stories helped to support the view that the conflict with Indigenous Peoples was considered merely a
pesky impediment to the misleading perspective of the peaceful process of colonization. Using Jacobs’ (2011) and Regan’s (2010) analysis casting settlers like the Payzant family as peaceful settlers, “The Island with The Bloody Hand” narrative helps to cover up the central story of conquest, colonization and domination of the British over the Mi’kmaq and French. As well, Jacobs (2011) and Regan (2010) note that by emphasizing the hardships that pioneers, endured such narratives have authorized a sense of entitlement on the part of the settlers where they feel they have earned the right to the land, which was stolen, from the Mi’kmaq.

Jacobs (2011), Regan (2010) and Elder Paul (2008) conclude that settlers’ perceptions of themselves as being the innocent victims of Indigenous Peoples enabled them to conceal the fact that settlers were often the original perpetrators of violence. The result, as observed by Jacobs (2011) and others, was that a false concept of colonialism emerged which supported the “heroic settler narrative of settler triumph” that all but erased the histories of violence and conflict with the Mi’kmaq. As Jacobs (2011) and Regan (2010) concluded, myths of “courageous settlers,” such as the Payzant family, who endured great hardship to take up new opportunities, placed the spotlight on their story and away from the Mi’kmaq whose lives were drastically changed as a result of colonization. Certainly, the Payzant family narrative, including the captivity component of the story, supports this view of colonization.

Jacobs’ (2011) and Regan’s (2010) analysis shows how this benevolent peacekeeping settler theme can be brought to light in narratives such as in “The Island with The Bloody Hand”. These myths, or reconstructions of history from a Eurocentric perspective, hid the process of the displacement of Indigenous Peoples such as the Mi’kmaq from their land and personifying the whole process as the norm. Since stories such as “The Island with The Bloody Hand” inaccurately portrayed the Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik, they enabled the British to easily divert
attention from the horrible crimes they were committing. Elder Paul (2008, p.3) explains that the malicious and atrocious acts which the British committed against the Mi’kmaq “have few, if any, equals in human history.”

If settlers switch the scenario and portray themselves as peace lovers and Indigenous Peoples such as the Mi’kmaq as warriors, then there is justification for colonizers to take up arms, and even use violence to protect themselves, their families, communities, land, and resources. The Payzant family tragedy as it has been told over time continues to portray this stereotypical image of the savage Indian terrorizing the well intentioned, hardworking Payzant settler family who had fled from religious persecution in Europe. European settlers, and not the Mi’kmaq, are the ones who are wronged. Regan’s (2010) examples of the benevolent peace lover and Indigenous warrior, and Battiste’s (2016) exposure of the truth about treaty violations confirm the inconsistencies between Canada’s national history narrative and the lived experiences of Indigenous Peoples.

2. Uninhabited Land / Terra Incognita

Jacobs (2011) suggests that during the era of colonization, newly-arrived European settlers believed that there were minimal inhabitants and so the land was free for the taking. Further to the point, Jacobs (2011) states the colonizers also incorrectly believed that if there were occupants of their new place of immigration, they were close to extinction and dying out.

Fundamentally, Jacobs (2011) maintains that the large British imperial expansion project viewed Indigenous Peoples, as a hindrance and obstacle to their overall occupation dominance and colonization pursuits. Jacobs (2011) demonstrates that by creating myths such as that of vacant frontier land, the colonizers justified their actions of land dispossession. Jacobs (2011)
also maintains that colonizers were even able to rationalize efforts at exterminating Indigenous Peoples, characterizing it as simply the hastening of an inevitable extinction.

This Eurocentric myth of settler colonization is evident in the narrative of the Payzant family on Coveys Island. When one listens to the story of the Payzant family as settlers in the “New World,” one easily creates an image of peaceful immigrants moving to a remote island off the coast of the wilderness of colonial Nova Scotia. Not much thought was given to Coveys Island as being part of a Mi’kmaq territory that had been inhabited for thousands of years before European colonization. Elder Hunt states that (2017) archeological evidence of shellfish mounds suggests that the Mi’kmaq lived in the area and suggests that island was on the direct coastal route that the Mi’kmaq used when travelling to seasonal fishing grounds. Like the Mi’kmaq, the Payzant family would have been attracted to the sheltered cove on the northwest side of the island, which was marked by fertile soil, ponds that provided fresh water supply, and abundant supply of seafood in the ocean.

Similar to other Protestant settlers of Nova Scotia, the Payzant family probably did not understand themselves as players in the intentional displacement and subjugation of the Mi’kmaq by the British. As Elder Paul (2008, 2017) has shown, the existence of the Mi’kmaq as a well-established society was not given much consideration at all when the English were invading their homeland and setting up European settlements. Elder Paul (2008, 2017) confirms that most colonial history has been recorded with little emphasis placed on Mi’kmaw culture, heritage and the 10,500-year-old legacy as a significant people of their territory known as Mi’kma’ki.

Further evidence that the Mi’kmaq inhabited this area is shown in Anne Marie Lane Jonah’s (2010) extensive work that focuses on Métis women in the 18th century in Atlantic Canada. Jonah (2010) notes that Lunenburg, Nova Scotia had a Mi’kmaw presence long before
British settlers arrived in 1753. Known as Mirlegueche, Jonah (2010) affirms that prior to British colonization was considered one of two of the oldest mixed French/Native (Mi’kmaw) communities in North America. Interestingly, one of the women, whom she researches, was born in Mirlegueche in 1732, twenty-one years before the Protestant settlers arrived.

3. White Superiority Myth

Boyd’s (2004) describes white supremacy as the inherent belief of European “white” people that they are superior to people of other groups in society. Boyd (2004) states that this doctrine promotes the assumption that people who have lighter coloured skin are superior in certain characteristics, traits, and attributes to people of other backgrounds. Boyd (2004) asserts that white people also typically use the “superior” term to describe a political ideology that perpetuates and maintains the domination over other people from whom they have stolen land and resources. Jonah (2010) for example comments on the complexity of identity in Louisbourg in the 18th century. Jonah (2010) notes that skin colour or ideas of “Indian blood” only carried so much weight and that these could be upended by social status (as seen in her stories of two Métis women with very different fates); “blood” or “race,” was only one measure by which Métis People were judged to be inferior at times (and other times not).

In “A History: The Construction of Race and Racism”, David Rogers and Moria Bowman (2003) affirm that Christianity influenced the emergence of race as a category of difference. Rogers and Bowman (2003) state that during the 16th and 17th centuries, both Roman Catholic and Protestant officials questioned whether Indigenous Peoples had souls and or were human beings. Rogers and Bowman (2003) found the Protestant Calvinist Church was much slower than Catholics to consider the humanness of Indigenous Peoples in an attempt to separate themselves from the Catholic Church.
As noted by Rogers and Bowman (2003) the Protestant Reformation (1517-1648) also happened at a time when world exploration and early attempts at European colonization were occurring in North America. As a result, people in Europe were gaining an increased awareness of other cultures and people. Although the origins of racism are complex, Christianity, certainly during this time-period, impacted how Christians negatively perceived, grouped and ranked people who were not white or Christian. Consequently, during European colonization of Mi’kma’ki, the Christian foundation for European white supremacy played a large role in settlers understanding of the Mi’kmaq in a disparaging manner.

Elder Paul (2017) reminds us of the Christian influence of racism in the 15th century. Known as the Doctrine of Discovery, it was created through Roman Catholic Papal decrees and stated that since non-Roman Catholics were unable to own land, explorers could claim the territory behalf of Roman Catholic monarchs. As noted by Elder Paul (2017) the Doctrine of Discovery gave permission and provided justification to European explorers for the takeover of Aboriginal lands including Mi’kma’ki. As well Elder Paul (2017) says that the European explorers incorrectly considered the Mi’kmaq to be an inferior race.

Further Elder Paul (2008, 2017) suggests that when the Norse were exploring North America in the 11th century, 500 years before a more sustained European colonization effort, they created inaccurate stories about the Mi’kmaq and other Indigenous Peoples which supported the false assumption about whites being superior. Elder Paul (2008, 2017) has researched early Norse saga documentation, which inaccurately describes the Mi’kmaq as being less intelligent than Europeans. Elder Paul (2008, 2017) says from the first contact, the Mi’kmaq and other Indigenous Peoples were viewed as being everything from sub-human to non-human by early European exploration and trade operations. As a result, these unfounded assumptions about the
Mi’kmaq and others Indigenous Peoples have instilled a perception that helped to support white supremacy ideology. Elder Paul (2008, 2017) contests, that despite the proof, there is still reluctance, even today, for settlers to accept that the Mi’kmaq and other Indigenous Peoples had advanced and evolved cultures and civilizations prior to European colonization. Elder Paul (2008) argues that despite evidence to the contrary this is still a tough stereotype to acknowledge and change even today. Elder Paul (2017) asserts that the hidden roots of white superiority run deep, one just can turn to the recent election results in United States of America to observe that racism is still alive and well today.

Elder Paul (2008, 2017) concludes that British perceptions of superiority enabled the leaders to dictate English values as the preferred way of life during their colonization quests. Elder Paul (2008) says that since the English considered British doctrine as the universal desired mode of civilization, they were unable to understand the Mi’kmaq as sovereign and sophisticated. One might suggest, that because the British incorrectly believed themselves to be the universal superior race, they were racially illiterate and unable to understand equality among all humans, regardless of the diversity.

Jacobs (2011) calls this type of narrative “white blindfold history.” Coined by former Prime Minister John Howard of Australia, Jacobs (2011) affirms that the purpose of “white blindfold history” was to create a narrative that places European settlers in a better light, than the Indigenous Peoples whom they colonized. The settler colonial myth is an example of “white blindfold history” and how this approach is used to understand the world. “The Island with The Bloody Hand” story is an example of “white blindfold history”, which reinforces historical accounts that make settlers look favourable compared to the erroneous portrayal of the Mi’kmaq as barbaric savages.
Jacobs (2011) has concluded that stories were disguised with colonial terms such as the Indigenous Peoples being savage and primitive to support Eurocentric civilization of new lands as an inevitable process. Jacobs (2011) notes that by creating the history from the dominant lens, the British had better success in early encroachments, dispossession and settlements of land throughout North America. By not understanding who the Mi’kmaq were, Elder Paul (2008, 2017, p.9) suggests the colonizers could view themselves as the “superior race”. Consequently, they were unable to fathom their actions as abusive and disagreeable to the Mi’kmaq.

Jacobs (2011) explains that since the European settlers had little exposure to Indigenous Peoples’ perspectives, they used their own inflated sense of themselves to create negative images about Indigenous Peoples, as induced by “The Island with The Bloody Hand” story. When one considers how “The Island with The Bloody Hand” story has been portrayed from Eurocentric perspective since its realization, it is easy to discern how the story has influenced how people understand the Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik in a negative fashion. Boyd (2004) has shown that when the Indigenous context is missing from narratives such (in this case “The Island with The Bloody Hand” story) it reinforces the sense of entitlement created by the colonizers which helps to keep the historically disadvantaged Mi’kmaq marginalized and on the outskirts of mainstream history.

Elder Paul (2008, 2017) has shown that the Mi’kmaw way of life, that was ignored, instilled a value system that many contemporary humans are still trying to emulate. Elder Paul (2017) highlights the axiological, epistemological and ontological emphasis of sustainability, human rights, and democracy demonstrated by Mi’kmaq and other Indigenous Peoples. Elder Paul (2008, 2017) suggests that these Mi’kmaw principles of ethics and conscience are something that we all should exemplify and emulate.
Chapter Eight

The Importance of Following Indigenous Storywork Principles

Key throughout my research has been respecting Indigenous research methodology and honouring Jo Ann Archibald’s (2008) *Indigenous storywork* principles. Since Archibald (2008) has demonstrated how to use this methodological framework so stories can become important tools for teaching, my research attempted to follow her methods. It is one of the reasons I chose to use a local oral myth in my own community that has been passed down for generations within my family and others. By following Archibald’s (2008) storywork guidelines, Mi’kmaw Elders, others and myself were able to deconstruct this well-established historical tale. Its new purpose was used to show how restorying can be used as a pedagogical tool for educational reform by creating space for historical narratives through *Indigenous storywork* and unsettling the settler.

From the very beginning it was important that I trusted and honoured what many Elders were teaching me along the way. When I became interested decolonizing my own upbringing and ways of being as a potential Master’s thesis topic, I first went to Elder Martin for counsel. I asked her how to begin to unravel the other truths and hidden narratives within our shared history while being respectful at the same time. When I told Elder Catherine Martin what I was contemplating she suggested that I pick a piece of my own history (and an oral story) I knew from my upbringing and then find the interrelatedness and synergy of other stories hidden within the story. Elder Martin expressed that since I was not Mi’kmag it was not my place and it would in fact be inappropriate to speak on behalf of the Mi’kmag. Instead Elder Martin suggested that I begin with a Eurocentric story that occurred on Mi’kmaw territory and see what else I can find. Elder Martin stressed that key to my study would be linking the content of my research with my personal relationships to local land and place that I am deeply connected to.
Although skeptical at first, I followed her advice, and wondered what on earth could I ever uncover from what seemed like a simple local folktale. With a little bit of digging I was able to connect “The Island with The Bloody Hand” story to broader social constructs such as the purpose of stereotypes and myths. I was able to expose how this story used Indigenous stereotypes and settler myths to reinforce negative images of Indigenous Peoples such as the Mi’kmaq, and supported the justification of land occupation and displacement of the Mi’kmaq.

Following another guideline of storywork principles it was important that I build relationships with Elders over time before they willing to share their deeper knowledge and pass their teachings on to me. As Archibald (2008) has noted in her work, I was, as a learner among the local Mi’kmaw community and as a result I must be patient and trust the Indigenous process of deep learning which was not just about delivering facts. For example, part of my learning meant that each Elder might share their own family history and origins, show me photographs of their family members and even disclose intimate details about their lives. This was especially true when an Elder wanted to emphasize how their family and own lives were impacted by colonization and how relationship is connected everywhere. It was also important to show respect during my meetings with an Elder, to follow Indigenous protocol. When inviting Elders to participate in my research, I offered a small pouch of tobacco, tied up in red cloth, to help guide us through the work we were doing together. Besides the lessons around my specific research, Elders advised me on traditional Mi’kmaw protocols for doing research such as practicing patience and trusting the process as the research unfolded.

A unique example of Indigenous storywork that is creating space for the integration of Mi’kmaw narratives with settlers’ stories is the beautifully painted hand drum that artist Mi’kmaw Elder Syliboy recently made for me. In keeping with Mi’kmaw modes of expression,
Elder Syliboy personally hand painted the evolution or story of my thesis work on a hand drum for me to use. My new drum is a constant reminder of the “honour, respect, responsibility, reciprocity, reverence, holism, synergy and interrelatedness,” as described by Archibald (2008, p.129), that I carried with me throughout this transformational research journey.

As with all Indigenous storywork, there are many hidden purposes of oral storytelling. Integral to the island’s lore are the original lessons it has taught settlers along the way. During the early days of British colonization of Mi’kma’ki the island was supposed to offer a safe refuge for the Payzant family to start a new life. However, their tragedy set the wheels in motion for the story to be woven into the entangled threads of European colonization. This story, which is part truth, part myth and a favourite ghost story amongst locals, I believe became propaganda that was used to support the displacement and disruption of the Mi’kmaq from their ancestral homeland.

From what seems like a simple local folktale told more as entertainment, 260 years later this same oral story has come full swing. By exposing the other stories hidden within, “The Island with The Bloody Hand” story as Elder Billy Lewis (2017) has demonstrated, has a new purpose, which is to begin to unsettle settler roots, origins and core beliefs.

By using Archibald’s (2008) storywork principles, the new story has the potential to teach settlers about their legacy of colonization and its disastrous impacts on the Mi’kmaq. When the story is told from the perspective of the Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik, settlers must come to terms with the adverse aspects of European settlement. Like myself, the re-emerging and re-envisioned story has the potential to influence other settlers to take a long and difficult look at the many benefits they have received from our forbearer’s colonial efforts at the disastrous expense to the Mi’kmaq. By recreating a more socially just version of “The Island with The
“Bloody Hand”, settlers can begin to understand their Eurocentric history from other viewpoints. Though this may be uncomfortable for settlers to acknowledge and accept, it is necessary if any type of reconciliation is going to occur.

Through respecting Archibald’s (2008) *Indigenous storywork* principles, Elders, other Mi’kmaw community members and myself were able create a more balanced meaning from “The Island with The Bloody Hand” narrative. My research is an example of how settlers and the Mi’kmaq can work together to discover new truths about who they are. By honouring *Indigenous storywork*, the power of the new story supports how critical thinking can be used in the Nova Scotia education system to find a more balanced version of Eurocentric history, which typically has ignored the Mi’kmaw perspective. The purpose of the new story also validates the ability of settlers and Indigenous Peoples to be able to work together within an Indigenous framework and demonstrate the value as of narrative as an educational tool.

Although not obvious initially, I believe it was no coincidence that at the same time I began my research for this Masters I became involved with *Walking with Our Sisters*. From this experience, I experientially witnessed Indigenous epistemology, axiology and ontology first hand. *Walking with our Sisters* is a travelling community based art exhibit/memorial that honours murdered and missing aboriginal women, girls, two spirited people and their families. For all who had an opportunity to participate in this Indigenous way to live in truth, including myself, *Walking with Our Sisters* was a testament to an Indigenous style counter narrative that differs dramatically from the mainstream. My time spent with this truly amazing Indigenous knowledge based system helped me to further build relationships across all aspects of my research and helped validate the purpose for doing this study.
Walking with Our Sisters eloquently shows how Indigenous Peoples in Canada have taken violent, tragic events in their past and present and have given them new purpose. Walking with Our Sisters demonstrates how the ability of partnership between Indigenous Peoples and settlers works within Indigenous community based learning. Walking with Our Sisters creates an Indigenous living narrative that honours missing and murdered Aboriginal woman and is also both teacher and healer. Walking with Our Sisters is an example of an Indigenous pedagogical intervention that provides evidence of the beauty of Indigenous storywork in action and the importance of honouring the seven storywork principles in order for truly transformational learning to occur.

Honouring Indigenous storywork and the seven storywork principles provides the perfect venue for kinship to foster between settlers and Indigenous Peoples, like the Mi’kmaq, enabling the journey of truth and reconciliation to begin. It is through Indigenous storywork that settlers can truthfully be attentive, learn and hopefully accept the uncomfortable and tumultuous aspects of their history and heritage. They then have an opportunity to learn about the significance of Peace and Friendship Treaties from a Mi`kmaw perspective, dispel colonial myths, and negative Indigenous stereotypes and embrace their shared history and culture of Mi`kma’ki.

An opportunity for the Mi`kmaq and settlers to work in partnership that is centered around a community approach to learning includes professional development days for educators. For example, every October, all Nova Scotia public school teachers attend a professional development day hosted by the Nova Scotia Teachers Union. Quite often innovative and socially justice styles of academic presentations are used. This would be an excellent occasion to showcase province wide, how to use Indigenous storywork as pedagogy which supports decolonization of the classroom.
As well, the Lunenburg Folk Harbour Festival, an annual summer music and cultural experience, is a perfect venue to practice decolonization through *Indigenous storywork*. This maritime music festival is known for its event space that attracts artists locally, as well as from all over the world. The intimate musical performances put on by the local musicians, often celebrate the rich history, culture, and storytelling that exists in the area. Elders Syliboy and Hunt have expressed interest in collaborating on this truly unique style of performance to create space for Indigenous Peoples and settlers to work together.

KIAROS is an ecumenical religious organization that works in collaboration for ecological justice and human rights. It is another space where this research can be used to facilitate decolonization across all aspects of Canadian life and culture. In partnership with settlers and Indigenous Peoples, KIAROS currently uses a type of *Indigenous storywork* which is known as “The Blanket Exercise.” The local affiliates are open to working together to continue supporting Indigenous knowledge which support the resurgence and self-determination of the Mi’kmaq in Mi’kma’ki.

Recently established in Halifax, is the KAZAN CO-OP Theatre Group. They have also conveyed interest in working together and supporting the dismantling of the settler and their colonial roots. Their choice of venues for this enterprise are either through drama connected to Indigenous ways of knowing or providing space for a panel discussion on decolonization.

Lastly, The Mahone Bay Island Conservation Association (MICA) is a local settler activist group who are based out of the South Shore of Nova Scotia. Their initiative is to protect and conserve the natural environment of the islands and shoreline of Mahone Bay where many Mi’kmaq lived prior to European colonization. It would be a possible opportunity to put Indigenous storytelling to use as they are very welcome to collaborating and cohosting events
with Mi’kmaq. These beginning possibilities of working in camaraderie and tandem between the Mi’kmaq and settlers, lays the foundation for “M’sitnokamaq (All Our Relations)” which is bedrock to Mi’kmaw philosophy.
Chapter Nine
Autoethnographic Reflection

This chapter will include an autoethnographic account of my research journey. The purpose of this qualitative research approach allowed me to account for research relationships and personal experiences that have been driven from the research and have resulted in deep learning.

1. Starting with Myself First

On his dying breath, my late Uncle Shorty said to me “You must think big but start small.” I have carried his last few words of wisdom with me and often think about what he meant. Since I have begun this quest for a transformational change in Canadian society I have realized (thanks in part to my uncle’s words) that in order to enact real change, I must begin with myself first before I can expect change in Canada and then the world. That is one of the reasons why I decided to begin with myself in understanding the labyrinth of decolonization. Elder Roger Lewis (2017) validated this during one of our conversations when he emphasized that both native and non-native people must begin their own personal decolonizing process first before larger changes can come about.

My recent return to university, became the catalyst for dismantling my Eurocentric upbringing. My academic studies helped me to understand the inherent hidden power of the status quo, which imposes its doctrine on all and limits the freedom of others such as the Indigenous Peoples in Canada like the Mi’kmaq.

My decolonizing process is my beginning attempt to support real change. Like Regan (2010, p.13), I have used my own stories “to explore a pedagogy for restorying a shared but conflicting colonial history.” As a result of my research, I think differently, act differently and
have begun my own path as a peaceful warrior for the self-determination of Mi’kmaq and other Indigenous Peoples and the protection and livelihood of all humanity and Mother Earth.

My research, interestingly, comes at a time when my family soon will be five generations that have shared the geographical location that is the focus of my research. As this research journey comes to a close, I will take up the responsibility of teaching the awakened version of “The Island with The Bloody Hand” as well as other colonial narratives. Aligning with Indigenous storywork principles, it is my obligation to educate the next generation of settlers who will then share a reciprocal understanding with the Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik of how and why this story and others came to be. This will in turn support their ability to work together and continue to restory these sagas, as they become the initiators of social change and action.

Through my research, I now have a different relationship with “The Island with The Bloody Hand” story, the island itself, Lunenburg and surrounding area. This relationship is now tied to understanding my hometown and Lunenburg County from a Mi’kmaw perspective. I now have many questions about the settlement of Lunenburg County and it’s impacts on the Mi’kmaq. Just like the Coveys Island raid, I am curious about the Mi’kmaq interpretations of other aspects of Lunenburg County history. My research has set the wheels in motion for me to become an Indigenous ally with hopes to expose other local historical narratives and empower others to follow in my footsteps to live in truth.

2. Relationship is Key

Integral to working in an Indigenous context is honouring and respecting Indigenous knowledge based systems. As a result, my research experience included spiritual, physical, intellectual and emotional components of Indigenous ways to do research. This greatly differs from mainstream academia, which places importance on qualifying and quantifying data in a
specific scientific manner. As I look back at all that I have learned from this experience, I realize that I have just scratched the surface of the importance of honouring, respecting and building relationship within an Indigenous framework.

Utilizing an Indigenous research methodology meant that I must first build genuine relationships within the local Mi’kmaw community. This trust was necessary to foster reciprocity I could even begin any type of research. This included relationships that have developed in the Indigenous community such as with All Nations Drumming, Walking with Our Sisters, KIAROS, organizer for Caribou Legs, helping and lending a hand whenever possible in the local Mi’kmaw community, and supporting social action causes such as Violence Against Women, Alton Gas and Standing Rock.

I gained a great deal of insight into the importance of practicing an Indigenous protocol from all these relationships. For example, through my practicum experience with All Nations Drum, I received many wise teachings that helped to support my intuition, sense of social justice and strong connections to Mother Earth as important components to how I should live my life. From the first time, I drummed with the group, I can honestly say that I felt I had arrived at a place where I belonged.

This combination of experiences within the local Mi’kmaw community helped me to understand their world views and practices that better enabled me to support the use of an Indigenous methodology with my research as well as larger contexts. I have come to understand, for example, how the Mi’kmaq follow similar principles to JoAnn Archibald’s (2008) Indigenous storywork principles, not just in oral storytelling, but also in how they culturally live their lives.
The most significant community based experience that helped me understand the power of Indigenous ways of understanding the world was volunteering with *Walking with Our Sisters (WWOS)*. *The Walking with Our Sisters* event was an example of people working from their hearts to show respect and pay honour to the missing and murdered Aboriginal women, two spirited people, and families in Canada.

I have had many pivotal moments from working with *Walking with Our Sisters* however the day that the art bundle arrived by two women who had been driving it in a U-Haul truck across Canada is perhaps one of the most memorable. On Tuesday, December 6, 2016, I went to Millbrook, Nova Scotia to greet the drivers and help unpack the bundle and accessories. It was a beautiful afternoon filled with friendship, laughter, and lots of food. There was smudging, song and ceremony before we opened the truck to remove everything. Each box and item was smudged as it came off the truck and then smudged again before it was placed inside its new home where it would stay before the art installation process began. In many ways, I felt like Christmas presents had just arrived and we were carefully placing them under the tree in anticipation of the big day when we would get to open each package.

I did not really notice anything at first other than, like everyone else, I was very excited about the bundle and drivers finally arriving safely. Everyone was in an extremely jovial mood as we took turns receiving boxes and other items from the back of the truck and very carefully placing them in the designated area. I think I had handled my fourth item when an overwhelming feeling came over me. I was not sad or despondent but still giddy from all the events of the afternoon.

As Dr. Bear handed me the next item from the back of the truck I felt a few tears trickle down my face. Completely caught off guard, the next thing I knew I began to cry and no amount
of effort could stop my waterworks. As I regained my composure I stopped to take in what had just occurred and realized that as Dr. Bear had mentioned in an earlier conversation, I was totally enveloped by the power and energy of the vamps, the *Walking with Our Sisters* memorial and the spirits of our honoured sisters. It was a lived experience that cannot be quantified in any way. I was present with the warm amazing phenomenon of my own essence and its connection to something much larger. This synergy wrapped itself around the heart and soul of who I was.

That day and that experience gave me a glimpse of the integrity and power of Indigenous knowledge based systems and ontology, which is connected to the lived experiences of the person. I am not sure I would have grasped this experience in the same manner if I had not previously learned about Indigenous ways and culture.

But most importantly, it has been through my involvement with *Walking with Our Sisters* that I have experienced firsthand how Indigenous Peoples and settlers can work together in the Indigenous community for the greater good. I have both the lived experience and individuals who taught me the importance of following Indigenous knowledge based systems in my own research. My recent volunteering experience with *Walking with Our Sisters* provided me an opportunity to witness and be part of an Indigenous lived experience. In turn this community inspired commemorative art memorial helped me to better understand the process of Indigenous pedagogy in action and how to apply this method to my research.

From being directly involved with the event, I was able to discern that *Walking with Our Sisters* was more than a ceremony that honoured missing, murdered, women, girls and two spirited people. It was a true example of an Indigenous pedagogical tool that vividly expressed the greatly disproportionate level of violence against mainly female Aboriginal Peoples in Canada. Similar to my own research this project served as a living testament for how Indigenous
Peoples and settlers can work together to present history as something very much alive and not static or fixed. Like the Payzant family tragedy, the *Walking with Our Sisters* memorial is an example of how to take a horrific event and give it a new purpose to help educate.

Another important aspect of Indigenous research was to realize the significance of the many layers of relationships within the research itself. On one level, I have made many Indigenous friends such as Elder Billy, Elder Nancy, Elder Lyn, Elder Gerry, Elder Ellen and others who have been instrumental in guiding me through my own research process. From the relationships that I have built as a result of my research and the *Walking with Our Sisters* event, I now understand the relationship that my research has with being a voice for the Mi’kmaq, supporting resistance to continuing colonization and helping to strengthening the Mi’kmaw community. Throughout my whole research, I am constantly reminded of Lilla Watson’s (Ablett et al., 2014) famous quote and its connections to deep significant relationships in my research: “If you have come to help me you are wasting your time, however if your liberation is bound up with mine then let us work together.”

When regrading *Indigenous storywork*, Archibald (2008) reminds us of the power of the interconnectedness of family, community, culture, land and the stories that are told. When considering the deep connections to “The Island with The Bloody Hand” story with my own family, the town of Lunenburg and the surrounding area it was easy to apply *Indigenous storywork*. Coveys Island and adjacent Second Peninsula (where my family have lived for four generations) are places dear to my heart, more than any other places in the whole world. As long as I can remember, I have interacted with this landscape on a holistic and intimate level. The island’s dominant presence offers more than just a geographic position in Prince’s Inlet to me
and my family as well as others in the community. The land and water resonate a special reverence and interconnectedness that touches every aspect of your being.

In many ways, the island has always been steeped with history and represents an important legacy. As local historian David Corkum (2016) surmised, prior to European colonization, for example, the Mi’kmaq would have lived on Coveys Island, during the summer months and would have taken great pleasure in hunting, fishing and foraging. The French were known to have settled at the end of Second Peninsula and on islands nearby. My research has shown the significance of the island during British colonization and the conflict between the British and the Mi’kmaq and their French allies. Today the island serves as both a beautiful place for people to enjoy, and reminder about our history.

MICA recently acquired the island to preserve its beauty and ensure that it continues to be a place for everyone to enjoy. MICA’s mission (MICA, 2017) “is to protect and conserve the natural environment of the islands and shoreline of Mahone Bay as well as the traditional, social and recreational opportunities valued by various communities.” An interesting question to consider is whether MICA consulted with the Mi’kmaq regarding their purpose and intentions for present day Mi’kma’ki. Is MICA another example of settler privilege which freely enables the status quo to continue to create this type of colonial stewardship without considering that it is still unceded territory and has never been relinquished in any manner by the Mi’kmaq? Should we be critical of this process as part of the unsettling of the past? Ironically when one browses the MICA (2017) website and goes to “Island History Artifacts” the only photo that is currently displayed is the boulder with the alleged handprint from “The Island with The Bloody Hand” and relative Lewis King Payzant placing his own hand over the faint image.
Though I have never lived on the island I have a deep relationship with its synergy and influence. Geographic location and oral storytelling as Archibald’s (2008) suggests share an interrelatedness and reciprocity. It is through and individual’s interaction with places that stories are created. Following the tenets of Indigenous storywork, it is because of the relationship that I have with this specific place and the oral history that has been told, that my research journey began here. Developing a relationship with my research and respecting the interrelatedness and deep reverence between this particular place, myself and my research was key to the success of my research.

To process what I was learning, it was necessary that I physically be near Coveys Island to allow all my senses to be heightened so that I could synergistically experience place. This was why I often chose to go to the Lunenburg and surrounding area when I was reading, researching and writing. When I needed a break from my research I often would walk along a nearby beach and gaze over at the island. Subtleties of nature that help me connect my research to Indigenous ways of knowing seem to be always present. For example, since I have begun this research journey I have noticed a pair of bald eagles that regularly fly nearby and I have witnessed a multiple of times a rainbow that seemed to originate from the southeast tip of the island. When I express to Elders what I have seen, they tell me that both are signs from Spirit, that I am on the right track, and that truth and wisdom are right around the corner. This I believe is a holistic connection between the storywork I have begun and something larger than myself.

3. **Interconnectedness of Humanity and all of Creation**

   A wisdom that I often heard from Elders was to trust in the Universe/Creator as it provides the lessons that we need to learn. It is up to us to have faith in this process as we discover the truths that the Universe/Creator intended. Throughout the whole research
experience, I intuitively trusted the journey I was on. Like Wab Kinew (2017), I also believe that we are all connected to something larger than ourselves.

From this research experience, something that has stood out was the continual benevolence and kindness that my Mi’kmaw acquaintances displayed towards others and myself. I was constantly amazed at their generosity and readiness to support each other, total strangers and play an active role in social causes outside the Maritimes such as Standing Rock and universal women’s rights. Since it is their nature, the Mi’kmaq were compassionate, friendly and accepting towards early colonizers when welcoming these strangers to their shore long ago. As well, Elder Paul (2007), Reid (2010) and others certainly have demonstrated many examples of the democratic, environmentally conscious and humanitarian life style, which the Mi’kmaq demonstrated prior to European colonization. I wonder if the answer to how settlers can begin to become settler allies lies in modelling the camaraderie exemplified by the Mi’kmaq towards the newcomers that arrived in Mi’kma’ki, and the respect they show for protecting the planet? Could it be as simple as following the ways of the Mi’kmaq and practice their understanding of compassion towards others and all life? Is this the key that will help us return to the innate harmonic relationship between all humanity and Mother Earth, which at the moment is not in balance?

4. Indigenous Storywork and Decolonization

Sium and Ritskes (2013) recent study called: “Speaking Truth to Power: Indigenous Storytelling as an act of Living Resistance. Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society”, speaks to the intricate and elaborate use of Indigenous storytelling as a framework for Indigenous knowledge production. From this research experience, I have come to similar revelations as Sium and Ritskes (2013) regarding the rich complexities of Indigenous
storytelling. Sium and Ritskes (2013, p.2) express that the purpose of a story is “to be disruptive, sustaining, knowledge producing, and theory-in-action.” Like Sium and Ritskes (2013), I now understand how Indigenous storywork provides a natural platform for decolonization and can have transforming potential in the journey of settlers like myself to becoming Indigenous allies, and in the self determination of Indigenous Peoples such as the Mi’kmaq.

By using Indigenous storywork as pedagogy to dismantle colonial archetypal narratives such as “The Island with The Bloody Hand”, these stories transcend into constructive junctures for Indigenous Peoples such as the Mi’kmaq. Sium and Ritskes (2013, p.3) suggest that the use of stories as tools for deep learning help Indigenous Peoples “reclaim epistemic ground that was erased by colonialism and, in the process, these stories also lay a framework and foundation for the resurgence of Indigenous sovereignty and the reclamation of material ground.”
Chapter Ten

Conclusion

This study serves as an example of the power of storytelling as a pedagogical tool. Specifically, this study demonstrates how Indigenous storywork can be used to support a culturally responsible approach to the decolonization of the settler that supports the resurgence of Indigenous Peoples, such as the Mi’kmaq in Mi’kmaw. As they share this space of scholarship in community, this culturally responsive approach to socially just learning is fostered through Archibald’s (2008) Indigenous storywork principles and their relationships of respect, reverence, reciprocity, responsibility, synergy, interrelatedness and holism.

Key to this research was that I followed Archibald’s (2008) Indigenous storywork principles and used a single story for academic purposes that intertwined my personal connections to family, community, land and place. This study brought to light how narrative can become a significant teacher. The success of the story as the primary educator demanded from me something that was both personal and relational. The use of a local colonial historical account as the focal point for this research speaks to the breadth and scope of stories as deep tools for learning.

Initially, one of the goals of the research was to attempt to find an Indigenous counter narrative in the traditional sense to the dominant well-known Eurocentric version of “The Island with The Bloody Hand” local oral tale. However, I was not able to discover a clear counter narrative. As a result, this created an opportunity for a learning experience consistent within Indigenous research methodology.

During the whole research experience, I was constantly reminded of how Aboriginal narratives are formed by a culture that is process-orientated and not product based like western
culture. Instead, I was asked by the story to uncover the implicit nuances and nuggets hidden within this historical colonial account that would disrupt my Eurocentric, colonial norms of objectivity, knowledge base and engrained upbringing. By following an Indigenous methodology, I was able to show the importance of subjective learning that generally is overshadowed by traditional western objective approaches to research. By following an Indigenous methodology and trusting in the holistic process of learning, I was able to make personal connections such as the relationship of the story to myself, my family, place and my cultural upbringing.

Since storytelling is inherently personal, this study helped to redefine scholarship as a process that begins with self. This was evident from the very beginning when Elder Martin’s (2016) instruction was for me to take a local oral tale, that I knew from my upbringing, and use as the instrument for beginning to decolonize who I am. This act hugely speaks to the ability of stories to be transformational. By honouring Indigenous storywork protocol I was able to take a small piece of my local colonial history, which had become folklore and entertainment over time, and base my entire Master’s thesis around its foundation. However, in order for me to be successful, it was necessary for me to follow the heart, body, and spirit of both the Payzant family tragedy and myself and honour an Indigenous methodology while travelling in the daily company of my research.

It was important that I respect each individual Elder’s choice in how to be my guide and mentor on this educational quest, which was different from a western approach to research. It was also imperative that I respected and revered the cultural knowledge that was being passed down to me that I trusted in the interrelatedness and ethical reciprocity of Two Eyed Seeing
(Institute for Integrative Health and Science, 2004) and *Indigenous storywork* to help me discover not the right and wrong but rather the balance and harmony in learning.

From this research experience, I now understand “The Island with The Bloody Hand” narrative as a traditional cultural Eurocentric oral story that has been used to communicate the life experiences of early Protestant settlers in Mi’kma’ki. Embedded within the tale were specific teachings of settler ideology and negative images about local Indigenous Peoples. This type of mainstream knowledge production served as propaganda that supported the imperial British intentions for occupation of Mi’kmaw territory. The power of this story is that it has been passed from one generation to the next so that the mainstream perspective has been used to intentionally silence the Mi’kmaq.

From an Indigenous perspective, this research allowed me to take on the responsibility of the circle of learning (Archibald, 2008). First by listening, then learning and now sharing and teaching, the new lessons are passed on from “The Island with The Bloody Hand” story. The re-storying of this Lunenburg County oral history serves as an example of how to integrate culturally responsive pedagogy as settlers and Indigenous Peoples work together for the greater good. By applying *Two Eyed Seeing* (Institute for Integrative Health and Science, 2004), Archibald’s (2008) *Indigenous storywork* and practicing the seven storywork principles this historical narrative shows how its interrelatedness to the past, present and future can undo its original teachings of supporting colonialism and instead become an instrument in the decolonization process. This research shows how the holistic synergy of storywork can be truly transformational by challenging the conformity in mainstream learning.

This method shows that when practicing reciprocity, settlers and Indigenous Peoples, such as the Mi’kmaq, can build relationship needed for reconciliation to occur. This research
demonstrates how settlers can become allies and support Mi’kmaw resurgence by disrupting and decolonizing their own cultural being. It serves as an example of an anti-colonial project that is both community based and culturally respectful to Indigenous ways of knowing and emphasizes the educational importance of storytelling. Through the use of historical narratives, Mi’kmaq and settlers can work together using Indigenous knowledge structures to challenge mainstream epistemic framework and enable teaching, learning and healing to occur.

A key aspect of my research demonstrates how Mi’kmaw Elders, settlers and scholars can work together and use Indigenous pedagogy, such as Indigenous storywork, to support educational reform. This research created the ability for “restorying,” or retelling with Indigenous perspectives, the historical narratives that have dominated the relating of the region’s history. Similar to Regan’s (2010) approach, this technique helped to introduce a decolonizing space and make room for the inclusion of the history and narrative of the Mi’kmaq. As Regan (2010) suggests, that today’s settlers must begin to understand their true history and in turn build respect for Indigenous epistemology. This can move them from being perpetuators of the continued colonization of Indigenous Peoples to being Indigenous allies.

Using an autoethnographic self-reflection, I could draw inferences and insights to wider cultural, political, and social meaning. This deep learning includes the importance of learning from and following Indigenous knowledge based systems that teach an individual that their efforts in life are connected to a higher purpose. This larger consciousness is exemplified by how the Mi’kmaq strive to live their life and treat others with benevolence and kindness. Reconciliation that is alive and present can be witnessed by the drum that Elder Syliboy made for me. Their founding principles for how to live life is that the key to a peaceful world is through compassion.
Ultimately, this research hopes to support respectful ways for reciprocity between settlers and Indigenous Peoples to occur throughout all levels of education. This study shows how Indigenous Peoples and settlers can work collaboratively to create more educational contexts, which as Archibald (2008, p.x.) says has the: “power to educate and heal the heart, mind, body, and spirit.”

When settlers become Indigenous allies, they have an opportunity to work together with the Mi’kmaq of Mi’kma’ki and begin the collaborative process of restorying. Today’s settlers can become Indigenous allies when they respect the importance of space for Indigenous storywork. However, the colonial legacy and the broken relationships (between Indigenous Peoples and Canada) of the past make trust and reciprocity difficult for many Indigenous Peoples to accept settlers as allies.

Lastly, this research serves as an example of an Indigenous pedagogical tool to be incorporated into the Nova Scotia Educational system. By following Indigenous protocol such as Indigenous storywork and Two-Eyed Seeing, Indigenous Peoples can take the lead and foster partnerships with students and staff. This in turn supports the initial steps of decolonizing education and critical reflection of the inherent power of the status quo. The current Nova Scotia Treaty Education Initiative is an excellent example of how the Mi’kmaq and settlers have been working together in solidarity to create educational reform across the board.

It is through unlearning, relearning, and embracing Indigenous ways of knowing that Indigenous allies begin to understand the inherent racism embedded in their adopted colonial system of culture and commerce. Upon disruption of this colonial fabrication, a more balanced and ethical understanding can emerge. Through Indigenous epistemology, truth and
reconciliation become transformational approaches for liberation, emancipatory growth and insight.
Appendix I

Interview Questions

Broad Themes That Formulated Questions for the Interviews

The proposed questions represent themes that were explored during the interviews:

1. Have you heard of “The Island with The Bloody Hand” story? If so, can you tell me this story as you know it?

2. Can you describe the first time you heard the story? How old were you? Where were you? What was the time of year? Who told you the story?

3. Potential question to ask settlers: What do you know about the Mi’kmaw’ version of the story?

4. Potential question to ask Mi’kmaq: What do you know about other versions of the same story?

5. Why do you think you know only the one version of the story?

6. What does this story tell us about 1756? What does it tell us about today?

7. What purpose, if any, do you think the story serves?

8. Do you have other stories that you would like to share?

9. How can Mi’kmaq ways of knowing be used for communicating the Mi’kmaw understanding of the history of Atlantic Canada?

10. How do you think schools and education, in general, can do a better job of telling these stories?
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