I. THE RESCUERS

In Inuit culture our elders are our source of wisdom. They have a long-term view of things and a deep understanding of the cycles and changes of life. . . . So it was natural for us to respect the newcomers who seemed to know how to survive and how to make their organizations work. Their power looked like wisdom. . . . We now know that it [was] a mistake . . .

Our people did not have any institutional immunity, just as we had no immunity to measles or alcohol. When these institutions came into our lives we had no way to deal with their poisonous side effects, their tendency to undermine wisdom, and our spirits slowly began to die. In our weakened condition we attracted even more services and more rescuers, and the cycle got worse. (Nunavik Educational Task Force, 1992: 11-13)

Freire's view that there are "powerless" populations is, on anthropological grounds, highly questionable. . . . Freirean and other participatory activists have tended to dis-value traditional and vernacular forms of power . . . because their understanding of power is largely derived from European Leftist traditions . . . In short, the inappropriate imposition of a certain vision of power on people who may not perceive themselves as powerless and, moreover, may not want to be empowered in the way being prescribed, is a problem area that has not been sufficiently addressed by Freireans. Nowhere is this more evident than Freire's failure to address the possibility that educators may be unable (or even unwilling) to strangle the oppressor within them. . . . The greatest danger of Freire's pedagogy, it would thus appear, is that it can be used as a very subtle Trojan Horse, one which appears to be a gift to the poor, but can all too easily contain a hidden agenda. (Blackburn, 2000: 13)

Paulo Friere was a "rescuer." "Rescuers" attempt to ameliorate conditions of the oppressed (certainly a worthy aim) however "rescuers" seem oblivious to the possibility of stemming the oppression of others in the first place.

One of the facts essential to decoding the rescuer mythology is the understanding that 20% of the world's people living in affluence consume 80% of the world's resources; "the remaining 4.7 billion people—80% of the population—survive on less than a quarter of world output" (Wackernagel & Rees, 1996: 102). Taking 80% of other folks' stuff does not seem to me to be very neighbourly.

Rushing next door after the fact to see if you can help seems the height of effrontery. It is a young Euro-American civilization that presumes upon itself the mission of rescuing the rest of the world, when, in fact, the rest of the world tends to view Euro-America as the culprit who threw them overboard to swim with. Witness Lawrence Harrison, senior fellow at Harvard, reciting a familiar tune when he argues that "culture is the obstacle" to development in Latin America; therefore American "social scientists" must find "ways to actively change cultural values in underdeveloped countries." "The problem is culture, and the solution is to change it . . .

Rasmussen, D. (n.d.). Cease to do evil, then learn to do good. . . . (A pedagogy for the oppressor). Unpublished manuscript.
in the countries where it is impeding prosperity" (Barss, 2000). Harrison's remarks echo those of The Economic Journal which 40 years earlier, in a moment of astonishing honesty, described the development-rescue-mission as follows:

Economic development of an underdeveloped people by themselves is not compatible with the maintenance of their traditional customs and mores. . . What is needed is a revolution in the totality of social, cultural and religious institutions and habits, and thus in their psychological attitude, their philosophy and way of life. What is therefore required amounts in reality to social disorganization. Unhappiness and discontent in the sense of wanting more than is obtainable at any moment is to be generated. The suffering and dislocation that may be caused in the process may be objectionable, but it appears to be the price that has to be paid for economic development; the condition for economic progress. (J. L. Sadie, in The Economic Journal, 1960, quoted in Griffin, 1995: 133)

Already, over a hundred years ago, "about 85% of the land mass of the earth was either a colony of Europe or a former colony of Europe," their resources being diverted to what Winston Churchill would later call "the rich men dwelling at peace within their habitations." (Dion-Buffalo & Mohawk, 1994: 33; Churchill, 1951: 382). In 1865, a pioneering British economist starkly illustrated how Britons viewed the earth's various local bounties:

The plains of North America and Russia are our [British] corn-fields; Chicago and Odessa our granaries; Canada and the Baltic are our timber-forests; Australia contains our sheep-farms, and in Argentina and on the western prairies of North America are our herds of oxen; Peru sends her silver, and the gold of South Africa and Australia flows to London; the Hindus and the Chinese grow tea for us, and our coffee, sugar and spice plantations are all in the Indies . . . . our cotton grounds, which for long have occupied the Southern United States, are now being extended everywhere in the warm regions of the Earth. (Stanley Jevons, 1865, in The Coal Question, cited in Wackernagel & Rees, 1996: 49)

As Kloppenburg has noted, "indigenous people have in effect been engaged in a massive program of foreign aid to the urban populations of the industrialized North" (Kloppenburg, 1991: 16). One present-day South American Indian leader refers to this as the "Marshalltezuma Plan," and has written to European governments asking that they repay the gold and silver borrowed between 1503-1660, arguing that Milton Friedman has been proven correct, "a subsidized economy can never function properly, and [this] compels us to claim—for their own good—the repayment of capital and interest which we have so generously delayed all these centuries" (Cuautemoc, 1998: 34).

To mature cultures, the resources that Euro-America gobbles up are interwoven necessities of land and life; they have been uprooted and dissolved in order for our economy to make use of them. We dissolve so that we can buy and sell the pieces. Lohman describes colonialism and development as the processes which "break down" the "social universe" of "partly independent wholes—cultures, languages, practices of livelihood, theories, arts, sciences," and "uses the fragments, deprived of their old roles, to build up new wholes of potentially global scope":

Farmland and forests have been removed from local fabrics of subsistence and converted to substrates for export cropping; rivers usurped to provide power for new urban sectors. . . . The diversity of knowledge held by local people has been devalued, pulverized and supplanted by a handful of disciplines—Western science, economics and management—controlled by outsiders. . . . Cultural characteristics like family loyalty, proficiency in traditional medicine, or patron-clientage, meanwhile, become sources of "comparative advantage" to be exploited, until they are finally worn away by the acid of the market. (Lohman, 1993: 157-8, 161)

The two main life-preservers that the Rescuers offer the world are Education and Economy, otherwise known as print and price, alphabet and money, bank books and school books. All "developed" peoples must be able to spell and spend. However, what the rescuers view as tools of salvation, the rest of the world experiences as the things which cast them further adrift. As Michael
Dove has insightfully argued, what the rescuers flaunt as an “additions” to societies, recipients experience as “subtractions”:

Development interventions are typically conceived as some type of “addition,” which is based on the premise that underdevelopment is caused by some type of “absence.” . . . The problem with this approach is that it shifts attention away from the international community’s own role as resource degradation and focuses instead only on its potential role as “helper.” I suggest that the international community needs to ask not just what it can do to help, but also what it must do to stop hurting. The cessation of most deforestation depends not on stimulating benevolent intervention by the international community, but on halting existing predatory interventions and not initiating any new ones. (Dove, 1996: 60-61)

This is the root confusion befuddling Euro-American “revolutionaries” : what they view as tools of rescue, much of the rest of the world experiences as tools of dissolution—not life preservers, but life-eroders. We the Euro-Americans—and I include Paulo Freire here—we spend a lot of time and money trying to help the rest of the world learn our economic system or learn our educational system—alpha-numeric competency being a prerequisite for successfully monetized minds.

The idea of the “global village” fills the minds and even the hearts of those who use the phrase with the good feeling that finally we have achieved something positive in our world. . . . And here is where I detect unconscious colonialism. . . . As we cannot have a global empire or a universal church let us, at least, have a “global village,” which will serve as a Trojan horse through which we can smuggle in the technology we want, the “science” we profess, and the system we advocate. (Raimundo Panikkar, 1983, in Vachon, 1995: 55).

We believe that we are compassionate. We don’t like to see suffering. The Buddha said: “Cease to do evil, learn to do good, that is the way of the awakened ones.” Well, it seems as if our habit is to rush into the “doing good” part without doing the “ceasing” part. I think that’s because the ceasing part doesn’t involve going out to the three-quarters world3 and being the “good guys.” The “ceasing” part means staying home in the well-off quarter and going to the fancy addresses in Rosedale (Toronto), or Westmount (Montreal) (or their equivalent swanky neighbourhoods in Chicago, New York, Boston, Seattle, Los Angeles) and addressing the men-in-suits behind iron fences who make the decisions that lead to bombs being dropped, forests being razed, rivers drained, or peoples being monetized and “literatized” thousands of miles away.

II. QALLUNOLOGY: THE STUDY OF AN ABERRANT NEW CIVILIZATION

I live in Iqaluit, Nunavut, almost 1500 miles north of Montreal. The Euro-Canadian recognition of Nunavut marks the first change to the map of Canada in 50 years. The new territory’s boundaries enclose almost 2 million square kilometres, three times the size of Texas, yet there are only 26,000 people here—85% of whom are Inuit who struggled for 20 years before securing the largest land claims4 agreement in Euro-Canadian history.

The governing organization that implements this land claim is called Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, or NTI; I work as a policy analyst for NTI. My job tends to consist of meeting with Qallunaat (“Europeans”) and negotiating agreements and so on, all the while trying to get across the notion of how strange white civilization is, how weird our belief system and way of life are—especially in contrast to a long-lived, mature civilization like that of the Inuit. Civilizations that are experienced, long-lived and ecologically-balanced are more aptly named “mature cultures,” says Gary Snyder, rather than social darwinist terms like “primitive” or “undeveloped” (Snyder, 1980: 112-115; see also Hofstadter, 1955; Berkhofer, 1979).

Getting this message across is not easy when at this very moment, there is someone working for the Federal government in Iqaluit who is wearing a nametag that says “Director of Inuit Training and Development.” A hallmark of rescuers is their conviction that “their own culture already contains everything worthwhile in others,” and that everyone else is just a junior version of
themselves" (Lohman, 1995: 60). Most Euro-American bureaucrats continue to believe that "just as a single person advance(s) from infancy through youth to reach adulthood, so all humankind (passes) through savagery and barbarism before gaining civilization" (Berkhofer, 1979: 47). If the government continues to ignore the reality of a thousand-year old already "developed" Inuit civilization then NTI may have to create a position for a Director of White Development in order to help get the point across.

Inuk journalist Zebedee Nungak refers to this sort of perspective-reversal as Qallunology; although Nungak has argued that since only Europeans get to be "Eskimologists," theoretically only Inuit should be allowed to be Qallunologists. (Nungak, 1999). Seeing as once every three years there is a major "Inuit Studies Conference" mounted (usually in a major Inuit centre—like Aberdeen, Scotland, for instance?), Nungak has joked about having a matching "Qallunology conference" in the Arctic, maybe with one of those museum-type dioramas with the white man in his traditional habitat, surrounded by specially collected European implements—the cell phone, pager, briefcase, electric shaver, and so on. All these artifacts are tools of the "road warrior"; specimens from his homeless, rootless civilization.

III. Rootlessness: The Two Poisons of Print and Price

Gary Snyder once gave the shortest answer ever when asked what folks should do to save the environment—he replied with just two words—"Stay Put!" I must admit, I didn't like his answer; it's bugged me ever since I read it (Snyder, 1995). But when you superimpose a map of species extinctions over a map of human wanderings, you discover that, indeed, the areas of greatest human immigration and exodus are also the areas with the highest level of plant and animal extinctions (Nabhan, 1997: 2). People who connect with a place look after it; those who are rootless do not. "Globalization is creating a world of powerless places at the mercy of placeless powers" (Wackernagel & Rees, 1996: 143).

We are the airport-transit-lounge culture, an "entirely new breed of people" says Pico Iyer. Iyer, who proclaims himself, with some ambivalence, to be a "Nowhere Man," says we are "masters of the aerial perspective," but reluctant to "touch down" anywhere (Iyer, 1997: 78). Once every six years the average Canadian changes hometowns; meanwhile the United States is "a lumpen society of mobile individuals to an extent unparalleled in the history of industrialized nations" (Berlin, 1997: 20; Kolko, 1984: 96). Why are we so rootless? In 1943, while living in England, Simone Weil was asked by the Free French to prepare some ideas on the "possibilities of bringing about a regeneration of France" (Weil, 1972: xv). Her answer is reprinted in her classic text, The Need For Roots:

To be rooted is perhaps the most important and least recognized need of the human soul. . . . A human being has roots by virtue of his real, active, and natural participation in the life of a community, which preserves in a living shape certain particular treasures of the past and certain particular expressions for the future. This participation is a natural one, in the sense that it is automatically brought about by place. . . . (Weil, 1972: 43).

Weil warned that what had undermined Europe was "the disease of uprootedness." Once uprooted, said Weil, one "uproots others"; however, "whoever is rooted in himself doesn't uproot others" (Weil: 48). Moreover, "the white man carries this disease with him wherever he goes," everywhere "European colonialism has been felt, it "ostracizes the land" (Weil: 81; Lopez, 1990: 31). And this only happens after the Land has been locked up, "enclosed," fixed, nailed down. Paper title is license to leave. Once land is locked into paper you leave it, and you can spend it, because land is capital, land is "congealed money" (Buchan: 91).

Thus, two "poisons" spread the "disease" of uprootedness:

"One of them is money. Money destroys human roots wherever it is able to penetrate, by turning desire for gain into the sole motive. . . . [The] second factor making for uprootedness is education. . . . [Education] abstracted culture from
tradition . . . [and the] result has been a culture . . . removed from the world, in a stovepipe atmosphere—a culture very strongly influenced by technical science, very strongly tinged with pragmatism, extremely broken up by specialization. . . . Nowadays a man can belong (to a culture) without . . . being aware that all the constellations are not visible at all seasons of the year. . . ." (Weil, 1972: 44, 45)

Education is a paper-based invention; it yanks one out of one's place and time. This only happens after a society's faith in the spoken word is replaced by faith in the written word. The alphabet is the most powerful "external memory device" ever invented says Donald; Postman calls the book "the original distance education tool" (Donald, 1991: 272–3, 356; Postman, 1998: 57). And if the Book is external memory, then Money is external value.

Buchan calls money "frozen desire"; Shopenhauer called it happiness in abstractio (Loy, 1994: 98). And just as paper money replaces the desired "thing," becomes the thing in itself, so to paper knowledge replaces wisdom, becomes the desired thing in itself. Print is the frozen word, price is frozen value.

It is my contention that we cannot formulate a "pedagogy for the oppressor" without investigating the twin poisons of uprootedness: Education and Money. The key theorician who identified Education as "solvent" is historian Ivan Illich (1971, 1977, 1981, 1992; also in Cayley, 1992); the key expositor of Money as solvent, was economist Karl Polanyi (1957; also in Stanfield, 1986).5

IV. Money: Lifeblood of the Disembedded Economy

In 1944, Karl Polanyi wrote what amounts to an "instruction manual" for our weird new civilization—kind of a "Euro-America for Dummies," you might say—he titled it The Great Transformation. Polanyi identified four "fictions" of this new civilization: (1) the illusion that pieces of the earth's surface could be owned by individual members of one species ("land ownership"); (2) the fiction that leasing humans was noble, whereas slavery—owning humans—was immoral ("labour"); (3) the fiction that coloured paper and metal could abstractly represent almost everything of value ("money"); (4) and a superstitious faith in "hugely fictitious bodies" ("corporations"). These four fictions dissolved a society's roots, they dissolved the essential connections between people and people and between people and place (Polanyi, 1957: 68, 71, 130, 178–9). The economy, which used to be something nested and controlled within the society, began to switch places with it and set the rules governing society.

Unnatural exchange, aimed at money making pure and simple rather than reproducing a community and sustaining amicable relations, is the root of Polanyi's concept of the disembedded economy. (Stanfield, 1986: 10)

In seventeenth-century England "the disembedded economy makes its abrupt and fateful appearance" eventually spreading across Europe, and fueling the most "astonishing" explosion of human migration in the earth's history (Stanfield, 10; Kolko, 1984: 68). Between the years 1821–1932 alone, 34 million people immigrated to the United States from Europe, while 16 million went to Canada, Argentina and Brazil. "There were many 'promised lands' to which to escape, and the British Isles and Germany—first touched by the traumas of capitalism—provided the bulk of reluctant emigrants until 1885" (Kolko: 68). It is important to note that in some years almost half of these immigrants were "re-immigrants"; that is, they were doing wage-labour in America for the second or third time, having returned home to an "enclosed" Europe desperate to buy a "pied a terre" in their true "indigenous" homelands. (Gabriel Kolko is the only historian to have emphasized these points; see Kolko, 1984, chapter 3). A shortage of ownable land at home led Europeans to claim lands abroad—a kind of real life game of musical chairs—albeit one with a more tragic outcome. Thus the "enclosure" of southern Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and America can only be understood against the earlier enclosure of England and Europe. The desperate scarcity of the means of life created by the ravages of enclosure and the other three fictions of capitalism (leaseable humans, currency, rise of corporations) created "homeless" masses eager to invade and claim the "new world" (Rasmussen, 2001).
Today, the almost unquestioned ideology of price means that from left to right, the entire political spectrum labours under the assumption that to be non-monetized is to be “poor,” or “undeveloped” (Sachs, 1992). Price congeals value—everything is measured in terms of currency or capital—social capital, intellectual capital, natural capital, human capital. Euro-American civilization tends to be synonymous with monogenerational and monolingual consumer households, themselves synonymous with acceleration. Each year, the industrial world burns up a million years worth of stored fossil fuels (Rasmussen: 2000b; Sachs, 1998: 45).

At root is the ideology of price. Why speed something up? To save money. Why have a “labour-saving device”? To save money; or to save time, because time is money. How do you get more respect for housework? Price it. How do you get more respect for environment? Price it. The battle between left and right in Euro-America is essentially a battle over how far to extend the domain of price. “Progressives” would like to see “full-cost accounting”—for example slapping a $60 billion sticker on Canada’s biodiversity in the hope that this will get economic elites to include things like this in their bottom line. A mother’s love is worth $10,000 in Manitoba; mental illness costs Canadian business $7 billion; price gouging, workplace accidents and other corporate costs born by taxpayers amount to $2.6 trillion in the USA. By factoring these things in, so the argument goes, a “progressive” society would be one of evenly-distributed scarcity, mobility, “access,” and money—one that would fine polluters, pay for housework, and subsidize daycare so our children wouldn’t harm themselves while we abandon them and go off to rent ourselves to each other.

Meanwhile, the elites seem to fantasize about finding, patenting, and profiting from new niches that can be priced to the exclusion of everyone else: dot-coms, pop songs, pharmaceuticals, the human genetic code—someone has even patented the New York city skyline. As Polanyi pointed out, the hallmark of a monetized people is their generation and veneration of scarcity. This scarcity-cult is best appreciated by opening any major business newspaper to the commodities section—sugar, coffee, orange juice, hogs. The headline will say one of two things: either it will say “Record Orange Crop: Prices Plummet,” or, “Prices Surge on News of Frost Damage to Orange Crop.” It doesn’t take more than that to illuminate the vast moral distance we have traveled from the mature civilizations of the planet. For monetized Euro-Americans, a bountiful harvest can mean financial collapse; calamity means profit. Abundance is bad news; scarcity is good news.

In Iqaluit, six years ago, the caribou herds returned. The elders had predicted this, their stories told of a multi-year migration cycle (I think they said forty years) which European scientists hadn’t been around to notice the previous time. Or the time before that. But the stories told it. And when the caribou came back, the community went out and hunted. There was a lot of meat, (there still is). There was a lot to share. Abundance was celebrated. There were many feasts.

Now, the Rescuers might say: We’re only trying to help; we want to put a safety net in place. But isn’t a safety net something you provide to people who are going to do something dangerous? Why do Euro-Americans do this dangerous thing? Why are we encouraging others to do it? What is it? What makes our lives dangerous?

Euro-American civilization is non-social. We’ve lost the building blocks of society before we even start—food, shelter, clothing, medicine—have all been locked up, made scarce, enclosed; the only way to unlock the requisites is to have the key: money, coloured paper. But can you sense the built-in surrender here? Do you hear it every day at work too? In order to get this coloured paper, you’re going to have to sell your lifetime in increments to others. This will mean choosing between life hours shared with your family/community/land—unwaged—or leasing your life hours to a fictitious body (corporate or government) for money. And because the latter option seems like our only choice, “essentially the neighbourhood has gone to work” (Hochschild in Snell, 1997: 27).

Meanwhile, Euro-America’s therapy industry tells its clients to “be in the moment.”...
human thought had succumbed to writing and writing had succumbed to numerical evaluation (Tuveson, 1969: 151; Postman, 1992: 13). These could be said to be the dates when these societies yielded to the ideology of literacy, the beginning of the wide scale belief that knowledge is a "subset of writing." As Suzanne de Castell explains:

I do not mean to imply that prior to the development of literacy human beings lacked knowledge, in the sense that they were ignorant. Indeed there is evidence that a wealth of intelligent accomplishment existed before literacy. . . . What I mean by suggesting that knowledge is a subset of writing is, rather, that the very idea of knowledge, the concept of knowledge "as such," and hence the idea that human beings could lack, develop, transmit, and possess knowledge, may be entirely a literate construction. (de Castell, 1990: 24-5)

The triumph of literacy can be marked by the ascendancy of the belief in knowledge as a paper, brain as book, world as school, universe as library. Print-based knowledge has replaced an enormous diversity of human expressiveness—sculpture, dance, poetry, song, drawing, architecture: vast forms of human expression, a diverse fluency in pattern languages that broad mass of people used to have. Now only specialized elites are fluent in these languages; the broad mass is minimally conversant, mostly in juvenile expressions of these pattern languages (Rasmussen 2000a). What pundits trumpet as an information explosion or knowledge economy is really just a bulge in one tiny sliver of our language spectrum—the rest of our human expressiveness has wilted, atrophied under the pressure to free up space for alpha-numeric language needed for the money economy. And while there have been some voices raised in alarm over the loss of oral language diversity, the wider atrophying of pattern language fluency seems to have garnered little attention.

Writing is about seeing and believing in symbols that are substitutes for sensual reality. The page, decorated with permutations of the alphabet, cannot represent smell, taste, touch, space, the teachings of the six directions, and earth. Most importantly, the alphabet is incapable of representing silence. . . . Deciding to subject reality to representation in 26 letters reflects a decision that reality can be represented in 26 letters . . . . This (is the) alphabetization of thought. (Sheridan, 1991: 24)

The ideology of print means that everything is seen in terms of the written word as the apotheosis of achievement; literacy is the measurement of intelligence, illiteracy is assumed to equal incompetency. A flood of expressions have come to equate competency with literacy—spiritual literacy, sexual literacy, visual literacy, family literacy, musical literacy etc. A little known government study recently suggested that 25% of Canadians suffer from "excess literacy" (MacKinnon, 1998). The Ruling Elite says to the people: The land that used to root you we have taken; the human arrangements that used to connect you we have broken; the pattern-language face-to-face myths and stories that once flowed between you and your place we have frozen (in print); Now we will train you to master alpha-numeric symbols in order to make money (from us) in order to get access to the land (we took from you) in order to buy the essentials of life. Economic atheism is not permitted. Once a people has acquiesced to the ideologies of print and price, once they’ve traded their spirit for spelling and spending, then it’s not much of a stretch to get folks to reach out for rescue. One of the major theorists of "rescue" was Paulo Freire. Let us now imagine what Nunavummiut might say if Freire arrived in the North today to teach his "liberatory pedagogy."

VI. PAULO FREIRE AS "RESCUER"

Men are not built in silence, but in word, in work, in action-reflection. (Paulo Freire, 1970: 76)

Paulo Freire called for "intervention," "liberation" and "transformation"; he called for the "oppressed" to rescue themselves with the help of his liberatory pedagogy (Freire, 1970). Freire’s admonishment of the non-literate for their "semi-intransitive," "submerged," and animal-like consciousness clearly places him in the cultural evolution school of thought which holds that civilizations evolve up a ladder of development from non-monetary and
what if the moment sucks? Work is drudgery; people want to be on their holidays; they don't want to be in the moment.

But what does this say about us: a nation of people who yearn for the end of the week? Who can't wait for the end of the work-day? For most of us, all we want is for Friday or 5:00 PM to come—soon. When you start each day plotting where you are in the week ("Thursday, one more day till the weekend") then you are rushing the grave towards you, wishing that your life passed quicker before your eyes, wishing the race were over. When I've talked to Inuit elders, I don't get any hint that they wish for the week to be over, the day to be over. Every moment passes in its appointed rhythm. There is no rushing toward the grave. Each moment is as it is; it can only be treasured when we take the price sticker off.

In the words of Wendat-Huron Georges Sioui, head of the Institute for Indigenous Governance in Victoria, B.C.:

Modern Amerindiains . . . see the Euroamerican concept of society as mere artefact and illusion. . . . (It) is increasingly obvious that the greatest worldwide crisis at the moment is the product of modern human beings who have lost their conscience and ignore the laws of nature. The ecological tragedy that future generations will experience is the harshest punishment the laws of our planet ever had to impose on humanity. . . . It is now permissible to think, and urgent to see, that the notion of classifying societies according to their "evolution" has been sheer fantasy on the part of certain civilizations isolated from natural, fundamental needs, which have been busy seeking and perfecting theories to legitimize their cultural imperatives. (Sioui, 1992: 101)

V. THE IDEOLOGY OF PRINT: EDUCATION AS SOLVENT

A moneyed age cannot understand a non-moneyed people, says James Buchan: "so pervasive is (money's) influence on our lives that it makes less moneyed ages incomprehensible, consigning them to barbarism or folklore" (Buchan, 1997: 34). A remarkable echo of the Canadian philosopher Harold Innis, who warned his English audience in a 1948 speech that a print-based culture could not possibly hope to understand an oral one (Innis, 1986: 59). Most non-alphabetized cultures have not seen fit to disembed a process called education from their ongoing pattern of life in order to transfer discrete objectifiable "knowledge" or "information" (see for example Micronesian navigators profiled in Turnbull, 1991).

Kiowa author N. Scott Momaday recalls the time when "words were medicine; they were magic and invisible. They came from nothing into sound and meaning. They were beyond price; they could be neither bought or sold..." (in Murray and Rice, 1999: 50). Nora and Richard Dauenhauer, renowned translators of Tlingit tales of Alaska say that the "writing down of oral literature, no matter how well intentioned or how well carried out, petrifies it... A petrified log may look like wood, but it is actually stone" (Murray and Rice, 1999: 97). But they ask, "Who is it for? The file cabinet?"

Things which formerly belonged to the domain of local and orally transmitted bodies of knowledge are now incorporated into a universal written culture. The alphabetization of knowledge stretches without interruption... This emphasis on written language disempowers people by bringing material existence under the purview of experts who are oriented to writing and use writing to orient others." (Porksen, 1995: 73–4)

Havelock, Innis, Illich and Holt pioneered the view of "knowledge" as a category of possessable knowing invented by writing (Havelock, 1986; Innis, 1951, 1986, Illich, 1971, 1992; Holt, 1976). Illich argued that a society's craving for "Education" arose only after a belief in "knowledge" as scarce product had thoroughly taken hold of a population (a particularly wide-eyed example of this is Freirean disciple Moacir Gadotti 11). Illich pointed out that "Education" is a new and aberrant invention, spawned by the ideology of literacy; the word itself doesn't show up in French until 1498, in English not until 1530, and in Spanish not until 1632 (in Prakesh & Esteva, 1998: 17). 1759 is the first occasion when Europeans begin to conceptualize the "world as school"; thirty-three years later the first instance of grading student papers gets introduced by a Cambridge tutor—
non-literary to the apex of the monetized and print-
knowledge-dependent (Freire, 1973: 3; Hofstadter,
1955; Kuper, 1988). Educators have long believed
that conferring literacy on members of an oral
culture would make them, in Havelock's words,
"wake up from the dream" (Stuckey, 1991: 78).
In Freire's words, they abandon "magical expla-
inations" and "hopelessness"—they emerge—"no
longer mere spectators, they uncross their arms,
renounce expectancy, and demand intervention"
(Freire, 1973: 17, 13.) Havelock and the Freireans
argue that "Nonliterates must be brought into fuller
life," and that only by "reading the word" can you
"read the world" (Stuckey: 80–83; Macedo and
Freire, 1987; Kidd and Kumar, 1981). Stuckey calls
this the "superiority-from-literacy" argument. In this
view, literacy not only "makes minds," it "makes
minds intelligent" (Stuckey: 78). The rescuers' doctrine says that "primitives" evolve as children
do, "by acquiring the sort of intellect we expect of a
good reader"; most notably:

- a vigorous sense of individuality, the capacity to
  think logically and sequentially, the capacity to
  distance oneself from symbols, the capacity to
  manipulate high orders of abstraction, the capacity
to defer gratification (Postman, 1982: 46).

C.A. Bowers has serious reservations about the
Freirean mission, especially when it seems to lead
to the undoing of established ways of life (Bowers,
1993: chapter 3; and Bowers 2001). Individualized,
competitive, argument-oriented literacy, what
Gouldner calls the Culture of Critical Discourse
(CCD), tends to cosmopolitimize and uproot
civilizations; it breaks their multi-generational links
and melds the atomized remnants into mobile
human rental units.

The culture of critical discourse . . . devalues tacit,
context-limited meanings . . . while it authorizes itself . . . as the standard of all "serious" speech . . .
CCD experiences itself as distant from (and
superior to) ordinary languages and conventional
cultures . . . it is conducive to a cosmopolitization
that distances persons from local cultures, so that
they feel alienation from all particularistic, history-
bound places and from ordinary, everyday life . . .
(Gouldner, 1979: 28–9, 59)

In Canada’s north, European attempts to
transform the Inuit way of life have been almost
uniformly disastrous (Okpik, 1966). Relocating
Inuit to zones lacking in animal life in order to
assert Canadian sovereignty resulted in starvation
and social disintegration (Tester, 1992). Next the
rescuers introduced "welfare colonialism," creating
dependencies, shattering links of sharing practices,
stealing children in order to give them a "proper"
education (Paine, 1977: 80). A proper Education
meant that not only was Inuikutut not permitted—
neither was silence. For in Euro-American
education, blank pages and silence are signs of
social dysfunction: time to call in the counselors
and break down the silence, convert it into
confession or journal entries.

Quiet native children were always being told to
"speak up," and encouraged to compete with each
other. Native habits like the silent facial yes and no
of the Inuit were stopped in class. . . . The children
often felt ashamed because they could not hunt,
clean skins or make things, travel, and stand the
cold as their old folks could. On the other hand
they considered the elder people rather ignorant
and old-fashioned. The old closeness between all
ages had been broken (Crowe, 1974: 198)

For a pedagogy rooted in alphabetized communication blank pages typically say nothing to
the reader; silence is similarly disdained. And yet
for civilizations steeped in the oral tradition and
fluent in "pattern languages" like music, quiescence
is just as important as activity. The oral tradition
may be "high context," but to Europeans it is "low
status" (Hall, 646–7; Bowers, 1997: 11–13).

One Nunavut author, Kenn Harper, tells this
story from his early days in the North: an old Inuk
fellow dropped in unannounced, there was a smile
and a nod, and the chap sat in the kitchen. Time
passed, half an hour, an hour; eventually the visitor
got up and left. It was quiet, Kenn says, we never
said a word to each other. Later on, Kenn heard
from others that this elder had been telling others
what a good visit he’d had with the Qallunaq
(Harper, personal communication, April, 1999).
Inuit civilization, with its "advanced speech ethics"
has the ability to "speak through silence." During
gatherings, Inuit leaders can be extremely "respectful
of nuances," and can "sense a nascent consensus
emerging from the silence" (Walker, 2000).
However, Freire's pedagogy negates the spaces of silence and declares them "inauthentic":

Human existence cannot be silent, nor can it be nourished by false words, but only by true words, with which men transform the world. To exist, humanly, is to name the world, to change it. Once named, the world in its turn reappears to the namers as a problem and requires of them a new naming. Men are not built in silence, but in word, in work, in action-reflection. (Freire, 1970: 76)

Freire asserts that "knowledge emerges only through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry men pursue in the world... apart from inquiry... men cannot be truly human" (Freire, 1970: 45-6). This is completely at odds with Inuit who believe that "when the teacher is the land, patience and wisdom go together... Things can usually be figured out in time, as long as one is a careful observer" (Nunavik Educational Task Force [NETF], 1992: 12). Furthermore, they caution that "there are limits to how much can be achieved in a classroom... [W]isdom can only be gained by engaging with life, by honouring one's heritage and by mastering the skills necessary for independence. We used to have this when we lived on the land" (NETF, 1992: 55).

This "honouring of wisdom and heritage" seems to contradict Freire's statement that people focused on "their sphere of biological necessity" focus "almost totally (on) survival and lack a sense of life on a more historic plane" (Freire, 1973: 17). They "confuse their perceptions of the objects and challenges of the environment," says Freire, but here perhaps it was he who was confused, if we compare the accounts provided by anthropologist George Wenzel, who spent several years with Inuit in Nunavut, Nunavik (Northern Quebec) and Greenland. Wenzel says that producing "niqituinnaq," or "foods that are 'real,' " "country foods." requires specific and essential cognitive ordering by Inuit with regard to animals and by animals to men. If an animal is to choose to participate in the food process, the Inuk harvester must approach the animal with an attitude of respect, and he must intend that the products of the animal's generosity will be available to all. (Wenzel, 1991: 139)

This does not sound like a people who are "confusing" the "challenges of the environment"; nor does it sound like a people who view "animals [as] submerged within reality, cannot relate to it; they are creatures of mere contacts" (Freire, 1973: 3). Freire's denigration of the non-alphabetized belies the wisdom in the Inuit way of life. Animals are "siitajuk (intelligent)," say the Inuit of Clyde River, "animals are aware of the thoughts, speech, and actions of hunters. This awareness provides animals with information so that they may choose to participate or not in encounters with hunters" (Wenzel, 138). As a result, "the success of a [hunter] is indicative of that person's cognitive referencing to both the human and animal communities with which he interacts... the core of any relationship is the basic recognition that an equity exists with animals as sentient participating members in a shared environment" (Wenzel, 138).

Betraying what David Abram has called an obsession "with the question of human specialness," Freire warns that the non-literate may be "so close to the natural world that they feel more part of this world than the transformers of the world," resulting in "almost a state of non-being," unable to become "more fully human" (Abram, 1997: 77; Freire, 105, 145). However, Nunavummiut don't experience this closeness to the natural world as less than human or merely human, but as more-than-human:

Ortega y Gasset's statement, "I am I and the environment," synthesizes the kind of meaning Inuit impart when they speak about niqituinnaq— a unity of environment, community and human identity... harvesting is not just the means by which food is extracted from the natural environment, but also the critical medium through which the human and animal communities are joined together... The fundamental... belief) is that a reciprocity exists between hunter and animal, between one person and another, and between the human community and the natural environment. (Wenzel, 1991: 137, 141)

Freire's own anti-orthodoxy is an orthodoxy in itself. In a national literacy campaign for the republic of Sao Tome and Princeipe, Freire helped design a series of workbooks that purported no less than to teach the nation's new revolutionary citizens "how to think correctly"
When we learn to read and write, it is also important to learn to think correctly. To think correctly, we should think about our practice in work. Our principle objective in writing the texts of this Notebook is to challenge you, comrades, to think correctly. Now try to do an exercise, attempting to think correctly. (Freire & Macedo, 1987: 76, 87, 88)

The individual thinker, surveying, naming, and arguing with his world, could be called Freire's orthodoxy. But in "Inuit heritage, learning and living were the same thing," and "knowledge, judgment and skill could never be separated. In institutional life these things are frequently pulled apart and never reassembled. For example, schools spend much of their energy teaching and testing knowledge, yet knowledge by itself does not lead to wisdom, independence, or power" (NETF, 1992: 15). Freire was evidently trying to get across the message here that a comrade should "think for oneself"; however, this obscures what Gouldner and Fox call the "complex authorship of ideas" and what James Paul Gee calls the "social nature of interpretation" (Fox, 1989: 72).

Types of texts and the various ways of reading them do not flow full blown from the individual soul (or biology); they are the social and historical inventions of various groups of people. One doesn't think for oneself; rather, one always thinks for (really with and through) a group—the group which socialized one into the practice of thinking. And of course, one "thinks for" different groups in different contexts (since) the literacy practices of these groups are always fully embedded in their whole repertoires of social practices, going well beyond language and literacy per se. (Gee, 1988: 209-10)

Paulo Freire strove to give the individual peasant and worker control over the means of knowledge-production, as he saw it. Freire's liberatory pedagogy in essence focused on knowledge as a print-based product, and it aimed to give the individual worker or peasant the ability to interpret and control this product for his or herself. Freire had no quarrel with the Euro-American civilization that spread the ideology of literacy, the civilization that spread the notion of language as non-silent, the notion of knowledge as print-based product, the notion of education as the means of knowledge-production. Freire constructed his pedagogy as a life-preserver for the oppressed, but he treated oppression as a fait accompli; he never seemed to take aim at the "poisons" that dissolve rooted societies in the first place.

VII. FIRST, CEASE TO DO EVII . . .

Twenty years ago my partner and I were involved in the East Timor issue in Canada. Indonesia, supported by the US, Canada, Britain and Australia, had occupied the tiny Portuguese colony of East Timor in one of the most brutal military occupations of the past century. We called our group the East Timor Anti-Intervention Committee, and by reading business journals we'd figured out that bullets from a factory in Quebec were making their way into Indonesian rifles and putting holes in Timorese people. In addition to bullets, Canada was shipping tanks and helicopter engines to the military, and, with mining interests factored in, our country was the biggest Western investor in Indonesia. When we approached several church and human rights groups about doing something, they always asked the same two questions: When were you in Timor? How do you propose to get aid in there?

Well: we were never in East Timor, and we were not proposing to send anything there. On the contrary, what we wanted to try to do is stop things from being sent there—things like bullets, tanks, helicopter engines. But it's amazing how quickly one is discredited if you haven't been to a place. How can you know anything? How can you presume to help?

"Solidarity" was the favoured approach back then. We're in solidarity with Nicaragua, folks would say, and they'd pile onto a plane and head down there to build a hospital or a school. Claire Culhane, Canadian peace activist and prison abolitionist, put it best when she used to talk about fighting within the "belly of the beast.

In 1985 she told me:

You know, I was in Vietnam during the war. I worked in a hospital, but it was turned into a military base. . . . I had to make one of the toughest
decisions of my life—to stay or go... I went to the Vietnamese embassy in France and I told a guy there my story. He said: "The bombs are falling on our heads, and they will keep on falling even if you're here. Why don't you go home and stop the bombs from coming here." (see also Lowe, 1992: Chapter 7; Culhane, 1972; Taylor, 1974)

"Cease to do evil, learn to do good."... Obviously things must be done in this order; there is no point in offering a drink of water to someone whose neck is under your boot. What Claire was saying is exactly the same as Gary Snyder's advice on how to save the environment: "Stay Put." Stop with the thieving and killing already. (William Eckhardt's research shows that 73% of all war-related deaths since 3000 BC have occurred in the 20th century A.D. Civilian deaths made up 58% of deaths in the first part of that century, rising to 74% in the 1980s and 91% in the 1990s; see Eckhardt, 1990, 1992). Since our way of life is causing most of the problems that the rest of the world has to deal with, the best thing we can do is deal with our own way of life. Stay put, and take everything the Economic Journal said in 1960 and reverse it: don't generate dissatisfaction, unhappiness, social and cultural upheaval, suffering and dislocation. As long as we need 80% of the rest of the world's stuff, we're going to end up having to go next door and bully people to get it. Rushing around the world thinking we're being neighbourly, proselytizing our alphanumeric fetishism, and narrowing down rich physical-oral-mental cultures into lonely consumers and dazed human "leasees" only burdens the planet with more people like us. And while Euro-Americans trapse around abroad, our economic system at home finds ever new ways to rob, destroy and pollute far away lands. Meanwhile we pat ourselves on the back, because we, "the rescuers," are out in the igloo or under the banyan tree teaching liberatory pedagogy to the suffering natives so that they can fight back and resist. But wait a sec—if we'd cleaned up our backyard maybe they wouldn't need our salvation, and maybe our pedagogy isn't helping them maintain or regenerate their cultures anyway. Let us not presume to do good until we have ceased to do evil. This ought to be the essence of a pedagogy for the oppressor—first—cease to do evil. Next, study our own behaviour. In his book, The White Arctic, sociologist Robert Paine said that his one "message" to whites was to drop the illusion that they were "in the Arctic to teach the Inuit," and instead focus on "learning about white behaviour" (Paine, 1977: xii).

Nunavut, for example, doesn't need to be rescued; and as my Inuit colleagues say exasperatedly, Nunavut definitely doesn't need any more "experts." Mothers in Nunavut have twice the allowable levels of dioxins in their breast milk. In the small community of Qikiqtaaluk (population: 499), just east of where I live, over 60% of the Inuit children under the age of 15 and almost 40% of Inuit women of childbearing age were found to have PCB body burdens exceeding "tolerable" guidelines (Government of Canada, 1999). Barry Commoner's recent "source-to-receptor" research tracked 70% of these dioxins to specific operations in the USA (Commoner, 2000). Nunavut doesn't need Americans to visit; Nunavut doesn't need Americans to come to its rescue; Nunavut needs Americans to "Stay home." Stay home in Ames Iowa, and Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. These are the communities whose municipal incinerators are producing the dioxins destined for the bodies of the Inuit women of Qikiqtaaluk. American communities and ours are tied together by America's invisible exhalation of death. America breathes out, and Inuit die. This is what a "pedagogy of the oppressor" needs to teach. Stay home. Go on a field trip to Alpena, Michigan, or Hartford, Illinois. Figure our how to clean it up, slow it down, stop it. It's the Euro-American way of life that needs to be put' under the microscope, not intriguing tribes in far-away lands. Instead of exotic slide shows on the Arctic, how abour American schools take exotic field trips to the municipal incinerators in Bethlehem Steel's and US Steel's iron sintering plants in Chesterton and Gary Indiana?—two of the dozen or so key sources of dioxin being exhaled to the Arctic. The dioxin particles rise with warm air and moisture and fall with cold temperatures, "grasshoppering" their way toward the north pole, where it is too cool for them to evaporate and instead they settle, absorbed into lichen, eaten by caribou, and in turn consumed by Inuit. In Coral Harbour (pop. 822), in the middle of Hudson Harbour, over half of the
annual dioxin burden for 1997 was deposited in just two months: September and October (Commoner, 2000). Dioxins from Ash Grove’s cement kiln in Louisville, Nebraska, from Lafarge’s cement kiln in Alpena, Michigan, from Chemetco’s copper smelter in Hartford Illinois, from the city of Harrisburg’s incinerator in Pennsylvania.

So: You don’t have to come to Nunavut. . . . Take my word for it, it’s a still a very beautiful place. If you like, I can send you a postcard. In return, maybe you could send me a postcard of the new scrubbers being put into the smokestack in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. That would be right neighbourly.
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ENDNOTES


2. Citing research by Canadian political economist Ian Robinson, Noam Chomsky has repeatedly pointed out that it is not so much a case of rich vs. poor nations, but rich vs. poor people: “In 1960, the GNP ratio between countries with the richest 20% of the world’s population and those with the poorest 20% was 30:1; by 1989, it had reached 60:1. But the same UNDP figures reveal that the ratio of the incomes of the richest 20% poorest 20% of people was about 140:1 not merely 60:1. Its data show that ‘more than half of the inequality between the richest and poorest 20% of the world’s people . . . is a function not of income inequalities among nations, but of income inequalities within nations.” (Chomsky, 1994, World Orders Old and New, New York: Columbia University Press; p. 139).


4. However, even the concept of “land claim” is problematic: “We must never use the term ‘land claim,’ . . . It is non-indigenous peoples who are making claims to our lands. We are not making claims to our lands.”- Kari-Oca Declaration, Rio Earth Summit, 1992, (cited in Hall, 1999: 852).

5. Illich and Polanyi are both largely excluded from academic studies in Education and Economics: a survey of recent graduate level reading lists for the major Canadian university faculties of education uncovers not a single Illich text; see David Gabbard’s Silencing Ivan Illich: A Foucauldian Analysis of Intellectual Exclusion (1993) San Francisco: Austin and Winfield. Karl Polanyi’s wife was barred from the USA due to her ties to the Communist Party, and the couple ended up in Canada in the post-war years; some have argued that Polanyi could have nurtured a whole new branch of economic anthropology had McCarthyite prejudices not dominated scholarship at the time; see Laura Nader’s essay “The Phantom Factor: the Impact of the Cold War on Anthropology” in Chomsky et al. (1997) The Cold War and the University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years, NY: The New Press.
6. Regarding leasing humans: note the following comments addressed to citizens in Washington in 1822 by an Osage leader Has-hak-atonga ("Big Soldier"): "You are surrounded by slaves. Every thing about you is in chains and you are slaves yourselves; I fear if I should change my pursuits for yours I should become a slave. Talk to my sons; perhaps they may be persuaded to adopt your fashions, at least to recommend them to their sons; but for myself, I was born free! and wish to die free!" (in Richard Drinnon's White Savage: The Case of John Dunn Hunter, New York: Schocken Books, 1972: 239).

7. Although the birth of corporations can be traced back 500 years to Holland and Venice, it was the seventeenth century British who thoroughly exploited the invention by "giving" large chunks of the world through royal charters to fictitious entities like the Hudson's Bay Company. Up until just over 100 years ago Americans routinely revoked corporate charters (for example extinguishing 10 banks in 1832 alone) if they ceased serving the public interest; but in 1886 the US Supreme Court bestowed perpetual existence and the rights of "natural persons" upon corporations. See Jim Hightower, "Chomp! How a 17th century British Scam morphed into a global monster," UTNE Reader, March-April 1998, pp. 57–61; Murray Dobbin (1998) The Myth of the Good Corporate Citizen: Democracy Under the Rule of Big Business, Toronto: Stoddart.

In an insightful debunking of the fallacy of shareholder rights, Marjorie Kelly describes stockholders as the new aristocracy, and questions their "divine right of capital" since the supposed "investment" that 90% of stockholders make by buying stock is a complete illusion. She notes that the "stock market works like a used car market... When you buy a 1993 Ford Escort, the money doesn't go to Ford. It goes to the previous owner. Ford gets the buyer's money only when it sells a new car. Similarly, companies get stockholders' money only when they sell new common stock, which mature companies rarely do... [A]bout 99% of the stock out there is "used stock",... trading in the purely speculative market, and never reach[e] corporations. So what do stockholders contribute, to justify the extraordinary allegiance they receive? Very little. And that's my point." Marjorie Kelly, "The Divine Right of Capital," Tikkun, July-August, 2000; Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 33–39.

8. The bulk of the immigrants to North America in this period were from southern and eastern Europe and they had great difficulty adapting to the now-dominant Anglo-Protestant culture. "Between the options of assimilation or disintegration, as Thomas and Znaniecki correctly noted a half-century ago, the immigrant was decidedly prone to the latter. And this was expressed in a retreat to individualist and egocentric norms to replace the constraints that the community or family had imposed in Europe—to crime, social breakdown, and atomism.... [P]eople who migrate—whether to another nation or just to another state—are significantly more prone to serious mental disorders than those who do not. ..." (Kolko, 1984: 94, 96).


11. "If we look at the cycle of discovery, we can see two moments, not more than two, that are dialectically related. The first moment of the cycle is the moment of production, production of a piece of knowledge, of something new. The other moment is when the piece of knowledge which has been produced is discovered or made known. ... And the teacher becomes the specialist at transferring the knowledge." Moacir Gadotti (1994) Reading Paulo Freire: His Life and Work, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, p. 13. This viewpoint entirely supports the monetized notion of knowledge as capital; witness economist Kenneth Boulding;
"Knowledge is clearly a capital stock of a population. Learning is the process by which additions are made to this stock..."—K. E. Boulding (1986) "Levels of Knowledge and Learning," in Thomas and E. Ploman (Eds), Learning and Development—A Global Perspective, Toronto: OISE Press, p. 80.
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