The Transeunt Listener:
Towards Futurities of Re-learning in Truth and Reconciliation Curriculum and Teacher Education

Patrick Phillips
University of Ottawa

Abstract:
What does it mean to read, write and act towards reconciliation in curriculum and teacher education? To answer this question, I perform a situated literature review of Truth and Reconciliation teacher education research. I borrow from Lisa Farley's (2010) concept of the reluctant pilgrim. While Farley reflects on a physical journey to understand how belief can withstand historical loss and immersion in ongoing systems of colonial power, I engage with her concept psychically; I attend to the words and listen for the implied hopes of the authors I read. Also attentive to my own beliefs and hopes as I read them, I become what I term a *transeunt listener*. I discuss how I became a transeunt listener through a form of reading-as-encounter and how it enabled me to understand how teacher education might address what I see as three tensions in truth and reconciliation teacher education discourse: 1) belonging; 2) disruption of settler consciousness; and 3) an expanded ethical capacity in teachers and curriculum theorists.

Keywords: re-learning; Truth and Reconciliation; transeunt listener; curriculum studies; teacher education

L'auditeur transeunt : Vers des futurités du réapprentissage dans les programmes de vérité et réconciliation et la formation des enseignants

Résumé :
Que signifie lire, écrire et agir pour la réconciliation dans les programmes d'études et la formation des enseignants ? Pour répondre à cette question, je réalise une revue de la littérature portant sur la recherche concernant la formation des enseignants liée à la vérité et réconciliation. Je m'appuie sur le concept du *pèlerin réticent* développé par Lisa Farley (2010). Alors que Farley réfléchit à un voyage physique pour comprendre comment la croyance peut résister à la perte historique et à l'immersion dans les systèmes coloniaux toujours en place, j'engage son concept sur un plan psychique; je suis attentif aux mots et j'écoute les espoirs implicites des auteurs que je lis. En demeurant également attentif à mes propres croyances et espérances lors de ma lecture, je deviens ce que j'appelle un *auditeur transeunt*. Je discute comment je suis devenu un auditeur transeunt grâce à une forme de *lecture comme rencontre*, et de la façon dont cela m'a permis de mieux comprendre comment la formation des enseignants pourrait aborder ce que j'identifie comme trois tensions dans les discours sur la vérité et réconciliation en éducation : 1) l'appartenance; 2) la perturbation de la conscience coloniale; et 3) l'élargissement de la capacité éthique chez les enseignants et les théoriciens du curriculum.

Mots clés : réapprentissage; vérité et réconciliation; auditeur transeunt; études curriculaires; formation des enseignants

> "What does reconciliation mean, Uncle Huckleberry?" Memengwe asked.
> "It means learning from the past so we don't repeat the same mistakes and making the world a better place for all humans and animals." (Blackstock, 2020, pp. 32-33)

> [There is] something of a fraught encounter with the dissonance that echoes at the heart of historical identification and perspectives. (den Heyer & Abbott, 2011, p. 610)

What does it mean to read, write and act in ways that encourage reconciliation in curriculum and teacher education? To answer this question, I performed a situated reading of pedagogical research texts in the field of Truth and Reconciliation teacher education. As a complexly intersectional, yet White, settler Canadian who is in the process of learning what Truth and Reconciliation means while also performing a task of institutional mastery in the form of a literature review from a fortified position atop the lands originally cared for by the Algonquin Peoples and who continue to care for the same, my response was not only situated within the bounds of my bibliography and within myself, but also by my experiences with Truth and Reconciliation discourse and teaching. Foundational to this article is Madden's (2019) call for both organizations and individuals to theorize "reconciliation in terms of assumptions, purposes, goals and discourses in order to more transparently position themselves in relation to and contribute within this emerging field" (p. 304).

I began by borrowing from Lisa Farley's (2010) concept of the reluctant pilgrim, a subject position from which historical consciousness and the possibilities and limitations of belief are not discussed or experienced separately. In taking up this concept, I include both the "material landscapes [or what is experienced] and the immaterial, imperial wishfulness [of] transcultural reparation" in my literature/discourse review (Farley, 2010, pp. 8-10). Similar to Farley (2010), I understand this transcultural reparation to be embodied in the texts, not only by the authors I read, but by me as I read the words of the discourse "despite what can be indicated in more certain terms" (p. x). While Farley (2010) reflects on a physical journey to understand how belief can withstand historical loss and immersion in ongoing systems of colonial power, I reflect on my academic journey as a *transeunt listener*, a term I define in the endnote but its relevance I explain fully in the next section.[1] For now, suffice it to say that I read my topic discourses "symptomatically", as a means of understanding how teacher education and its discourse might hope to affect change in and outside the minds of educators, including myself (Farley, 2010, p. 27). As a transeunt listener, I identify and discuss what I see as three key tensions in Truth and Reconciliation teacher education discourse. The first is belonging, or the tension between the inclusion or "success" of Indigenous and non-Indigenous students and their teachers within wider settler society and the hope for self-determination beyond such frames. The second is a disruptive expansion of settler consciousness

[1] Because this note is lengthy, it has been placed as an endnote, located after the references. All other notes are placed as footnotes (at the bottom of the pages).

that includes Indigenous perspectives. The third is the hope that teacher candidates and curriculum theorists broaden their ethical capacity to more fully read, write and act in the contexts of a profoundly implicating sense-making of their relationships with fellow human beings and the more-than-human world. I conclude by discussing how a transeunt listening to Truth and Reconciliation discourse calls me towards new futurities[2] of re-learning in curriculum and teacher education.

Literature Review as Pilgrimage and Transeunce

> The ethical invites a focus on transient moments of encounter with others in which subjectivity is performed or achieved. (Phelan, 2019, p. 5)

When I first encountered Lisa Farley's (2010) *reluctant pilgrim,* I was moved—or rather, I felt myself move. In turn, what it means to be "moved" by reading a text changed for me. It became more than a private affective experience. I do not mean to suggest that I felt no emotion; indeed, my reading of the subject of Farley's (2010) pilgrimage, the collective memory of survival and enduring belief embodied in the story of Lejac Residential School resident Rose of the Carrier Nation was a very emotional one. More than that, it was a compelling historical-subjective nexus. For me, reading became a movement between places of subjective formation that compelled me to attend and follow. Reading became more akin to listening—it called for my embodied presence in the text. The act of listening suggests 'being there' in the place (or text) for the speaker and giving my full attention to what is being asked of me in response. Ethical encounters with discursive texts in this listening allow the possibility of texts to change us and our beliefs, acknowledge the hopes of others as if they were our own and even prompt us into affinitive action.

As I write while imagining my reader, I realize that concepts like 'pilgrim' and/or 'pilgrimage' may seem disconnected from or even at odds with the ostensible decolonial goals of Truth and Reconciliation. While I acknowledge this tension between concepts and goals, I suggest it also has generative value, not least for me. Farley's (2010) pre-colonial understanding of pilgrimage on Turtle Island is more akin to "a journey to one or more ritual landscapes to leave offerings for and interact with spiritual essences residing there in order to fulfill obligations relating to the maintenance of

---

[2] I ask my reader to consider that the word "futurities" is intentional and distinct from "futures". As cultural studies scholar Rebecca Wanzo (2020) relates, "'Futurity" connotes not just what will happen or a time that is not yet. It is laden with affective attachments such as hope and fear. But it is best understood in relationship to the other words that are often proximate to it, such as "time", "horizon", "utopia", and "dystopia". Throughout North America, futurity is consistently associated with identity, linking ideas of what the future will look like with the belief that various groups can build a new space or, in our worst imaginings, be injured by an impending world that disavows or has no place for them. Futurities are simultaneous and sometimes competing with the idea of the future always contained within another project related to nation or identity. Theorists of futurity in American studies and cultural studies have thus focused on this nexus of identity and imagined world building" (p. 119). As Wanzo further relates, before he coined the term "manifest destiny", American ambassador John L. O'Sullivan declared (1839, p. 427) that the United States was destined to be "the great nation of futurity", suggesting that European colonists never sought to "de-populate the land" by "wicked ambition". The violent takeover of Turtle Island belies such mythologies. I presently suggest that we, as human beings, can yet craft better futurities together.

world balance and social identity" (Palka, 2014, p. 10). As such, pilgrimage might be understood as a curriculum for spiritual sustenance, renewal and transformation. This does not mean evading the more common and Eurocentric sense of the word or ignoring the power and privilege a religious or otherwise spiritual pilgrimage might enact. Pilgrimages or journeys for Palka (2014) and Farley (2010), whether physical or psychical, allow one the opportunity to step away from everyday social obligations, "conventional norms and hierarchies", to self-reflect or connect with different others one might not normally encounter and so critique, at least inwardly, institutionalized, taken-for-granted hopes and futures (Coleman, 2015, p. 146).

While elsewhere, Catholic priest Fr. Frank Fahey (2002) suggests that the "pilgrim is always in danger of becoming a tourist" or a voyeur, he also acknowledges that an attentive tourist "is constantly running the risk of becoming a pilgrim" (p. 218). Pilgrimage, then, can offer a transformative journey of being changed as a human being. Notwithstanding the Judaeo-Christian assumptions underlying educational histories and futurities in what some of us call Canada, including the legacy of residential schools alongside the constraints of teacher education programs and their still mostly-White or otherwise non-Indigenous settler demographics, I posit that reading as a pilgrim on a pilgrimage offers an entry point for teachers and teacher educators to encounter crucial topics relationally (Childs et al., 2010; Cho & DeCastro-Ambrosetti, 2005; Janzen & Cranston, 2016).

In the context of Truth and Reconciliation education, for or by teachers, reading in this way is now, for me, such a pedagogy. Harried into conforming to the curriculum of teacher education and, subsequently, classroom practice, I find that teacher students see themselves as includers of knowledge rather than agents in its construction. In part, because they are assessed only on what they are compelled to know, their focus is on what they should include in their lesson plans to cover topics like Truth and Reconciliation adequately, while many of their teachers are often (myself included) concerned with the same. However, expanding their view with concepts of agential construction forge the notions of relationality I want to engage in with them and with you, as readers, here.

As a complexly intersectional, yet White settler curriculum scholar, I enjoy the privilege of questioning my institution's teacher education curriculum and my own curriculum. I also feel the same pressures as teacher students in that my curriculum is very much about learning to cite (or include) the right sources and demonstrate a mastery of educational knowledge.[3] Like teacher students, I too am compelled to operate within the confines of academia and what Papaschase Cree

[3] Here and throughout this essay, I use the phrase "teacher student" to encompass any student, undergraduate or graduate, who I teach or mentor across the courses I teach and the research projects I administer or otherwise facilitate. Many if not most graduate students (MA, MEd, PhD) at the University of Ottawa's Faculty of Education are also practicing educators. Many of these students, in my experience, are still in the midst of understanding the implications of Truth and Reconciliation education—or have not even begun to when I first meet them, in the case of many international students who wish to stay, live, and eventually teach in some capacity in service to the state of Canada.

scholar Dwayne Donald (2011) calls the walls of colonial frontier logics. As such, what I have mostly read, researched, taught and written about so far are all textual commodities and the trappings of an academic life which assumes the ideal research output is a textual commodity.

Academic reading is more than a textual commodity for me when I engage with it as a listener. For example, during the global pandemic, I found that reading as an act of listening became the primary site for my encounters with others and their ideas. It became a collection of places where I encountered the hopes and futures of those other than myself. Reading-as-listening was a conscious choice between being moved or simply reading and extracting. It prompted me to intertwine ethics with understanding towards partnership with others to know differently.

In terms of positionality, reading and theorizing curriculum studies texts in this listening way has become for me, a kind of *binate*—but not binary—movement. It is at once a movement toward encountering places and people outside my own lived experience and a movement that simultaneously passes through my own personal experiences of queerness, disability, neurodivergence, intergenerational trauma, survival of abuse and assault, displacement and abandonment, homelessness, an ethics of care and, especially, my relationships with the more-than-human world. Further to my positionality, my reading and writing within this essay are the seeds and soil of a larger in-process project that envisions the possibility of re/presenting educational discourse and its authors in ways that do not foreclose relational implications. So, my hope for this essay is that it be read as a work of and invitation into a pedagogical relationality with me, one that not only traverses physical presence, but creates a close psychical proximity between us through the material arrangement of the text and through our joint hopes and fears as they intersect with Truth and Reconciliation discourse.

Farley (2010) suggests that locating "curriculum 'in place' returns knowledge to the particular context of its construction and that endows [it with] significance" (p. 8). She even cautions us about the "risks of tearing bodies from knowledge, feet from ground, and curriculum from community" (p. 8). I wondered then, as I read Farley (2010), if physical "place" was significantly different from psychical "place" especially because my interlocuting subjectivities were largely formed in my psychical encounters with texts. Farley (2010) helped me answer my own question. She reminded me that to encounter place is to implicate one's own body; it means considering "not only how the particularities of a place shape us, but also how we, in turn, affect the routes we travel'' as historical subjects (p. 9). I determined that physical place and psychical place operated very similarly, if experienced as relational and ethical.

That said, from a curriculum studies perspective, "place" is perhaps located somewhere in-between the physical and the psychical in terms of con-texts and the affects of texts, but not necessarily so in terms of how texts effect change in us or our movements as human beings (Phillips, 2021). This effective—and affective—change is the rare and enduring lesson I learned from reading Farley's pilgrimage. I changed because of being able to follow her movements through psychical places as she traversed real places, towards palpable changes in her understandings of things, even when such understandings were conflicted by doubt, guilt, hope, belief, or abject gaps in her

experience or comprehension. In this essay, I traverse the topography of Truth and Reconciliation in the so-called settler state of Canada, in which the meaning of Truth or Reconciliation is contested and often cannot be conflated (Stein, 2020).

Given my experience with Farley's (2010) text, a superficial pedagogical encounter some, and perhaps many, students of education have with texts, be they teacher candidates or graduate students or tenured professors could arguably be a focus for concern. To examine what I mean by "encounters", I draw on the work of Kent den Heyer (2009, 2012) and his co-authored work with Abbott in 2011 about curriculum-as-encounter. den Heyer (2009) makes a

> distinction between curriculum-as-thing (body of facts, skills, and attitudes to deliver to the student body) and curriculum-as-encounter (the ways in which our shared sense-making is itself a historical legacy that requires explicit study) [that] reflects two differing interpretations of curriculum in curriculum studies and teacher education literature. As thing, curriculum questions concern how best to convey the content that students should acquire, what techniques assist in this acquisition, and what assessments best measure acquisition. . . . In curriculum-as-encounter, inquiry focuses on the interplay between [the] discursive contexts that shape pedagogical intentions. (pp. 344-345)

Literature review as a curriculum-as-encounters also reminds me of Aoki's (2004) distinction between curriculum-as-planned and curriculum-as-lived, or for my purposes, reading-as-lived. In a literature review, one must already be open to being changed by what one encounters, at least on a discursive level. (The synthesis of a literature review is, ideally, a new subjectivity in relation to a matter at hand.) As a curriculum, however, how might a literature review engender change in the human being? Scholars like den Heyer (2009), Britzman (2003) and Carson (2007) suggest that curriculum-as-encounter attends to the real complexity of difficult topics both in and outside the classroom lives of teachers. This includes the possibility of having unsettling encounters with "knowledge already possessed", when we learn that this knowledge might be incomplete or when we feel the need to rethink "deeply held intellectual beliefs and emotional investments" (den Heyer, 2009, p. 346). These investments might include collective commitments to settler futurities and the (colonial) stories that we inhabit daily in their maintenance (Tupper, 2020). Another similar investment might be our "encounter [with] the 'grand narratives' shaping mainstream interpretations about agency", as we find them in "the daily news to the refined air of scholarship" (den Heyer, 2018, p. 230). den Heyer (2018) is particularly concerned with the agential subjectivity in teachers as an outcome of history education curriculum. As it relates to the subject of this paper, I see that the outcomes den Heyer (2018) seeks and terms "agential subjectivity" are not so different from the outcomes I seek through reading Truth and Reconciliation teacher education discourse. For den Heyer (2018) "the question of agency and the traffic between material and symbolic structure on the one hand and people's perceived choices and available actions on the other" are similar to how I listen as I read and engage with text as if I were 'there,' so that it moves me to action in the here and now—making me a transeunt listener (p. 241).

I hope to demonstrate how reading as listening and as curriculum might find "moments, and their associated tensions, when subjectivity is achieved in all its singularity—when teacher candidates persist in questioning the given, steal time for solitary study or act upon well-defined commitments" (Phelan, 2019, p. 4). As Phelan (2019) contends at the intersection of curriculum theorizing and teacher education, "to be educational, teacher education must be primarily concerned with the teacher's subjectivity, that is, with the teacher's freedom of expression, thought, and action" (p. 4). While Phelan (2019) does not address the question of *whether* teacher education can or should work to produce teacher subjectivity, I propose that it must because these subjectivities and their agency are necessary for action and transformation, and because, as a minimum, it is better than a passive academic interpretation. What I invoke instead is what D. G. Smith (1999) names the *hermeneutic imagination*, which he claims has the capacity to throw "open the challenge to inquire into what we mean when we use words like curriculum, research and pedagogy . . . [and ask] what makes it possible for us to speak, think and act in the ways we do" (p. 28). For Smith, this is a generative act that allows us to envision and hope for change "[amidst the] constraints and difficulties that constantly threaten to foreclose on the future" (p. 29). A capacity to imagine what a text's author senses and hopes for as we read them adds, for me, a necessary part of being a transeunt listener when we read.

Similar to Laura Jewett's (2011) hermeneut, I am a navigator. I engage reading as transience between what Jewett (2011) calls "spheres of temporary coherence" and becoming in which ritualized academic practices such as reading might be expanded into an ethical space or place in which we are affected as human beings (p. 93). Reading into writing becomes what Brian Casemore (2008) offers as a topos for "being-in-place [as] being-in-language, [where] a writerly act [is] entangled in the skeins of history and our inner lives" (p. 111). Thus, I view the discursive encounters I have on my reading pilgrimages as hermeneutical—a pre- and post-religious, spiritual, ethical empathy. My pilgrimages reconfigure Jewett's (2011) reading-as-transience and Casemore's (2008) writerly entanglements into an active readerly *transeunce*. When defined as a mental act or series of mental movements having effects outside the mind, transeunce is a good word to describe the kind of transformative, active and practical manifestations I experience when reading. Theologian Russell's (1979) conception of transeunce is also akin to mine. She defines it as "the human ability to go beyond ourselves toward others in order to realize our own being . . . [and] as historical [ability]: always in the process of going beyond the present, and beyond [ourselves] toward the future" (p. 48). And so, transeunce might offer us a way to frame living, re/learning, writing, reading and teaching within and across the ethically-dependent and interconnected praxial tributaries that flow into and out of curriculum studies, teacher education and particularly Truth and Reconciliation education. Thus, re-learning and teaching how to do so in a good way is essential for the well-being of all our relations, human or otherwise. It is essential as we collectively move into and constitute un/foreseeable futures that might include relations with unprecedented displacement, placelessness and unpredictable powers, like AI. With this in mind, I offer here that we share, as human beings, an ability for transeunce. And so more to the point, I suggest that such an ability for transeunce is a

stance of ethical and kinship relationality that spans non-Indigenous and Indigenous worldviews.[4]

To summarize, such movement and ethical, future-oriented transeunce defines my approach to reading Truth and Reconciliation teacher education discourse and to understanding the three tensions I found within it related to belonging, disruption of settler consciousness and hopes for an expanded ethical capacity in teachers and curriculum theorists.

Belonging: Integration or Self-Determination?

> By design, this process inherently has us responding to the Euro-Western construction of Indigenous policy. Clearly this approach does not work. (Pidgeon et al., 2013, p. 29)

In tracing the status of Indigenous education from the Indian Act through to the early days of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), Michelle Pidgeon, of Mi'kmaq ancestry from Newfoundland and Labrador and her colleagues, including Jo-ann Archibald of the Sto:lo First Nation (2013), place careful focus on working and speaking against Canadian government assimilationist policies as the impetus behind education for Indigenous students.[5] Reflecting on 40 years of Canadian federal control of Indigenous education, Pidgeon et. al. (2013) identified core principles for protecting future Indigenous students' rights and for anticipating the challenges these students' rights might face in the future, starting with the *Indian Control of Indian Education* (ICIE) (1972) policy document. For the ICIE's (1972) authors, Indigenous students have "rights to good quality education that truly honours Indigenous ways of knowing and being" (1972, p. 5). This document, designed with the support of the National Indian Brotherhood (now the Assembly of First Nations), remains just as relevant today as it was in 1972. Inequitable funding for education between non-Indigenous and Indigenous schools and communities, alienation of communities from schooling and widely ingrained systemic discrimination and violence towards Canada's Indigenous Peoples continue across all state apparatuses, ostensible social nets and the so-called Canadian multicultural mosaic. Meanwhile, Indigenous families still face systemic violence at the hands of Canada's child welfare system (Blackstock, 2009). And perhaps even meaner—more cruel towards our shared future generations of relatives—the original covenants and Treaties between first and newcomer to Turtle Island largely remain forgotten or even actively dishonoured. These truths are inseparable from issues of teacher education, even if teacher education has been continually implicated as a nexus from which a future of redress might originate. In other words, teacher education must constantly

---

[4] As Elder Duke Redbird of the Saugeen Ojibway Nation ([1960] 2019; personal communication, November 13, 2024) has taught me, today no other peoples are as transient or nomadic as White citizens, in the sense that as a White-embodied human being one can be as nomadic as some pre-contact Indigenous Peoples.

[5] Here and throughout this writing, I intentionally use the capitalized terms Indigenous and Indigenous Peoples as an expression of respectful solidarity across the diversity of First Nation, Métis, Inuit, status and non-status Peoples within the colonial boundaries of what some of us call Canada. This is in line with international discussions, including the terminology of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Where possible, I attribute specific community relationships. I leave terminology used in quotations intact (Younging, 2018).

question how transformative or reconciliatory teaching might be, while historical promises remain broken, and injustices persist against Indigenous Peoples and our shared more-than-human kin beyond the classroom.

Layered into educational self-determination, which would respect Indigenous life-worlds, is a tension between pushing against assimilation (as the precondition of belonging) and finding belonging (through equity in or alongside wider settler society). In 2010, Kanien'kehá:ka scholar Frank Deer assessed the congruence between the behaviours and attitudes of Indigenous students, those of their teachers and the prescribed outcomes of Canadian citizenship education in Manitoba schools. Deer (2010) frames the consequences of past "problems with colonizers" as "a struggle for identity as well as a quest for self-determination" and "belonging" for Canada's Indigenous students (p. 2). Wary of assimilative success, Deer (2010) makes the distinction that Canadian schooling "may be regarded as a neo-colonial enterprise when employed with Aboriginal students" (p. 3). However, belonging for Deer (2013) appears to be a matter of being inside or outside the frame of Canadian citizenship and economic participation. Deer (2013) recommends "integration of relevant Aboriginal perspectives in curricula and school activities" and better recognition by teachers of "Aboriginal students' personal circumstances" (pp. 23-24). However, Deer (2010) earlier aligned his recommendations with the goals of Manitoba Education, Citizenship and Youth's 2004 Aboriginal Education Action Plan. This plan "identified graduation, access to and completion of post-secondary education, career preparation, and relevant research as its principal objectives" (Deer, 2010, p. 4).

Listening more deeply, Deer's (2010, 2013) concern with belonging registers self-determination alongside the pragmatic hope that Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations might be yet sustainable, with their respective ways of knowing and being brought into dialogue through supporting Indigenous presence in teacher education. Cree Métis scholar Michelle Hogue (2012) reminds me that the lived reality of schooling means that these hopes are always-already co-implicated in education. While Hogue (2012) is "continually bothered by the lack of Aboriginal representation and success in post-secondary" education, she is equally concerned that Indigenous students "must leave their culture at the door and adopt Western approaches to education and curriculum to succeed" (pp. 77-78). Read as a systemic concern, belonging is not just a tension created by the question of who gets to belong, but who gets to belong and how. When settler communities understand that assimilation in any form is not an option, the more serious question becomes: How can settler schools create environments in which Indigenous students can thrive and learn on their own terms? Hogue (2012) suggests that without the wider systemic opportunity to belong in Western systems, educational institutions will continue to lack the capacity to truly honour Indigenous ways of knowing and being.

I framed the header for this subsection intentionally as a question because in my experience, teacher students often understand belonging as a choice between integration into a single Canadian curriculum or as an experience separate from such a curriculum (and so beyond their requirements to understand or, more generously, their everyday praxis). In my experience teaching, teacher students face difficulties unpacking what voices like Pidgeon et al. (2013), Deer (2010, 2013) and

Hogue (2012) mean by belonging. The dominant frames of equity, diversity and inclusion in teacher education seem to cast belonging as either a matter of assessed success or as a passive, multicultural curricular additive. In their study following the effects of British Columbia's (BC) Aboriginal Education Enhancement Agreement, White et al. (2012) found that teaching for belonging had shown some positive impacts for Indigenous students in BC public schools in terms of belonging and success understood outside of Eurocentric norms. However, these impacts were highly localized and attributed to the actions of individual teachers and the "pockets of knowledge" they carried. In other words, these were teachers who did more than their contractual obligations warranted towards relating to Indigenous students, communities, histories and knowledges. In my own teaching, I have felt such a "pocket", not just of knowledge but of ethics too. I try to guide students beyond standard curriculum and institutional ethics to read/listen to Indigenous voices to better understand Indigenous perspectives on Indigenous issues and convey these in their classroom teaching. However, while White et. al. (2012) made conscious attempts to move away from Eurocentric concepts of success even when working within these same Eurocentric-global capitalist frameworks, I find that the teacher students I teach still cling to status quo assumptions about what a classroom should produce—successfully tested, standardized and retained students—to frame their understandings. Cannon (2013) considers how non-Indigenous teachers are themselves oppressed within settler colonial systems but says that the "tangible outcome" of having a dialogue about what educational success looks like in different cultures is still located within an individual rights framework (p. 29). In other words, the teaching of colonial history and Indigenous-settler relations in teacher education continues to be largely framed within a Western social justice paradigm and as such assumes no fundamental changes are needed to the operationalization of teaching in settler public education or settler society at large (Kovach, 2013).

Cree writer and scholar Tracy Lindberg (2015) notes that institutions' dependence on a kind of "bums in seats" logic when making space for Indigenous ideas and bodies is at best superficial and at worst inhospitable (p. 77). Student teachers in my classrooms sometimes reflect a similar logic when responding to writings like those of Deer (2010) and Hogue (2012) and to their calls for redress in terms of improving the academic success of Indigenous students through retention and integration into Canada's future economy. This call for improvement as well the logic used to address it is "not a new proposal. It arose in the 1950s as an assimilative federal policy aimed at moving Indigenous students from residential schools and into provincial schools" (Wiseman, 2018, p. 335). Amidst commitments to mandate integration of Indigenous perspectives across teacher education and K-12 curricula, Wiseman (2018) posits that more is needed to realize a "(r)evolution" in Canadian teacher education. Wiseman (2018) suggests that "belonging" for Indigenous bodies and their ways of knowing and being is difficult to articulate in a non-Indigenous institutional register. Wiseman (2018) suggests that while space and inclusion in classrooms for Indigenous Peoples and ways of knowing and being can be mandated (revolution), meaningful change will only happen in classrooms when individual educators are committed to the efforts they need to make in working towards this goal (evolution).

Kanien'kehá:ka scholar Sandra Styres and colleagues suggest that educational change must begin with an examination of worldviews in teacher education and research (see Styres et al., 2010). Without it "Indigenous communities, funding agencies, universities and researchers [who] all recognize the need and the possibilities for effective, positive and collaborative research" will continue to be wary "of the landmines that still remain buried within a landscape of disparate epistemologies, mistrust and isomorphic discourse" (Styres et al., 2010, p. 619). Set within what Donald (2011, 2019), calls the enduring colonial logics of institutions and their greatly forgetful curricula, I suggest that teacher education educators and scholars must seriously ask themselves: What happens when a non-Indigenous teacher, raised and integrated in Western neoliberal society, is mandated to include the histories and present perspectives of Indigenous Peoples? Similarly, Lindberg (2015) asks how can Indigenous knowledges and perspectives find a home in teacher education and teachers?

Answers to these questions form the crux of educational belonging for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous bodies. However, real answers need to address the actual problem, which is that teacher education programs still espouse and re-enfold teacher students into a White-and-neoliberal ethos yet purport to believe in Truth and Reconciliation. In my own experience teaching teachers, I find myself, a White settler and my mostly-White or racialized non-Indigenous students still working to understand the full weight of these questions. As I read and re-read each semester, I grow increasingly more determined to find some kind of—or kindred—answer that I can embody. As a transeunt listener, I believe I have found a partial answer to these questions. Even a complexly intersectional White settler like me can listen in person or as they read and allow themselves to be moved and changed by what they hear the other saying.

Even so, the onto-epistemological implications of Truth and Reconciliation teacher education literature always push against the walls of the classroom and bleed across weekly topics. I find myself and my students caught between understanding Truth and Reconciliation as teachable content contained within prevailing curricula and a burgeoning impulse to challenge what we teach and how we teach it. I have for some time begun to openly question the physical and psychical boundaries of what we consider education to be and ask what it could be in this place, and I offer the same lingering uncertainty as a lesson to the students I teach. I ask them, what non-Indigenous scholar Jennifer MacDonald and Métis scholar Jennifer Markides (2019) ask of themselves, that is, to "recognize the complexity of this work and [acknowledge] that certain assumptions of voice, power, truth and representation are embedded in our practice" (p. 96). I further ask them to find ways of "sharing perspectives—influenced by our own values, assumptions, concerns, and aspirations—[to] reveal new possibilities of living well together" in a hope that they will (MacDonald & Markides, 2019, p. 96). Although these requests are often met with a roaring silence, I am hopeful that, for some at least, these silences mean they are taking the time to reimagine what it means for themselves and others to belong.

Settler Consciousness: Epistemologies of Ignorance, Unsettling the Settler and the Limitations of Settler Futurity

> While existing colonial relations may create the appearance of "peace" in Canada, this appearance is misleading and needs to be interrupted. (Tupper, 2014, p. 472)

In his September 2010 update to the Senate on the TRC's progress, Murray Sinclair, Anishinaabe of the Peguis First Nation and Chair of the TRC, insisted the: "residential schools have had such a dramatic impact upon Aboriginal people in Canada that sometimes people believe it is an Aboriginal problem. It is not an Aboriginal problem. It is a problem that all people in Canada need to think about and address" (Government of Canada, 2010, pp. 7-8). As Wiseman (2018) notes, the TRC is "a key historical instance of documenting and acknowledging the violence and atrocities perpetuated on Indigenous young people and their families via the Canadian state" (p. 224). As such, it is also a key instance through which Canada's colonial history is recast not only as a problem for Indigenous education but for non-Indigenous education as well. Although it is certainly not the first time Indigenous voices have asserted this reality in teacher education discourse, the TRC has arguably prompted a "shift" in academic thinking towards the need for non-Indigenous teachers to adopt a stance that is consistent with a meaningful and respectful address of Indigenous history and perspectives in schooling as a necessary condition for reconciliation. However, Aitken and Radford (2018) note that as part of a larger global trend, teacher "resistance, ambivalence and negativity around teaching for reconciliation have emerged as important objects of research" (p. 41). Bissell and Korteweg (2016) understand this resistance, ambivalence and negativity as a psycho-social complex that they term the *settler-teacher horizon*. Reading through similar discourse, I see the need for practices of "unsettling" in teacher education on this horizon. Regan (2010) ostensibly calls for teachers to interact "differently with Indigenous [P]eople[s]", that is, to act "with vulnerability, humility, and a willingness to stay in the decolonizing struggle of our own discomfort" (p. 13).

As Tupper (2014, 2020) and den Heyer and Abbott (2011) attest, the "power of conscious and unconscious history, memory, and national narratives [constitute] the way individuals develop identities as citizens of a country" (Tupper, 2014, p. 476). While "all disciplines are entered into as stories already in progress that provide a sense of history and identity for their members", as teachers of teacher students we must ask teacher students "to attend to ways institutional storytelling shapes their historical understandings and, by extension, the values they are prepared to convey to their future students" (den Heyer & Abbott, 2011, pp. 611-620). den Heyer and Abbott (2011) found that teaching teachers to address multiple historical perspectives, including Canada's history of residential schools, means working against what Seixas (2000) describes as an entrenched, single story of Canada and what Stanley (1998) describes as the grand narrative of those who populate these prevailing stories. Even with these historical thinking concepts in their curriculum, den Heyer and Abbott (2011) found that their students nevertheless could not avoid trying to reintegrate their understanding of history so that it was congruent with Canada's nationalistic imaginary. Tupper (2020) defines this imaginary as constituted through the "settler colonial consciousness", which "normalizes and celebrates the settler experience, rendering the past and present experiences of

Indigenous [P]eoples either invisible or as distinctly separate from what is worth knowing" and ultimately "inhibits opportunities for ethical relationships and reconciliation with Indigenous [P]eoples in the future" (p. 89). Unsettling settler colonial consciousness in teacher education is a crucial, and for some, a difficult proposition, because it means letting go of deeply and collectively held investments in shared and individual settler futurities (Seixas, 2004).

"In schools", Tupper (2014) says, these "colonial dispositions are typically perpetuated through 'colonial-blind' discourses that deny the continuing harm embedded in settlers' historical and contemporary relationships" with Indigenous Peoples, and "include narratives of the nation that do not account for [their] foundational importance" (p. 470). In contrast, Tupper (2014) says that Treaty education is an intervention that can unsettle settler colonial consciousness in meaningful ways. Treaty education is at its core a peacebuilding education. It not only centers Indigenous Peoples as foundation peoples of Canada, underlining the legal rights of Indigenous Peoples that are often and flagrantly disregarded, but also Indigenous ways of knowing, being and relating (Tupper, 2014). So, a study of Indigenous Treaty rights and its abuses asks students to reconcile breaches of Treaty law with a settler colonial idea/imaginary that sees Canadians as law-abiding citizens with much to learn from Indigenous conceptions of Treaty. Once settler consciousness is expanded in this way, teachers can learn how the "land, valued and disputed, is at the heart of Indigenous-settler relations" (p. 473). Tupper's (2014) teacher candidates spent time "studying the provisions, spirit and intent of the numbered treaties, including their negotiated terms for on-reserve education" then considered how these were foundational but broken promises that have led to historical and present injustices against Indigenous Peoples and ongoing settler ignorance (p. 479). Critically and crucially, however, Margaret Kovach (2013) of the Pasqua First Nation suggests that teaching *from* Treaty is perhaps not the same as teaching *through* Treaty. Indeed, as Tupper (2015) acknowledges elsewhere, practices of revealing ignorance do not necessarily destabilize a settler worldview. Kovach (2013) stresses that Treaty for Indigenous Peoples is "an active relational" process of enacting *sacred* agreements that "include[s] seeking continuous counsel and dialogue on matters that have bearing on the parties involved" (p. 112). She strongly suggests that without engaging with Treaty as verb, the futurity of its spirit would be lost, and it would become "one item among many in a curriculum that seeks to ready students for a job market and not for life as citizens in a still-colonized land" (p. 112). Kovach's concept of Treaty thus suggests more is needed beyond destabilization of settler identity.

There are, therefore, settler psychical, structural and relational limitations for the hope to move from Reconciliation as the outcome of a procedure to a continuous commitment in teachers to new configurations of relationships. In attempting to facilitate a pedagogy of decolonization informed by the then ongoing TRC discussions, Madden and McGregor (2013) found that what is "sayable and doable" in classroom spaces is still constrained by the colonial pedagogical encounter (p. 379). Even before decolonization can be perceptible, the proposition of unsettling teacher identity assumes teachers "who are conscious of their social, cultural and historical positions, and associated emancipatory possibilities, as well as capable of challenging colonial ideological, epistemological and ontological commitments in various cultural processes, including education" (Madden & McGregor, 2013, p. 373). Unsettling, suggests Schaefli et al. (2018), demands that one is ready to dismantle

"epistemologies of ignorance" that are constantly being reinforced on a personal and collective level (p. 477).

This is perhaps much to ask of a settler teacher education course, required or otherwise, or even a whole program. Scott and Gani's (2018) research discuss conflicting evidence of just how reconciliatory teacher education programs have become. They also found that teacher candidates and teacher training institutions can be "overwhelmingly supportive" of Indigenous perspectives when framed within a neoliberal diversity lens, but not at all supportive of the relational implications of such knowledges and perspectives, including "the need to recognize the constitutionally enshrined collective rights of Aboriginal peoples in Canada" (Scott & Gani, 2018, p. 172). This contingent support also suggests that unsettling settler consciousness is an ongoing but consistently contested and limited project. Between 2012-2014, when I was an MA student at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE)/University of Toronto, in the Curriculum, Teaching and Learning department, none of my required courses, all taken alongside current teachers, referred to Canada's colonial history as a concern for teacher education. I made a personal choice to take an Indigenous Knowledges in Education course as one of my electives. Until writing this paper, I thought that course had unsettled my *perfect stranger* identity, which Potawatomi-Lenapé scholar Susan Dion (2007) describes as a position of privileged ignorance. This privileged ignorance is a stance from which White settler teachers consciously or unconsciously resist engaging in good relations with Indigenous Peoples while simultaneously claiming cultural disqualification and denying the role Whiteness plays in maintaining this ignorance. Now, I am not so sure. Much of my unsettling work has so far been in the form of internal reflections on my own consciousness, leaving me institutionally rewarded but still a stranger to Indigenous students and their ways of life. Higgins et. al. (2015) reminds me, however, to be wary of binaries such as familiar/strange. I am reminded that, while I was studying Indigenous knowledges in education at OISE, I simultaneously became part of the Bead and Read circle, part of what was then the new Indigenous Visual Culture Program at OCAD University. I brought in my course readings to discuss with my community there and so was welcomed into conversations that expanded them into the worlds of Indigenous literature, storytelling and material cultures. I learned to bead weave well enough—technically and in a good way—that I was trusted by my community to facilitate the circle for a semester. As I have foreshadowed earlier in this essay, I draw on and weave relationally through similar experiences that have contributed to my becoming as a transeunt listener.

Through hopeful listening to concerns for belonging alongside calls to unsettle my thinking suggests the possibility of "unlearning" settler colonial identity and so opening my consciousness to *re-learning* (Korteweg & Fiddler, 2018). My own definition of Reconciliation now implicates my commitment to the wellbeing and self-determination of Indigenous learners as inseparable from my settler position while I recognize the need "to come together in solidarity and seize the opportunity to learn what it means to be a good human being" (Burm, 2016, p. 52). I suggest that learning to be a good human being is not conditional on one's blood or what lands and waters nourished one's ancestors. It is a deeply ethical and necessarily binding call to all our kin. Such is the logical and ethical futurity of Truth and Reconciliation teacher education, as I see it here.

From Unlearning to Re-learning: Reconciliation as an Expanded Ethical Capacity in Teacher Candidates

> I am questioning what it might mean to resignify "reconciliation." What new space might be created through simultaneously using and troubling this concept in order to move beyond the prevailing constructions in [circulation]? What is gained and what is lost in purposely positioning our work in conversation with what is often referred to as "the era/age of reconciliation"? (Madden, 2019, pp. 294-295)

In focusing on the development of a "de/colonizing" theory of reconciliation education, Madden (2019) inserts a slash in 'decolonizing' to acknowledge but make productive the fact that "efforts to challenge and pursue reconciliation within colonial systems are embedded in those same systems and re-grounded in their associated logics and practices" (p. 300). Madden (2019) proposes a framework that encompasses not only the TRC's exegesis and calls, but also centers Indigenous counter-stories, active critique of how Reconciliation is conceived and enacted, and the resurgence of land-based ways of knowing. Madden's (2019) framework urges "engagement that extends beyond reflection and dialogue" (p. 304). It also urges attention "to instances and perspectives that exceed prevailing constructions of reconciliation" (Madden, 2019, p. 300). In this final section, I focus on what I gleaned, through my transeunt listening, as a new space of re-learning in excess of teaching as framed through prevailing teacher education, curricula and teaching contracts. Osmond-Johnson and Turner (2020) similarly cast Reconciliation as "newly re-imagined relationships [becoming] the ethical space of engagement for moving beyond the status quo" (p. 66). In their study of school principal leadership, the authors conceptualize Reconciliation in education as an "*Indigenist agenda*, [my emphasis] a discourse that makes space for non-Indigenous peoples to situate themselves as being responsible for taking up Indigenous issues in diverse ways" (Osmond-Johnson & Turner, 2020, p. 58). These "diverse ways" also exceed how teachers are taught and taught to lead other teachers. They find their source in deep personal commitments not stated in their job descriptions, including "developing close, personal bonds" with Indigenous students and their families, Elders and communities" (p. 62). Just as Osmond-Johnson and Turner (2020) suggest that a "relational acumen" beyond "traditional senses of school operations" is needed to access this space, Madden (2019) links *excess* to a relational model of continually re-imagining (of) Reconciliation education (pp. 63-67). "Excess", according to Madden (2019), "can teach about the protocols, norms, and forms intended to solidify and secure [phenomena like reconciliation]; [can attend to how] excess reconfigures space wherein thought can confront, provoke, and orient anew" (p. 300). Similarly, in their work with teacher candidates in an Indigenous education elective, Lisa Korteweg and Anishinaabe educator Tesa Fiddler (2018) not only expose their students "to the pain and suffering of Indigenous [P]eoples . . . but also to the dynamic and rich [Indigenous knowledge] that continues and contributes to environmental sensibilities, community sustainability, and ancestral-spiritual connections with the Land and all creatures" (p. 269). Like Madden's (2019) framework, this implies a critical excess is needed to shift "towards a stance of openness to reconciliation as a process of (re)learning and building relationality" (Korteweg & Fiddler, 2018, p. 269). They also state

that teacher candidates must still "realize that there is a conflict of teacher narratives where who they want to become as settler / Canadian teachers clashes with responsibilities and commitments they should enact [with and in] Indigenous" contexts and actively challenge the former (Korteweg & Fiddler, 2018, p. 269). Further, they suggest, there must be a shift away from the institutional expectation of teachers to be "nice, fair, polite (apolitical)" professionals to expectations of teachers being "rooted in a commitment to restitution of Indigenous rights, reclamation of [Indigenous knowledges], and self-determination" (Korteweg & Fiddler, 2018, pp. 257-263). Such a commitment goes beyond unsettling; it advances a re-imagining of who future teachers should be.

This commitment includes the stories we embody and perpetuate as teachers and requires re-learning what it means to be in relation as entities of land, water and place-based sacredness (Phillips, 2020). Exceeding typical settler introspection, my reading/listening of Tupper (2020) teaches me the potential of "(re)storying" settler colonial consciousness, despite how easy it is to "slip back into the comfort" of the settler imaginary (p. 89). Tupper's (2020) writing goes beyond reflection and guilty ignorance to "overtly connect [her] memories and experiences in the past with current colonial realities" by "(re)creating memory" through her relationship with land (p. 94). Doing so, for her, transforms a "desire for ignorance" into a desire to live in contention with her own settler existence and re-remember ethical relation (pp. 98). Elsewhere, Kanien'kehá:ka scholar Kiera Brant-Birioukov and colleagues also consider (re)storying—as in Archibald's (2008) *storywork*—important, especially with teachers (see Brant-Birioukov et al., 2020). "Integral to *storywork* as an active pedagogy involves a conscious acceptance of one's role in a holistic process", which I understand as not only content-delivery, but a commitment to truth-telling (Archibald, 2008, p. 111). For Regan (2010) truth-telling in storywork includes taking responsibility for sharing Indigenous counter-stories of resistance, refusal and resilient resurgence to not only engage student teachers but also engender teacher identities as learning with and in support of Indigenous futurities (Madden, 2019). Importantly, these futurities and one's own ethical teacher identity imply actively exceeding the bounds and maintenance of a Canadian imaginary and colonial state; it must include, at least for me, an embodied advocacy against anti-Indigenous racism in and beyond the classroom (Lorenz, 2017; Scully, 2018).

Further, what is often missing from much truth-telling literature, including the TRC's calls to action, is our speaking, listening and being truthful in relation to land and other more-than-human relatives as a necessary condition of Reconciliation (Madden, 2019). As Donald (2021) reminds us, whether I am listening for hopes of self-determination, de/colonization or counter-storying, this must happen while engaging with a place on planet—or Mother—Earth. Donald (2021) maintains that "Indigenous-Canadian relations will not be repaired and renewed by an educational commitment to provide students with more information about Indigenous [P]eoples" or, I would add, settler scholars and educators simply generating more knowledge about ourselves as settlers (p. 61). As an educator and knowledge holder, Donald (2021) sees that his "most important contribution" to reconciling Indigenous-settler relations has been his walks with fellow educators, including non-Indigenous educators, on the land guiding them through stories and shared physical movement. He says of these fellow educators that they "walk themselves into kinship relationality" (Donald, 2021, p. 61). Donald's (2021) insights raise questions about how much conventional research, discourse and

teaching can contribute to the re-learning that needs to take place, and how accessible this re-learning process might be.

As a transeunt listener, I have attempted to move through teacher education discourse as an active participant. While I have taken many walks through the local meadows, in the nearby woods and along its many waterways while writing this paper and now consider these walks integral to my knowledge synthesis and individual knowledge claims, I have done so as a White settler who has, at least part of the time, been isolated from other people(s) by a pandemic—without kinship beyond what I have read, my own perceptions and my private encounters with the more-than-human. While teacher education programs have begun incorporating land-based pedagogies and to include community relationships and their contexts into learning syllabi, these practices are not consistently centered or supported across Canadian universities (Scully, 2018). While it seems fair to ask teacher candidates what it would mean for each and every one of them to have relational access to the land on which they live, it would be unjust to ask traditional knowledge holders to share their insights with every student. As I walk "in the body" through the local forests and "in the spirit" through Truth and Reconciliation discourse, I begin to understand that feeling kinship with other humans and beyond—including my/our *spiritual* relatives—requires "us to move from thinking that we are discrete beings separate from the natural world to being held in a web of relationships" (Markides, 2023, p. 2).[6] It requires me to move from being alone and dislocated to being deeply connected to and in relationship with all things and places, including the future teachers and students whom I cannot yet imagine (Markides, 2023; Airton, 2019). From this perspective, reading as a transeunt listener feels like what Métis scholar and educator Aubrey Hanson (2018) calls "relational encounters" with literature—and in my case, academic literature (p. 314). I feel a sense of spirit missing from my settler colonial curriculum, which I feel compelled to further kindle in my curriculum theorizing, teaching and life more broadly. My transeunce motivates a desire to "show up" for Reconciliation across all my own geographies, which "does not require an Indigenous initiator or necessitate additional labour on the part of Indigenous [P]eoples" (Madden et al., 2020, p. 68). Yet, relational re-learning also seems a necessary next move if we are to do more than enact additional futurities that simply unsettle (and so commodify and temporally fix this unsettling).

On September 30, 2021, I attended the first National Day of Truth and Reconciliation at Beechwood Cemetery, an event sponsored by Ottawa's Beechwood Cemetery, First Nations Child and Family Caring Society and Project of Heart. While walking, my own spirit called me to slow down

---

[6] In Indigenous and indeed ancient Christian wisdoms, "spirit" and "matter" are not opposite poles on the same spectrum. "Physical" does not mean "non-spiritual" while "spiritual" does not mean "non-material", however counterintuitive they have been re/presented in dogma or severed from pre-colonial wisdoms (R. W. Walker, personal communication, December 4, 2024; see also Walker, 2021). Thus, like Rose of the Carrier Nation, I am not pre- or post-religious; my spirit is inspirited with all my experiences of faith, including those of my ancestors and which I may re-learn from all my more-than-human kin around me (Howe, 2002). I welcome my reader to consider their own spirit as they read across my academic offerings in this essay.

and attend to how I make meaning of Reconciliation in transeunce and in transit across geography. Afterwards, I was privileged to view a screening of *Spirit Bear and Children Make History*, a stop-motion adaptation of *Spirit Bear: Echoes of the Past* (Blackstock, 2020). Whether in the film or the book, a reader/listener learns alongside the protagonist about the need for belonging, for shifting one's consciousness and for noticing how this shift creates new resonances in mind, body, place, heart and spirit. This was a glimpse of the relational resonance that teacher education and research must seek to re-learn.

Since that 2021 autumn day on and near the leading edge of the turtle's shell and through to the finalization of this essay in late 2024, I find myself however keenly aware that I am (such as I am and cannot be otherwise) taking and offering a great academic risk in calling for Western and Indigenous knowledges and Peoples to walk strong together, including a robust and multivalent discourse of spirit. I am also morbidly aware that—as we approach the 10th anniversary of the release of the TRC's Final Report—much has yet to be done to establish a so-called era of Truth and Reconciliation, now perhaps swallowed whole and unborn by a new, global trend of ostensible therapeutic benevolence in which the nation state is positioned as the healer of the relationship (Moon, 2009). There is still much denial of Truth and its teaching in Ottawa, based on the reports of my own teacher students. It is largely surface-level; meanwhile, it is now not uncommon that White and many equity-seeking communities and their children bully and assault queer and trans youth, of any background, in Ottawa schools with impunity. And more broadly, there is much sadness, doubt and turning away. Even the Yellowhead Institute has opted out of their commitment to monitoring the take up of and meaningful action in response of the TRC's Calls to Action. In spite of this and even because this, I urge, like Haig-Brown (2008) does, that the shared material world we find ourselves in today, with all its/our crises and terrible denials of relationships, calls on us collectively as a privileged species or global human nation—in the sense that there are, traditionally and if we are to take Indigenous ways of knowing-being-doing *seriously*—water, sky, plant and animal nations as well as other more-than-human nations and that we are beholden to them as kin. And so, by logical and faithful extension, our spirit worlds may be—or need to be—brought into kinship, necessary for finding kinship in the flesh. Such are the futurities my transeunce now welcomes me towards, at least privately.

I thus believe I would be remiss in my ethical relational responsibilities if I did not acknowledge at least a few truths, hopes and fears for readers to seek transeunt pilgrimage. During this essay's attenuated gestation in the editorial womb—and I will be attending to this metaphor, or more of a metonym, shortly—I have continued my transeunt reading across and beyond Truth and Reconciliation teacher education discourse to include its implications for human and more-than-human relational ethics and actions more broadly. I leave them at the end of this article as relational offerings for potential transeunt trajectories of not only unlearning but also re-learning.

In 2023, the Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies published a special issue which celebrated a bringing together of Francophone perspectives on addressing the TRC's findings. I posit that this special issue encapsulated the present limitations stemming from notions of

unsettling and unlearning as constrained by the futurities of curriculum studies and teacher education discourse—as a discourse of unsettling and unlearning without the obligation of re-learning. For example, Duquette et al. (2023) found in their review of how Quebec teacher training curricula are responding to the TRC that Indigenous cultural and historical perspectives are generally still materially and epistemologically sidelined. Teacher candidates receive the curricular message that teaching perspectives other than the dominant nationalistic narrative are optional, while any direct address of settler colonialism is still framed within a Eurocentric conception of history, nation-building and so-called progress. Melançon (2023) further suggested that minoritized Francophone communities are complicit in the settler colonial order of Canada, yet historically and culturally tend to focus only on Anglophone oppression of and competition between Francophone and Anglophone communities, effectively denying a sustained address of settler colonialism in Francophone contexts. Like Melançon (2023), Moisan et al. (2023) attribute this limitation to nationalistic and identity-grounding myth-narratives harboured and sometimes reinforced by Quebec Francophone educators that cast the history of early French settler-Indigenous relations as equal and united against a British colonial threat, and so the resulting and surviving Francophone settlements and cultures as enlightened and even themselves equal to claims of Indigeneity. In this way, I suggest, a settler colonial, Eurocentric identity becomes difficult to question—not just in the curricula examined by these authors, but by virtue of a focus on the settler identity as an essentialized and exclusive binary. Boelen (2023), however, offered her Francophone audience a way of intervening on settler identity construction through the address of spirit or spirituality in education. Boelen (2023) noted (or rather echoed from across decades of uncited scholarship[7]) that the TRC found that the need for spirituality in education was integral to Reconciliation. However, the topic remains taboo in many Eurocentric contexts of Canadian education despite the perennial suggestion in my reading that a deep awareness of our connection and interdependence with each other and the more-than-human world might meaningfully interrupt the settler colonial thinking that currently limits truth and redress.

Once again, some scholars have perhaps not yet learned to read as a transeunt listener. In his book chapter "The Wâhkôhtowin Imagination: Walking Pilgrimage as Resistance and Resurgence in Settler Colonial Spaces", non-Indigenous theologist Kenneth Wilson (2024) relates that his research over the past several years has attended the question of whether walking pilgrimages "can help non-Indigenous people begin to understand ourselves as related to each other and the world in which we live—in other words, whether those walking pilgrimages can generate a sense of wahkohtowin in us" (p. 52). Referencing Donald's (2021) article, Wilson (2024) makes the following statement out of which he cannot quite walk himself:

---

[7] I encourage submitting authors and readers of this journal and curricular subject to read as a transeunt listener across decades and even centuries of Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholarship and other cultural production, including in the contexts of relationship denial or re-building between first and newcomer.

> I find myself wondering, though, whether settlers can learn from ideas like wahkéhtowin. To be specific, I wonder whether walking pilgrimages can lead settlers to a recognition of the ways we are related to and dependent upon the land around us. That has been a difficult question to answer. The epistemological, ontological, and cosmological divides between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples make it hard for the latter—that is, for people like me—to fully understand concepts like wahkéhtowin, never mind put them into action. Most of the time, my explorations of this question end up concluding that settlers can get close to practicing wahkéhtowin, but that our deeply ingrained ideas about the world as subordinate to and separate from its human inhabitants make it difficult for us to fully engage with it. I also find myself wondering whether other peoples who have experienced the bite of settler colonialism—those who have been forced to resist its logic of elimination—might find themselves more attuned to something like wahkéhtowin, compared to the settlers who have invaded their territories. (p. 53)

Wilson (2024), like many scholars of curriculum in Canada and beyond and of course their teacher students, still embraces his perfect stranger positionality as if is the right and only way, space or place for him to be. Instead of walking himself into kinship relationality—as Donald (2021) clearly (in my projected transeunce) welcomes him to do or at least imagine as possible—Wilson (2024) abrogates his own ethical relational potential in favour of exploring vicariously the relational potential between Donald's (2021) work and a non-White scholar's textual commodity. In response, I suggest as a future direction of curriculum studies and teacher education research that careful consideration be given to how we are dividing human and more-than-human empathy in all contexts of our shared and interconnected existence.[8]

Perhaps more directly related to Truth and Reconciliation, I suggest that two more negotiable futurities might be possible. In their recent literature review of scholarly perspectives of Truth and Reconciliation in pre-service teacher education, Tupper and Omoregie (2024) attempt to "[circulate] ideas and [provide] insights into the re/conceptualizations and practices that hamper or open possibilities for achieving the educational goal of reconciliation" (p. 552). They offer a view that their "targeted review of the literature provides a significant contribution that challenges a dialectical evaluation of efforts to advance the goal of reconciliation" (Tupper & Omoregie, 2024, p. 552). They point once again to the "spirit" of land-based education but somehow, in my view, leave that word, "spirit", unspirited and without re/connection to the spirit of Treaty or its spirit of mutual aid beyond

[8] Even as I write this paragraph, many of my friends and curriculum studies colleagues are fervently unsettled by the results of the most recent US presidential election. I offer the dense and perhaps choking breadcrumb of thought that such a result was not due to right-wing rhetoric or anything that the president-elect did or did not do. My transeunt listening of this public discourse suggests that the root cause is what I am currently theorizing as a *division of empathy* between communities who should be allied. I leave my reader to consider their own potential complicity in hierarchizing one equity-seeking group or cause over another and the full consequences for relational ethics, especially as we look forward to a likely partisan shift in federal governance north of the border—a border we still maintain.

contract.[9] I do not mean to compare Tupper and Omoregie's (2024) approach to my own literature review here in this essay or diminish their efforts to reach a curriculum, history education and policy audience, but I suggest that a conventional treatment of the literature continues to invisibilize, however unintentionally, a great wealth of relational data. I use "wealth" and "data" strategically here, to relate the neoliberal and hypercapitalist language these (primarily history education and social studies education) authors choose to re/present the voices of Truth and Reconciliation teacher education discourse and the future hopes they offer. But I also suggest that we do the same in curriculum studies and our teaching—yoking, as Tupper and Omoregie (2024) do, our futurities to (what I read in transeunce) the increasingly spent hegemony of conventional relational frameworks like, for example, those of Tuck and Yang (2012) and Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández (2013). I mean this in the sense that these discursive places are, to my reading, inhospitable to kindred imagination. In fact, these places may decouple and leave to wither the material and imaginative capacity of our shared humanity (Phillips, 2025). This decoupling includes but is not limited to what some scholars, such as Garba and Sorentino (2020), suggest is the effective collapse of past and future relationships into an Indigenous-non-Indigenous binary, thus foreclosing enfranchisement of racialized non-White and diaspora communities—who endure through semiotic traditions and thrive through evolving cultural imaginaries despite no access to ancestral lands—from so-called decolonial futurities, whether they be settler or Indigenous.

Instead, I invite all readers to imagine, in their capacity as transeunt listeners, what it means to them and the author when they read that *we are all treaty people* as we move together across time, space, geography and theoretical topography toward whatever this place will become in future (Chambers, 2012). As Chambers and Blood (2009) write, "Whether we are [I]ndigenous or newcomer, today our tipis are held down by the same peg. Neither is going anywhere" (p. 274).

This said, Tupper and Omoregie (2024) do leave hanging fruit for our critical and spiritual sustenance, saying,

> Power is a significant category in *pre-and post*-colonial [*emphasis* added] politics; it was and is the enabler of subjectivation and racism. Power imbalance generates the excluded middle that provides the logic for fabricating racial binaries of superiority/inferiority, developed/under-developed, and the savage/civilized. Power sets the rules for who gets what, when, and how. (pp. 510-511)

As I traverse Tupper and Omoregie's (2024) reading of Cree/Saulteaux scholar Gina Starblanket and Wapsewsipi Cree scholar and poet Dallas Hunt (2020), I notice co-constituting pre/post-colonial politics engendering an *eliminatory logic/logic of elimination*. Readers familiar with the topic of this essay might recall and contemplate how Patrick Wolfe's (2006) famous phrasings have become "ubiquitous as countless scholars embrace the phrase 'the logic of elimination' and point to the fact of [settler colonial] invasion as 'a structure not an event' that invokes his work without even needing

[9] cf. Kovach, 2013; cf. Mills, 2017

to attach his name to this formulation", while very few scholars consider the assumptions being brought into their work through such deployment (O'Brien, 2017, p. 251). In direct contestation of such logics as taken for granted in our theorizing, Kanaka Maoli scholar J. Kēhaulani Kauanui (2016) argues that without purposefully engaging with "enduring indigeneity" as counterpoint to settler colonialism studies theory and its oft-shallow or acritical deployment by many scholars across many fields, one runs the risk of propagating "another form of elimination of the native" in which it remains status quo to "foreclose or bracket other formations . . . in ways that may sidestep how they are not only entangled, but also are co-constituted", ultimately producing "a binary of settler and native" (n.p.). Kauanui (2016) offers two senses of "enduring indigeneity" as counterpoints to a logic of elimination. The first is "that indigeneity itself is enduring—that the operative logic of settler colonialism may be to 'eliminate the native'. . . but that [I]ndigenous [P]eoples exist, resist, and persist" (Kauanui, 2016, n.p.). The second is "that settler colonialism is a structure that endures indigeneity, as it holds out against it" (Kauanui, 2016, n.p.). The generative, rather than eliminatory logic here, is then that "indigeneity is a category of analysis that is distinct from race, ethnicity, and nationality—even as it entails elements of all three of these" while being purposefully mindful that "indigeneity is a socially constructed category rather than one based on the notion of immutable biological characteristics" (Kauanui, 2016, n.p.). Re-learning from White Earth Band Ojibwe historian Jean Maria O'Brien (2017), and rejoining with Kauanaui (2016), we must seriously consider if Indigeneity as we implicate it as a null curriculum when discussing Indigenous-non-Indigenous futurities might yet sustain settler colonial "assimilatory campaigns of infinite imagination" in our theorizing and teaching (O'Brien, 2017, p. 249). In my view, such logics are always-already a human potential, as we form communities (with kin) and attempt (or not) to share the finite land and resources of/birthed by Mother Earth. As theorists and educators, I worry deeply that we are in fact holding static our thinking, our students and ourselves in liminal spaces and places of endless discomfort and evacuative unlearning. In reading, writing and teaching in this way we might be perpetuating what I would call an ethical void of infinitely *liminating futurity* in which future good relations between each other and the more-than-human world are forever left unborn or even unconceived.

I was warmed by the most recent works of Brant-Birioukov (2024), in which she asks us to trust that her and her ancestors' creation stories are true and not only worthy to be read as such by history education scholars, but worthy of being listening to and learned from by non-Indigenous scholars and students. She asks:

> What if I told you that the journey of Sky Woman is not a fable? What if I told you this journey is not a story of a woman who spontaneously emerged from parting clouds and befriended a turtle? What if I told you instead that this was a story of a woman spiralling into a downward depression of grief and bereavement? A story of a young woman who fell in love with a handsome lacrosse player she could not be with. A story of a young woman who, alone and pregnant, was forced into exile as she grappled with the terrifying darkness that is deep, bone-aching depression. A story of an expecting mother who understood the urgency to create a

> safe place to birth and raise new life in. If I told you this story was true—would you believe me? (Brant-Birioukov, 2024, pp. 112-113)

While not explicitly saying so, or using my words, I suspect Brant-Birioukov (2024) is asking me/us to be transeunt listeners as we engage with Indigenous knowledges.

In my ongoing commitment to transeunt listening, I traverse the recent writing of Markides (2024) as she offers the wisdom of Métis aunties as scholarship. As unconventional as this may be, she suggests that such scholarship is

> . . . a touch-stone or route marker for what is ahead and [and which may] not include a literature review or standard citations. Instead, the entirety of [this article] is the source of inspiration and the wellspring of scholarship that has in-formed these first passages. Why bend to academic conventions [or fear of cruelty]? Rebellious blood flows through these veins. (Markides, 2024, p. 1)

In the spirit of Markides (2024), who includes Two-Spirit folks as her kin and women colleagues, I invite all my kin to read my article not only as a different kind of scholarship, but as a different type of scholar—a transeunt listener. I conclude in an unconventional way with this thought of mine:

> And so, what if I whispered to you that I felt ready for a *Great Remembering*, across all the dreams of our ancestors? What if I offered to you that I had *re-learned* enough to meet you, some day before this incarnation of the world ends, as kin? What if shared with you that I want to have children of my own, and raise them in a good way and towards futurities that would best nourish them and their own kin in world(s) I cannot yet (or only) imagine? What if told you this is all true—would you believe me, or at least trust that I believe in myself and each other together?

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council for supporting the early research and writing development from which this work stems.

References

Airton, L. (2019). Welcoming what we cannot imagine. In W. S. Gershon (Ed.), *Sensuous curriculum: Politics and the senses in education* (pp. 47-64). Proquest.

Aitken, A., & Radford, L. (2018). Learning to teach for reconciliation in Canada: Potential, resistance and stumbling forward. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *75*, 40-48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.05.014

Aoki, T. T. (2004). *Curriculum in a new key: The collected works of Ted T. Aoki* (W. F. Pinar & R. L. Irwin, Eds.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410611390

Archibald, J. A. (2008). *Indigenous storywork: Educating the heart, mind, body, and spirit*. UBC Press.

Aristotle. (1925). Metaphysics. (W. D. Ross, Trans). The Internet Classics Archive. https://classics.mit.edu/Browse/browse-Aristotle.html (Original work published 350 B.C.E.)

Aquinas, S. T. (2014). *The summa theologica: Complete edition*. Catholic Way Publishing. (Originally written ca. 1265-1274)

Baudelaire, C. (1964). *The painter of modern life, and other essays* (J. Mayne, Trans. Ed.). Phaidon.

Benjamin, W. (1999). *The arcades project*. Harvard University Press.

Bissell, A., & Korteweg, L. (2016). Digital narratives as a means of shifting settler-teacher horizons toward reconciliation. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue Canadienne de l'éducation*, *39*(3), 1-25.

Blackstock, C. (2020). *Spirit bear: Echoes of the past* (M. McKibbin, SJ Okemow, R. Banda, & M. Browner, Illus.). First Nations Child & Family Caring Society of Canada.

Blackstock, C. (2009). The occasional evil of angels: Learning from the experiences of Aboriginal Peoples and social work. *First Peoples Child & Family Review*, *4*(1), 28-37.

Brant-Birioukov, K. (2024). Sky Woman and Haudenosaunee oral histories in Canadian curriculum. In M. H. Brunet, K. R. Llewellyn, & R. Fine-Meyer (Eds.), *Women, gender, and history education: perspectives from Ontario and Quebec* (pp. 109-129). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-69781-4

Brant-Birioukov, K., Ng-A-Fook, N., & Llewellyn, K. R. (2020). Re-storying setter teacher education: Truth, reconciliation, and oral history. In K. R. Llewellyn & N. Ng-A-Fook (Eds.), *Oral history, education, and justice: Possibilities and limitations for redress and reconciliation* (pp. 107-131). Routledge.

Boelen, V. (2023). Décoloniser la spiritualité: Une démarche à intégrer dans le processus de décolonisation de l'éducation. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.25071/1916-4467.40761

Britzman, D. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach* (2nd ed.). State University of New York Press.

Burm, S. (2016). More than a social justice project: The continued road towards truth and reconciliation. *First Peoples Child & Family Review, 11*(1), 49-53.

Cannon, D. M. J. (2013). Changing the subject in teacher education: Centering Indigenous, diasporic, and settler colonial relations. *Cultural and Pedagogical Inquiry*, *4*(2), 21-37. https://doi.org/10.18733/C3KS3D

Casemore, B. (2008). *The autobiographical demand of place: Curriculum inquiry in the American South*. Peter Lang.

Carson, T. R. (2007). *The time of learning: A dilemma for teacher education's response to diversity* [Paper presentation]. CATE Invitational Conference on Research in Teacher Education, Winnipeg, MB, Canada

Celidwen, Y., & Keltner, D. (2023). Kin relationality and ecological belonging: a cultural psychology of Indigenous transcendence. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.994508

Childs, R. A., & Ferguson, A. K. (2013). Who can be a teacher? How Ontario's initial teacher education programs consider race in admissions. In L. Thomas (Ed.), *What is Canadian about teacher*

education? Multiple perspectives on Canadian teacher education in the twenty-first century (pp. 173-186). Canadian Association for Teacher Educators/Association Canadienne des formateurs à l'enseignement.

Chambers, C. (1999). A topography for Canadian curriculum theory. *Canadian Journal of Education / Revue Canadienne de l'éducation*, 24(2), 137-150. https://doi.org/10.2307/1585924

Chambers, C. (2012). "We are all treaty people": The contemporary countenance of Canadian curriculum studies. In N. Ng-A-Fook & J. Rottmann (Eds.), *Reconsidering Canadian curriculum studies: Provoking historical, present, and future perspectives* (pp. 23-38). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137008978_2

Chambers, C. M., & Blood, N. J. (2009). Love thy neighbour: Repatriating precarious Blackfoot sites. *International Journal of Canadian Studies / Revue internationale d'études canadiennes*, 39/40, 253-279. https://doi.org/10.7202/040832ar

Cho, G., & DeCastro-Ambrosetti, D. (2005). Is ignorance bliss? Pre-service teachers' attitudes toward multicultural education. *The High School Journal*, *89*(2), 24-28. https://doi.org/10.1353/hsj.2005.0020.

Coleman, S. (2015). Pilgrimage. In J. D. Wright (Ed.), International encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences (2nd ed, pp. 146-148). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.84026-X

Deer, F. (2010). Teachers' and principals' perceptions of citizenship development of Aboriginal high school students in the province of Manitoba: An exploratory study. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, *110*, 1-33. https://journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/index.php/cjeap/issue/view/2872

Deer, F. (2013). Integrating Aboriginal perspectives in education: Perceptions of pre-service teachers. *Canadian Journal of Education / Revue Canadienne de l'éducation*, *36*(2), 175-211. https://journals.sfu.ca/cje/index.php/cje-rce/article/view/1283

den Heyer, K., & Abbott, L. (2011). Reverberating echoes: Challenging teacher candidates to tell and learn from entwined narrations of Canadian history. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *41*(5), 610-635. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2011.00567.x

den Heyer, K. (2018). Historical agency. In S. A. Metzger & L. M. Harris (Eds.), *The Wiley international handbook of history teaching and learning* (pp. 227-251). John Wiley & Sons. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119100812.ch9

den Heyer, K. (2009). Sticky points: Teacher educators re-examine their practice in light of a new Alberta social studies program and its inclusion of Aboriginal perspectives. *Teaching Education, 20*(4), 343-355. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210903254083

Dion, S. D. (2007). Disrupting molded images: Identities, responsibilities and relationships—teachers and indigenous subject material. *Teaching Education*, *18*(4), 329-342. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210701687625

Donald, D. (2011). Forts, colonial frontier logics, and Aboriginal-Canadian relations. In A. A. Abdi (Ed.), *Decolonizing philosophies of education* (pp. 91-111). Sense Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6091-687-8_7

Donald, D. (2016). From what does ethical relationality flow? An "Indian" act in three artifacts. *Counterpoints*, *478*, 10-16.

Donald, D. (2019). Homo economicus and forgetful curriculum. In H. Tomlins-Jahnke, S. Styres, S. Lilley, & D. Zinga (Eds.), *Indigenous education: New directions in theory and practice* (pp. 103-125). University of Alberta Press.

Donald, D. (2021). We need a new story: Walking and the wâhkôhtowin imagination. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, *18*(2), 53-63.

Duquette, C., Pageau, L., & Tremblay, M.-L. (2023). Les appels à l'action de la Commission de vérité et réconciliation du Canada dans la formation initiale à l'enseignement de l'histoire: Où en sommes-nous. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.25071/1916-4467.40757

Elliot, D. J. (Ed.). (2005). *Praxial music education: Reflections and dialogues*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Fahey, F. (2002). Pilgrims or tourists? *The Furrow*, *53*(4), 213-218.

Farley, L. (2010). "The reluctant pilgrim:" Questioning belief after historical loss. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, *8*(1), 6-40.

Forsythe, L., & Markides, J. (Eds.) (2024). *Around the kitchen table: Métis aunties' scholarship* (pp. 1-4). University of Manitoba Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781772840742

Garba, T., & Sorentino, S.-M. (2020). Slavery is a metaphor: A critical commentary on Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang's "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor." *Antipode*, *52*(3), 764-782. https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12615

Government of Canada. (2010). *Proceedings of the standing senate committee on Aboriginal Peoples*. Issue #10 (September). Ottawa: Senate of Canada.

Haig-Brown, C. (2008). Taking Indigenous thought seriously: A rant on globalization with some cautionary notes. *Journal of the Canadian Association of Curriculum Studies*, *6*(2), 8-24.

Hanson, A. J. (2018). Relational encounters with Indigenous literatures. *McGill Journal of Education*, *53*(2), 312-330.

Higgins, M., Madden, B., & Korteweg, L. (2015). Witnessing (halted) deconstruction: White teachers' 'perfect stranger' position within urban Indigenous education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *18*(2), 251-276. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2012.759932

Hogue, M. M. (2012). Interconnecting Aboriginal and Western paradigms in post-secondary science education: An action research approach. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, *10*(1), 77-114.

Howe, L. (2002). The story of America: A tribalography. In N. Shoemaker (Ed.), *Clearing a path: Theorizing the past in Native American studies* (pp. 29-48). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315023113

Janzen, M., & Cranston, J. (2016). The challenges of implementing a diversity admission policy. *University Affairs* .https://www.universityaffairs.ca/opinion/in-my-opinion/challengesimplementing-diversity-admissions-policy/

Jewett, L. (2011). Casting curricular circles, or the sorcerer, the phantom and the troubadour. *Complicity: An International Journal of Complexity and Education*, *8*(2), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.29173/cmplct11169

Johnson, E., & Recollet, K. (2020). Kin-dling and other radical relationalities. Artlink, *40*(2), 82-89.

Kauanui, J. K. (2016). A structure, not an event. *Lateral, 5*(1). https://doi.org/10.25158/L5.1.7

Korteweg, L., & Fiddler, T. (2018). Unlearning colonial identities while engaging in relationality: Settler teachers' education-as-reconciliation. *McGill Journal of Education*, *53*(2), 254-275. https://doi.org/10.7202/1058397ar

Kovach, M. (2013). Treaties, truths and transgressive pedagogies: Re-Imagining Indigenous presence in the classroom. *Socialist Studies: The Journal of the Society for Socialist Studies*, *9*(1), 109-127. https://doi.org/10.18740/S4KS36

Lindberg, T. (2015). On Indigenous academia. In D. E. Lund & P. R. Carr (Eds.), *Revisiting the great white north? Reframing whiteness, privilege, and identity in education* (2nd ed., pp. 71-87). Brill.

Lorenz, D. (2017). Reversing racism in the time of reconciliation? Settler colonialism, race, and Alberta teachers. *Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education/ Revue Canadienne Des Jeunes Chercheures et Chercheurs En Éducation*, *8*(1), 80-97.

MacDonald, J., & Markides, J. (2019). Duoethnography for reconciliation: Learning through conversations. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *65*(2), 94-109. https://doi.org/10.55016/ojs/ajer.v65i2.56407

Madden, B. (2019). A de/colonizing theory of truth and reconciliation education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *49*(3), 284-312. https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2019.1624478

Madden, B., Michaud, C. K., Edgar, T., & Jones, J. (2020). Wandering with/in the University of Alberta: Teaching subjects & place-based truth & reconciliation education. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *66*(1), 50-71.

Markides, J. (2023). Learning to walk relationally and live Métis. *Holistic Education Review*, *3*(1), 1-5.

Markides, J. (2024). The work of Métis women: An introduction. In L. Forsythe, & J. Markides (Eds.), *Around the kitchen table: Métis aunties' scholarship* (pp. 1-4). University of Manitoba Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781772840742

Martin, K. (2023). Kinship is not a metaphor. *Settler Colonial Studies*, *13*(2), 219-240.

Melançon, J. (2023). La position contradictoire des communautés francophones en situation minoritaire dans l'ordre colonial canadien. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum*

Studies, *20*(1), 126-146. https://doi.org/10.25071/1916-4467.40754

Mills, A. (Waabishki Ma'iingan). (2017). What is a Treaty? On contract and mutual aid. In J. Borrows & M. Coyle (Eds.), *The right relationship: Reimagining the implementation of historical treaties* (pp. 208-47). University of Toronto Press.

Moisan, S., Maltais-Landry, A., & Hirsch, S. (2023). Autochtoniser l'enseignement de l'histoire du Québec et du Canada au secondaire et à l'université: Entre volonté, obstacles épistémologiques et tensions identitaires. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.25071/1916-4467.40756

Moodie, N. (2019). Learning about knowledge: Threshold concepts for Indigenous studies in education. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, *46*(5), 735-749. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-019-00309-3

Moon, C. (2009). Healing past violence: Traumatic assumptions and therapeutic interventions in war and reconciliation. *Journal of Human Rights*, *8*(1), 71-91. https://doi.org/10.1080/14754830902717726

National Indian Brotherhood/Assembly of First Nations. (1972). *Indian control of Indian education*. Policy Paper Presented to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. https://www.oneca.com/IndianControlofIndianEducation.pdf

O'Brien, J. M. (2017). Tracing settler colonialism's eliminatory logic in "Traces of History." *American Quarterly, 69*(2), 249-255. http://www.jstor.org/stable/26360844

O'Sullivan, J. L. (1839). The great nation of futurity. *The United States Democratic Review*, *6*(23), 426-430

Osmond-Johnson, P., & Turner, P. (2020). Navigating the "ethical space" of truth and reconciliation: Non-Indigenous school principals in Saskatchewan. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *50*(1), 54-77. https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2020.1715205

Palka, J. W. (2014). *Maya pilgrimage to ritual landscapes: insights from archaeology, history, and ethnography*. UNM Press.

Phelan, A. M. (2015). *Curriculum theorizing and teacher education*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203387078

Phillips, P. (2020). Entities of land and water: Teaching against a terrible fate. *FooknConversation*. Available at: https://www.fooknconversation.com/entities-of-land-and-water/

Phillips, P. (2021). Critical Black futurism: Affecting affinities within curriculum studies. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*,*14*(2), 1-21.

Phillips, P. (2025). *The division of empathy: How curricular practices of unsettling foreclose on democratic futurities*. [Manuscript submitted for publication].

Phillips, P. & Ng-A-Fook, N. (in press). *Rewiring for artificial intelligence: Education, contemporary issues, and futurities*. Information Age Publishing

Pidgeon, M., Muñoz, M., Kirkness, V. J., & Archibald, J. (2013). Indian control of Indian education: Reflections and envisioning the next 40 years. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, *36*(1), 5-35.

Redbird, D. (2019) Duke redbird on the future of cybernetics and Indigenous communities 1960s. *Vimeo*. https://vimeo.com/330049451

Regan, P. (2010). *Unsettling the settler within: Indian residential schools, truth telling, and reconciliation in Canada*. UBC Press.

Russell, L. M. (1979). *The future of partnership*. Westminster John Knox Press.

Schaefli, L. M., Godlewska, A. M. C., & Rose, J. (2018). Coming to know Indigeneity: Epistemologies of ignorance in the 2003-2015 Ontario Canadian and world studies curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *48*(4), 475-498. https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2018.1518113

Scott, D., & Gani, R. (2018). Examining social studies teachers' resistances towards teaching Aboriginal perspectives: The case of Alberta. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, *12*(4), 167-181. https://doi.org/10.1080/15595692.2018.1497969

Scully, A. J. (2018). *Whiteness and land in Indigenous education in Canadian teacher education* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Lakehead University. https://knowledgecommons.lakeheadu.ca/handle/2453/4311

Seixas, P. (2004). Theorizing historical consciousness. University of Toronto Press.

Seixas, P. (2000). Schweigen! Die Kinder! Or, does postmodern history have a place in the schools? In P. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history: National and international perspectives* (pp. 19-37). New York University Press.

Smith, D. G. (1999). The hermeneutic imagination and the pedagogic text. *Counterpoints*, *15*, 27-44.

Stanley, T. (1998). The struggle for history: Historical narratives and anti-racist pedagogy. *Discourse : Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *19*(1), 41-49.

Starblanket, G., & Hunt, D. (2020). *Storying violence: Unravelling colonial narratives in the Stanley trial*. ARP Books.

Stein, S. (2020). 'Truth before reconciliation': The difficulties of transforming higher education in settler colonial contexts. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *39*(1), 156-170. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1666255

Styres, S., Zinga, D., Bennett, S., & Bomberry, M. (2010). Walking in two worlds: Engaging the space between indigenous community and academia. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *33*(3), 617-649.

Tuck, E., & Gaztambide-Fernández, R. A. (2013). Curriculum, replacement, and settler futurity. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, *29*(1), 72-89.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *1*(1), 1-40.

Tupper, J. A. (2014). The possibilities for reconciliation through difficult dialogues: Treaty education as peacebuilding. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *44*(4), 469-488. https://doi.org/10.1111/curi.12060

Tupper, J. A. (2015). Curricular spaces of renewal: Toward reconciliation. In H. Smits & R. Navqi (Eds.), *Framing peace: Thinking about and enacting curriculum as "radical hope"* (pp. 97-109). Peter Lang.

Tupper, J. A. (2020). Cracks in the foundation: (Re)storying settler colonialism. In K. R. Llewellyn & N. Ng-A-Fook (Eds.), *Oral history, education, and justice: Possibilities and limitations for redress and reconciliation* (pp. 88-104). Routledge.

Tupper, J. A., & Omoregie, A. E. (2024). Challenges and possibilities for truth and reconciliation in teacher education: An engagement with the literature. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *47*(2), 492-521. https://journals.sfu.ca/cje/index.php/cje-rce/article/view/6307/3701

Tynan, L. (2020). Thesis as kin: Living relationality with research. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, *16*(3), 163-170. https://doi.org/10.1177/1177180120948270

Tynan, L. (2021). What is relationality? Indigenous knowledges, practices and responsibilities with kin. *Cultural Geographies*, *28*(4), 597-610. https://doi.org/10.1177/14744740211029287

Walker, R. W. (2021). *O beautiful dust: Walking the wilderness toward common praye*r. Elm Street Books.

Wanzo, R. (2020). Futurity. In B. Burgett & G. Hendler (Ed.), *Keywords for American Cultural Studies, Third Edition* (pp. 119-122). New York University Press. https://doi.org/10.18574/nyu/9781479867455.003.0034

White, K., Budai, J., Mathew, D., Deighan, M. R., & Gill, H. (2012). Educators' perspectives about a public school district's Aboriginal education enhancement agreement in British Columbia. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, *35*(1), 42-60.

Wiseman, D. (2018). Finding a place at home: The TRC as a means of (r)evolution in pre-service (science) teacher education. *McGill Journal of Education*, *53*(2), 331-349. https://doi.org/10.7202/1058401ar

Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research, 8*(4), 387-409.

Younging, G. (2018). *Elements of Indigenous style: A guide for writing by and about Indigenous Peoples*. Brush Education.

Endnote

Between the initial inception of this paper in mid-2021 and its updating in late 2024, this concept has transited my thinking and theorizing. It now includes my hopes and fears for the future of our planet and kin within and goes beyond the contexts of Truth and Reconciliation teacher education. As of the time of writing this sentence, Google's

nascent AI web search summary cannot provide any kind of summary or definition of transeunce. ChatGPT claims that transeunce possibly stems from medieval Latin scholasticism's *transeunt* or *transire*, which mean a passing through, and describe causation that extends beyond the agent's subjectivity. This might be distinguished from purely immanent processes, which remain contained within the agent itself. The same gestating AI entity suggests the possible Spanish/Portuguese cognate *transeúnte*, meaning "passerby" or describing someone who is temporarily in a location without establishing permanence. Returning to its metaphysical incarnation, Thomas Aquinas (2014) in *Summa Theologica* (1274; first mechanically printed 1464) draws attention to a motile causality of transience and transeunce. Aquinas (2014) suggests that God's actions are both immanent (existing within) and transeunt (having effects outside Himself) as part of the process of creation. For example, according to Aquinas (2014), God's act of sustaining the universe has transeunt effects in the existence and movement of entities, broadly construed. While I lack the space to follow the progressive movements across Western printed thought, it bears noting that Aristotle's (ca. 350 B.C.E./1925) thinking in his *Metaphysics* (containing his "First Wisdom") oscillates between potentiality and actuality or the process of moving from potential to actual as often requiring transeunt causality (my own transeunt reading). And we could follow time's arrow to many modern thinkers on affecting and effecting movement such as Baudelaire (circa. 1859-60; see Baudelaire, 1964) and Benjamin (circa. 1922-44; see Benjamin, 1999) for more literary, arts-based and academic, curriculum studies-adjacent apertures into transeunce.

Some readers may notice that I have not cited the adjacent literature on oral histories and its paradigmatic understanding of listening and/as witnessing. However, this omission is intentional. I find that such literature rejects the written word as a lesser relational medium in favour of the ostensibly more authentic oral accounting and its closer proximity to relational meaning-making. In the contexts of fraught histories and conceptions of history (and one's present/future agency or responsibility in witnessing such history), *vis a vis* my conception of transeunt listening, this literature nevertheless reinscribes a mastery of what listening and witnessing means *in text*. Simultaneously, this fixing implies that the reader is *a priori* unable to understand listening and witnessing in the very medium it is codified, while implicitly encouraging, as an expert source, citing this text as what listening and witnessing can or should mean. Instead, here I attribute Jennifer Markides (personal communication, December 18, 2024) and her methodological work behind the introduction to her recent edited collection as inspiration for verbalizing what I mean by listening (Forsythe & Markides, 2024). To navigate the settler colonial, heteropatriarchal expectations of academic publication culture while still introducing her collection's authors in ways that truly honoured their intentions, Markides *listened* to herself reading each chapter. She also listened to her own editorial reading notes and the words of contributing authors shared in conversation. Such a listening meant attending to the hopes and fears she could hear in the authors' words, but also Markides's own affective *a posteriori* encounters with the words of the authors, however difficult to encounter and dwell in. For Markides, much like my transeunt listening, this was a careful movement through the words of others as places of subjective transformation that affected ethical, real change in how authors' ideas were then—as more-than an ossification of voice—re/presented in text and so could be heard by those prepared to listen as they read.