

Patricia A. Monture-Angus

Shortly after I took over the position of editor of the *Native Studies Review*, I began to consider exactly what my vision of this periodical was. I understood the position of editor to be a position that required this "vision questing." It turned out to be both a difficult and uncomfortable process. I also knew that simply turning out volumes of a journal was insufficient to satisfy me on a personal level. The problem with my "vision questing" is simple: I have never fully made up my mind on the discipline of Native Studies and what it is. It is difficult to craft or catch a vision for a Native Studies journal without this definition in place.

I can reassure myself that Native Studies is a new discipline – about twenty years old in Canada. However, that's not really the problem. I am quite clear that Native Studies is about relationships. The study of these relationships (note, not disciplines) might be historical or they may be contemporary. The might be social, spiritual, economic or legal. Absolutely, the relationships involve people – Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people. I do not like that much – the non-"whatever" people. I will, therefore, now revert to using the term "White," even though I recognize that it may offend some and clearly oversimplifies.

As Native Studies is about relationships, and not disciplines, it is not the degrees that qualify one as an outstanding scholar of Native Studies. The degrees, perhaps, in and of themselves, do not hinder the creation of superior scholarship, but they certainly do not guarantee it. Native Studies, to my mind, often fails to meet the challenge embedded in its own invention: to do, see and be in a university differently. For me, Native Studies is clearly about voice. It is one avenue in a university where the excluded voices of Aboriginal people ought to be heard as well as encouraged.

I did not realize when I sat in the editor's chair the dilemmas I would face, since I did not recognize the degree to which conventional publishing practices and ethics fail to consider the issues in Native Studies. Some of these questions look like:

- Have proper protocols been followed in securing and then sharing traditional knowledge, including the wisdom of the Elders? How do I quickly learn the proper protocols for how many different nations?
- How do I, as a non-Métis, encourage Métis scholarship? Do I have the right or the obligation to do so?

- Are north/south, community/urban profiles being adequately represented? Should they be in every volume?
- What is the balance between conventional university scholarship and Indigenous knowledge in each volume?
- How much inclusion of Aboriginal scholarship (that is, work by Aboriginal authors) legitimates this journal (or volume), in my opinion? In others' opinions?
- What about gender representations? It is interesting to note that there are four associate editors for the *Native Studies Review*; all are men; of the four men, three are White.
- Is the *Review* a venue for new and/or "different" scholarship, scholarship that would most likely be turned away by other academic journals publishing law, history, archaeology, sociology or anthropology? And why do I leave science off that list?

As a young woman, I was taught by Mohawk, Cree and Ojibwe teachers to know my history. That is again where I turned in my confusion this time, looking for answers to the questions that perplexed me. What I learned troubled me. There had never been an Aboriginal senior editor or woman senior editor of this journal before. After my initial reaction, I just got a sick feeling because I knew that I was already out on a limb – out on a limb before I had said or done a thing.

This left me with a choice. Should I pursue the "power" of the editorship and do things "my way" as every senior editor who has gone before has done, most likely with impunity. Should I caucus the group of editors and begin the struggle to "Aboriginalize" the journal in the consensus fashion? Of course I recognized that the "consensus" route was fraught with difficulty. I was one in a process of five and could easily be overruled, overturned and turned inside out. Since this has happened more than once to me in the past in department meetings, I choose the "stick-my-neck-out-yet-again" approach.

In closing, I would like to provide a few words of thanks to our loyal readers who have patiently waited for this volume. I do not expect further delays and look forward to finalizing the next volume, "Women and Decolonization."