

As it stands, university administrators “measure” Indigeneity based primarily on . In two instances they often ask for further information – reserved seats and awards (i.e., scholarships and bursaries) – but generally, self-identification is the major dynamic of identity making in the academy, as in society more generally.

It might be useful to encourage administrators to think about the issue of Indigenous identification in terms of two dynamics and two “moves” (based on this preponderance of self-identification):

1. non-Indigenous administrators not wanting to be racist (or be accused of being racist) for challenging someone’s claim to Indigeneity;

2. a looming ‘white possessiveness’ (Moreton-Robinson 2016) that encourages non-Indigenous/white people with various distances of Indigenous ancestry to make claims to Indigeneity despite their lack of lived experience or ongoing connection to an Indigenous collective or collectives.

1. moving from genealogy to kinship;

- Métis historian Brenda Macdougall (2013) differentiates between genealogical and kinship focused studies in terms of the former’s focus on establishing links between people living today and ancestors who have passed, while kinship studies were meant to gain insight into Indigenous worldviews through an examination of their family (and other) relationships. While genealogy requires no ongoing relationships, kinship does. As such, it is important for us to think about identity claims in terms of kinship dynamics.

2. moving from self-identification to citizenship;

- Self-identification is a hallmark of genealogical logics – it operates as a form of “inert” kinship, since it requires no ongoing relationships with living collectives but rather, needs only the urge to self-identify (a primary marker of white possessiveness). Citizenship,