Qualitative Inquiry

Unbecoming Claims: Pedagogies of Refusal in Qualitative Research
Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang

The online version of this article can be found at:

Additional services and information for *Qualitative Inquiry* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://qix.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://qix.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations: http://qix.sagepub.com/content/20/6/811.refs.html

>> Version of Record - Jun 2, 2014

OnlineFirst Version of Record - May 16, 2014

What is This?

Unbecoming Claims: Pedagogies of Refusal in Qualitative Research

Eve Tuck[1] and K. Wayne Yang[2]

Abstract

This article discusses the role of refusal in the analysis and communication of qualitative data, that is, the role of refusal in the work of making claims. Refusal is not just a no, but a generative stance, situated in a critical understanding of settler colonialism and its regimes of representation. Refusals are needed to counter narratives and images arising (becoming-claims) in social science research that diminish personhood or sovereignty, or rehumiliate when circulated. Refusal, in this article, refers to a stance or an approach to analyzing data within a matrix of commitments, histories, allegiances, and resonances that inform what can be known within settler colonial research frames, and what must be kept out of reach.

Keywords

settler colonialism, refusal, coding, making claims, knowledge territories

The fundamental thesis of the anthropologist is that people are objects for observation, people are then considered objects for experimentation, for manipulation, and for eventual extinction. The anthropologist thus furnishes the justification for treating Indian people like so many chessmen available for anyone to play with.

—Vine Deloria (1988), *Custer Died for Your Sins*

To act on the desire to be the opposite, the desire not to collaborate, is to object.

—Fred Moten (2003), "Resistance of the Object" in *In the Break* (p. 239)

Speak to any computer programmer, and she will tell you that coding is an art form, a glimpse into the systematizing of relationships that form the deep structure for the world that programmer is creating—code is the language that gives expression to what is felt by the programmer. Yet we observe a tendency in social science to reduce coding to a mechanical process (St. Pierre & Pillow, 2000)—an increasingly quantitative, increasingly positivist approach that masks the power relationships about who comes to know whom in the creation of knowledge. More importantly, coding, in the guise of objective science, expands the project of settler colonial knowledge production— inquiry as invasion is built into the normalized operations of the researcher. Coding, once it begins, has already surrendered to a theory of knowledge. We ask, what is the code that lies beneath the code?

In this article, we theorize refusal to settler colonialism— the code beneath the code. This article begins with a recognition that some communities—particularly Indigenous, ghettoized, and Orientalized communities—are over-coded, that is, simultaneously hyper-surveilled and invisibilized/ made invisible by the state, by police, and by social science research (Tuck & Yang, 2014; see also Kelley, 1997; Said, 1978; Smith, 1999). In these communities, research can be a dirty word (Smith, 1999) and though people have been over-studied, the promised benefits of participating in social science research have been slow to accumulate (Tuck, 2009). Our emphasis here is how we have taught refusal to ourselves and to our students.

This article unfolds in two sections. We start with a discussion of refusal as an analytic practice that addresses forms of inquiry as invasion. And because we cannot, will not, share certain accounts, we sometimes trace the perimeter of the refusal; other times, we use examples from art and literature to illustrate what we mean. We share some examples that we have used in our teaching to inform a critical response to the proliferation of damage-centered studies, rescue research, and pain tourism. The second section details

[1]State University of New York at New Paltz, USA
[2]University of California–San Diego, La Jolla, USA

Corresponding Author:
K. Wayne Yang, University of California–San Diego, Social Sciences Bldg. Room 222, 9500 Gilman Dr, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA.
Email: kwayne@ucsd.edu

the practices and performativities of refusal, from our own work and works by other qualitative researchers.

Refusal as Analytic Practice

The regulatory ethical frames that now dominate the conversation about ethics in academe are only a recent provision, and they cannot do enough to ensure that social science research is deeply ethical, meaningful, or useful for the individual or community being researched (Tuck & Guishard, 2013). The stories that are considered most compelling, considered most authentic in social science research are stories of pain and humiliation. Reporting on that pain with detailed qualitative data and in people's "real voices" is supposed to yield needed material or political resources; this is the prominent but unreliable theory of change in the academy. However, settler colonialism, other colonial configurations, White supremacy, heteropatriarchy, and the pursuit of wealth by some at the expense of others have indeed caused pain in the lives of real people, which deserves scrutiny and exposure.

As we discuss in this article, analytic practices of refusal provide ways to negotiate how we as social science researchers can learn from experiences of dispossessed peoples—often painful, but also wise, full of desire and dissent—without serving up pain stories on a silver platter for the settler colonial academy, which hungers so ravenously for them. Analytic practices of refusal involve an active resistance to trading in pain and humiliation, and supply a rationale for blocking the settler colonial gaze that wants those stories. Refusal can comprise a resistance to making someone or something the subject of research; it is a form of objectless analysis, an analytic practice with nothing and no one to code. Analytic practices of refusal can help researchers and the people who prepare researchers to avoid building our/their careers upon the pain of others. As we describe in this article, refusal is a generative stance, not just a "no," but a starting place for other qualitative analyses and interpretations of data. Refusing the colonizing code of research is an analysis that must come after, before, and beyond coding. It must precede, exceed, and intercede upon settler colonial knowledge production.

Settler Colonialism as the Code Beneath the Code: Inquiry as Invasion

Code is a word rarely interrogated in qualitative research outside of a few technical definitions. A code is a cipher, a system of signifiers that make words meaningful. To codify is to manage, to arrange in an order that is meaningful to the coder. Coding is something we do to objects. Codes stand in for objectified living things. Codes become objects themselves, to be treated objectively, in the way that the living things would not allow. Codes are not meant to object. After

coding, the important decisions have already been made. Observations, when encoded, are governed by the concealed language of the code—what is meaningful derives from the code, not from what is observed. To refuse the colonizing code requires deconstructing power, not objective cataloging of observations. Indeed, "objectivity" is code for power. From a legal standpoint, code refers to rules and laws that comprise settler sovereignty—for example, the Black codes that restricted the movement, education, and personhood of Black people in the North and the South under slavery and then under Jim Crow. Settler codes express the putative right of the settler to know and thus to govern all the people, land, flora, fauna, customs, cultures, sexualities in his seized territory. To refuse settler sovereignty is to refuse the settler's unquestioned right to know, and to resist the agenda to expand the knowledge territory of the settler colonial nation.

Despite the almost ritualistic importance given to coding in the training of novice researchers, rarely examined is the code beneath the code. Who gets to know? Who gets known? Where is knowledge kept, and kept legitimated? What knowledge is desirable? Who profits? Who loses/pays/gives something away? Who is coerced, empowered, appointed to give away knowledge? These are the analytic questions that drive beyond coding. In a sense, these are not open-ended questions, but ones that have already been answered for us. The academic codes that govern research, human subject protocols, and publishing already territorialize knowledge as property and researchers as claimstakers. Academic codes decide what stories are civilized (intellectual property) and what stories are natural, wild, and thus claimable under the doctrine of discovery. Human subject protocols establish that individuals must be protected, but not communities. Individuals are empowered to give away the community's stories. Individuals may be compensated, but only lightly, with a small fee, a gift certificate to a university bookstore, a thank you note, a free meal, a string of beads.

Settler colonial studies seek to understand the particular features of settler colonialism, and how its shapes and contours of domination (like that in the United States, the context from which we write but also Canada, New Zealand, Israel, Chinese Tibet, and Australia) differ from other forms of coloniality. Invasion is a structure, not (just) an event in time (Wolfe, 1999). In settler colonial contexts, land is the ultimate pursuit: Settlers arrive in a new (to them) place and claim it as theirs. They destroy and then later erase (via assimilation or cultural strangling) Indigenous peoples, and use weapons and policy to extinguish their/our claims to land. Settlement requires the labor of chattel slaves and guest workers, who must be kept landless and estranged from their homelands. The settlers locate themselves at the top and at the center of all typologies—as simultaneously most superior and most normal. Because land is the

ultimate pursuit, settler colonialism involves a daedal arrangement of justifications and unhistories to deny genocide and brutality. Settler colonialism must cover its tracks, and does so by making its structuring natural, inevitable, invisible, and immutable (Tuck & Yang, 2012; Veracini, 2011).

Inquiry as invasion is a result of the imperative to produce settler colonial knowledge and to produce it for the academy. This invasion imperative is often disguised in universalist terms of producing "objective knowledge" for "the public." It is a thin disguise, as most research rhetoric waxes the poetics of empire: to discover, to chart new terrain, to seek new frontiers, to explore, and so on. The academy's unrelenting need to produce "original research" is what makes the inquiry an invading structure, not an event. Social science hunts for new objects of study, and its favored reaping grounds are Native, urban, poor, and Othered communities.

In related writing, we presented three axioms of social science research that ground our analysis of the need for refusal to inquiry as invasion. The axioms are as follows:

(I) The subaltern can speak, but is only invited to speak her/our pain. Drawing from bell hooks' (1990) observation that the academy fetishizes stories of the violated, we note that what passes for subaltern "voice" in research is a commodified pain narrative: "No need to hear your voice. Only tell me about your pain. I want to know your story." (p. 343)

(II) There are some forms of knowledge that the academy doesn't deserve. This axiom is the crux of refusal. The university is not universal; rather, it is a colonial collector of knowledge as another form of territory. There are stories and experiences that already have their own place, and placing them in the academy is removal, not respect.

(III) Research may not be the intervention that is needed. This axiom challenges the latent theory of change that research—more academic knowing—will somehow innately contribute to the improvement of tribes, communities, youth, schools, etc.

All three axioms gesture toward what lives beyond the paradigm of research—voice, knowledge, interventions—and ought to be kept out of reach. As researchers, when we overhear, uncover, are entrusted with narratives that we know will sell, do we stop the sale?

How to See Refusal (and How to Not Get Disappointed About Refusal)

Teaching the analytic practice of refusal is unsettling both because students may first consider refusal to be undesirable, as failure, and also because it can feel like explaining refusal requires exposing that which ought not to be exposed. In our classrooms, we turn toward images and narratives in art and literature that already resist becoming data, that resist domestication into settler stories.

For example, the film *Old Dog* (Tseden, 2011) revolves around solicitations for the sale of an old Tibetan mastiff and an old Tibetan man's refusals to sell.

Dog trader: Will you sell me your dog?
Akhu [herder]: Not selling. Not selling.
. . .
Dog trader: If you don't sell him to me, someone might steal him.

The film's premise is loosely based on contemporary events, that is, "a feverish appetite among China's nouveau riche for the mastiffs owned by Tibetan nomads, such that recently a mastiff named Hong Dong sold in China for $1.5 million" (Shakya, 2011). Pema Tseden, hailed as "the first Tibetan filmmaker," has remained strategically silent on the potential allegories embodied by his film, a strategy that some have speculated aided the film in passing through increased scrutiny by Chinese censorship committees (Lim, 2009). However, it takes little inference for students to see the critiques of Chinese settler colonialism in Tibet. "Sell it before someone steals it" is an ironic truism for Indigenous people in settler nations where land, rituals, and even Native identity are actively stolen and commodified. In this way, students begin to see refusal as resistance to plunder. Refusal also disputes the theories of change that tacitly endorse settler modernity. "Their life is much better in the mainland," the dog trader offers as sympathetic rationale, to which the elderly nomad replies, "Who's to know?"

By engaging performative examples of refusal, such as *Old Dog* and other texts we discuss later in this piece, our discussions about research disrupt the assumed inevitability of settler expansion, and the presumption of benefit that settler modernity may offer to Indigenous and urban and poor communities which fuel many qualitative research projects in these communities. In research methods courses across the North American continent, the message the students otherwise receive is to study something, anything, to learn how to do research. But some objects of study are sexier, that is, more fetishized, thirsted after, and surer to garner an A or yield a publication. *If you are going to do research, you had better find something that is worth saying, and pain and humiliation are worth saying.*

Indigenous and Native researchers, researchers of color, and/or queer researchers in academe are frequently pressured to mine their families, communities, and personal stories to become recast as academic data. The archive on pain just grows and grows. Novice researchers are explicitly and tacitly encouraged to go for low-hanging fruit, interview your neighbors, your grandmother—but not everyone's grandmother promises to be interesting. Bring in personal artifacts, family heirlooms/stories, private moments, and

hawk them. Ironically, these same novice researchers may be caught in a choice between studying their own communities or waiting for someone else to do so, themselves even becoming informants in someone's study; to sell it before someone steals it, as in the dog trader's words.

Alongside the connotations we have already invoked, "code" can also refer to a set of ethical commitments, such as a code of medical ethics. Refusal is a code concerned with *not selling*. It is the code of the object—the code of the dog itself, the being that is made a "thing" by those who assume the right to sell, buy, and own. In discussing the objectness of Black persons, Moten (2003) opens his book with the truism, "The history of blackness is testament to the fact that objects can and do resist" (p. 1). Such a perspective does not try to reform the academy, to rescue research from itself (and for itself), nor to see things "both ways." The refusal stance is an attribute of objecting objects, and it is a choice, a code of ethics, a stance to be assumed, for refusing researchers. Refusal is a stance in that it is resolute. It is the posture of an object that will not be removed nor possessed.

Practicing Refusal: Studying to Object

> [According to Tibetan tradition,] it is taboo to use dogs as a commodity or to allow them to be bought and sold.
>
> —Tsering Shakya (2011)

> One does not sell the land people walk on.
>
> —Crazy Horse (September 23, 1875)

When we learn something from our data that may make a contribution to the field, we call that something a claim. To claim something is to mark it as new, and as newly mine. Claim (n.d.) has meant to call, to name, to describe (c. 1300), and later, "a piece of land allotted and taken" (c. 1400). Claiming is an act of possessing, of making property, of enclosure. Colonizers traveled on boats and horses to claim new lands for old crowns. Researchers make claims for a living. Claiming is public, is personal.

The work of data analysis is the alchemy of becoming-claims. We use this turn of phrase, "becoming-claims," to signal, of course, Deleuze's conceptualizations of becoming but also the production and aesthetics (the comeliness) of claims within settler colonialism—the critiques of which provide the grounds to *refuse Deleuze* (see Tuck, 2010). What others call the "raw data"—the things we heard on purpose or accidentally, the documents we glimpsed while flipping toward something else, the scent of a story that eked out the cracks of an encounter, our notes, our neatly transcribed interviews, now little radio-play scripts—all of this mingles and mashes together, yearning to become-claims. Becoming-claims are all of those things that might be revealed as our findings, make us famous, put our children through college, allow us to retire and be remembered where we're dead—might change the world for the better. Many of those becoming-claims come out of the lived lives of real people we have met along the way: their stories, their worries and desires, their sense of the way the world works. This last part is too easy to disregard or forget.

Thus, refusal is not a code word for critical research, socially engaged, or culturally sensitive research. It is not the reflexive caveat, the hand-wringing, the flash of positional confession before proceeding as usual. Furthermore, the turn toward humanizing the object into a subject—often through the inclusion of people of color, women, youth, and Native researchers—is important work, but not the same as refusal. The goal of refusal is not for objects to become subjects in the academy, but contrarily, to *object to* the very processes of objectification/subjection, the making of possessors and possessions, the alchemy of becoming-claims. When we teach courses in qualitative methods or workshops in participatory action research, we think of teaching refusal not as teaching novice researchers to seek an appropriate, non-problematic object of study, but as an ethic of studying to object. Rather than chasing aims of objectivity, we encourage researchers to take up a stance of objection, one that will interrogate power and privilege, and trace the legacies and enactments of settler colonialism in everyday life.

How to Read Refusal

The pursuit of objectivity, always defined by those in power to protect their power, occludes the intuition of the observer—the sixth sense that could be his or her ethical radar and moral compass. In teaching and learning refusal, we often turn toward art to give language to the intuitive. Using art to think/feel through theory—to decode power and uncode communities—trains our intuition. Refusal is not just a no, it is a performance of that no, and thus an artistic form.

Ken Gonzales-Day's (n.d.) *Erased Lynchings* series—whereby he intervenes on the photographs taken, sold, and circulated of lynched victims by erasing the body of the tortured, murdered, and often mutilated man—redirects our gaze to the assembled onlookers/participants in the murder, to the space of the crime, and to the hidden gaze of the photographer and the viewer (ourselves). Gonzales-Day's erasures are refusals. We are not permitted count the wounds on the murdered man, study his face, guess his age, wonder about what he did to "deserve" his violation, or measure the length of the rope. Instead, we observe the Sunday attire of the onlookers, their eyes as they meet the camera, the heroic/dignified poses they perform. We wonder how the photograph was staged, where it was sold, who looked at it. It poses a number of different observational problems (see also Tuck & Yang, 2014).

In Wayne's research classes, he asks novice researchers to present photographs of their intended research space, and to intervene on them through techniques such as erasing the foregrounded object, to see what is unobserved and call attention to what is preferred observation. Student researchers use these exercises throughout all stages of their research—from before they ever formulate a research question or choose a research site, to the communication of their research findings. Throughout the course, students conduct multiple exercises in photography, prose, and poetry to reflect and redirect their observations and interpretations. These exercises address a series of questions: How is (y)our research gaze damage-centered? How is space racialized? How is race spatialized? How is space sexualized? gendered? How is space haunted? What is a desire-centered (re)searching gaze? Their final research conference is accompanied by a juried art exhibition. At the 2010 conference, the exhibition *(W)hauntings* included galleries, film screenings, and performance art that engaged the want of power, the hauntings that elude and trouble the gaze, and the desires of the researcher.

While conducting these art-theory exercises, student researchers often come back to class saying that their research questions, their observations, their choice of object "feels wrong." That wrong feeling is right, leading most researchers to create and practice forms of refusal in their work: refusing to share sensational interview data, refusing to search for the subjectivity of the Other, refusing the god-gaze of the objective knower, refusing to draw conclusions about communities—choosing to write instead about power in the form of institutions, policy, and research itself.

One foundational text that has been especially compelling in our work with students has been Zora Neale Hurston's (1928) *How It Feels to Be Colored Me*. "I do not weep at the world," Hurston tells us, "I am too busy sharpening my oyster knife" (p. 215). Eve's (Tuck, 2009) "Suspending Damage: A Letter to Communities" charges us to think beyond damage-centered research, and compels Wayne and his students to ask, "Am I looking for damage, pain, and harm?" This is a direct challenge to the normalized research practices at the intersection of social science and policy/practice where the first task is to produce a "problem statement" or "needs assessment" of the community under study. Robin Kelley's (1997) "Looking for the 'Real' Nigga: Social Scientists Construct the Ghetto" challenges researchers to think—am I looking for authenticity, for "real culture," "real blackness"? Avery Gordon's (1997) *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination* asks us to see what is unseen, the hauntings, and the cause of the hauntings. George Lipsitz's (2007) "The Racialization of Space and the Spacialization of Race" asks that instead of looking for racialized people, to look at how space is racialized (in his work, how the same space exists under White and Black spatial imaginaries). Roderick Ferguson

(2004) and Jack Halberstam (2005) teach us to de-normalize the sexuality of space, to question how spaces and times are sexualized and gendered. None of these writers ask us to perform "ethno"-graphy by observing people or collecting their stories—standard "data" that qualitative researchers assume almost a priori they will pursue. They challenge us to say no.

Because settler colonial invasion is active, and the imperative to invade is unrelenting, a refusal stance against inquiry as invasion requires more than passive resistance, more than simply not selling/telling.

Refusing Thoroughly

In much of social science, people, land, culture make becoming-claims for researchers at all stages of inquiry. Thus, in our work with students and co-researchers, we have tried to embed refusal throughout the research process, at all stages of inquiry. At the design stage, the most prominent form of refusal in our work has been to resist the urge to study people (and their "social problems") and to study instead institutions and power. This is something Eve has described as a deliberate shift in the unit of analysis, away from people, and toward the relationships between people and institutions of power. For example, in participatory action research with New York City youth, many of whom had been pushed out of school, their work focused on the policies and practices that colluded to produce school pushout. (In Wayne's words, not anthro-pology, but misanthrope-pology.)

Refusals are also necessary at the data collection stage. Methods that rely upon a researcher's observations already make a claim about knowledge, how it is acquired, and who is in the position to acquire it. That is, observation itself is making an epistemological claim, rooted in the dynamics of gaze, space, and power. Students have found instructive examples of refusal at the data collection stage in Akwesasne Mohawk scholar Laura Terrance's (2011) description of the role of refusal vis-à-vis the space of the colonial archive:

> Somewhat by chance I discovered a boarding school journal in a library. It was an autograph journal that belonged to a young woman who attended a residential boarding school in the early twentieth century. As an autograph journal opposed to a personal log or diary, it contains entries made by several other students. But I am not actually going to tell you anything that is written in the journal. I am not going to tell you the name of the young woman the journal belonged to or even her tribe. I am not going to tell you which boarding school she attended and I am not going to tell you which library I found it in or where it is now. (p. 621)

Terrance points out that the archive is a laboratory of power—wherein a researcher can finger through the lives of people already encoded into objects: Not only Edward

Curtis-esque staged photographs of unsmiling, costumed, disappearing Indians but also personal artifacts taken without consent, stories written under duress, or the very bones, bodies, and tissue samples of Native people. Terrance asserts that the voices of Native people, trapped in archives intent on preserving them as "vanished Indians," are also objecting objects, but they cannot speak (p. 625). Their objection is made mute by the archive, and thus unobservable, uncodable, objectively absent from the data. Assuming a refusal stance means to stop touching the objects, and to observe instead the objectifying space and its sexual, racial, and biopolitical architecture.

Refusals are necessary at the stage often thought of as "coding." We ask students how researchers code for the refusals to their research, for the objects' objection. How does the researcher honor that refusal? How might the researcher code for her own honoring or dishonoring of refusals? Audra Simpson's (2007) instructive article, "On Ethnographic Refusal," provides commentary on her ethnography on Mohawk nationhood and citizenship and is a multi-dimensional example of refusal centered in Kahnawake Nation, within which she herself is a member.

> "Enough," I realised, was when I reached the limit . . . what am I revealing here and why? Where will this get us? Who benefits from this and why? And "enough" was when they shut down (or told me to turn off the recorder), or told me outright funny things like "nobody seems to know"—when everybody does know and talks about it all the time. (Simpson, 2007, p. 78)

Simpson's article shows us that the interviewee refuses but does so in coded language. *Nobody seems to know*. To hear it, the researcher must be fluent in the code of refusal. She also reveals her own refusal—*enough, what am I revealing here and why?* Probably she could find some individual willing to say the becoming quote that the academy would claim. *Everybody does know and talks about it all the time.* Instead, she enacts her own refusal—*uncoding* the objects, refusing to stake the claim.

> And I also knew everyone knew, because everyone knows everyone's "predicament." This was the collective "limit"—that of knowledge and thus who we could or would not claim. (Simpson, 2007, p. 77)

When coding data, how do researchers enact our own refusals—where can we take the black marker and draw lines of redaction, cut and *not* paste, delete, insert blank spaces in lieu of text? And particularly, where is a safe-keeping box for the narratives not ours to give away? As an illustration of how we might talk about this with students and co-researchers, we treat the following lines from *Old Dog* as hypothetical data. In teaching, we feel less uncomfortable using words from the screenplay than actual refused stories from our research. But were these words actual

"data," collected in the process of an interview, we are not so sure about telling them out. The illustration below, employing *Old Dog* as a stand-in for refused data, is an example of how sacred knowledge should not, from a refusal stance, be domesticated into social science data.

> Akhu [herder]: ~~I am not selling. The herd relies on dogs. Like in the old saying, "Dogs chases down the deer lowland, bottom of the valley, caretaking [to care for (well-meaning)], and people look after the dogs." I am not selling.~~
>
> dog trader: ~~It is not that we are heartless, but people can't keep them from being stolen.~~
>
> Akhu: ~~Your father used to be a well-known hunter. He raised twelve dogs. Everyone looked up to him, and here you are now selling dogs.~~

We realize that some readers might find the strikethroughs that we present to be confounding. Isn't this a powerful story to share, an opportunity to expose the internal predicaments of Tibetan nomads caused by settler expansion, and to showcase Indigenous knowledge? Won't it be helpful to legitimate this herder's wisdom as theory in the academy? Isn't this what it will take to humanize or diversify the academy, to make it more relevant? From a refusal stance, no. These are efforts that expand the reach of the academy, which allows it to accumulate more and more territory. There *are* proper ways to share this knowledge, and we posit that social science publication is not one of them. This knowledge *is* powerful. It is *already* shared as Tibetan wisdom. Abstracting this quote, lionizing it in research, would contradict the very aims of the film itself. In an interview with National Public Radio (NPR), Tseden critiques how the West's romance with Tibet abets in the colonial vanishing trick: "I think Tibet has always been mythologized and worshipped, and made more remote" (Lim, 2009). Tseden chose to share this knowledge through a particular vehicle: *Old Dog* is the first feature length film in the Tibetan language, with a Tibetan cast of non-professional actors, in Tseden's home of Amdo, and he funds free screenings for local audiences in the more remote Tibetan regions (Lim, 2009). His efforts expand Tibetan sovereignty and thought-worlds, not settler colonial knowledge.

A Closing Contrast

The *20/20* television special "A Hidden America: Children of the Plains" (ABC News Productions, Films for the Humanities & Sciences (Firm), & Films Media Group, 2011) portrayed journalist Diane Sawyer literally riding a horse into Oglala Lakota territory to expose the profound poverty of Pine Ridge Indian Reservation. The special, of course, remained silent on the role of settler colonial nation-states and corporations in producing poverty in places such

as Pine Ridge, and sought explanations that would not implicate viewers, or settlers, or ABC, the federal government, or anyone, except for the people of Pine Ridge. *Indian Country Today* journalist Rob Schmidt (2011) described the special as little more than "poverty porn." Diane Sawyer's essay and exposé reflect the downside of liberal advances in representation and inclusion; *you may be seen, but only as damaged; we may see you, but only from the safety of our own homes; you are responsible for your own damage, and I am responsible for my own success.* The theory of change puts too much faith in the power of exposure and awareness, and doesn't account for the complacency of voyeurism.

Soon after the special, another analysis of poverty in Pine Ridge emerged when youth from the community created a video response to Sawyer's production, which they made available to the public on YouTube. The student video is a pointed refusal of Sawyer's narrative, telling her and viewers, "I know what you probably think of us/I saw the special too. Maybe you saw a picture, or read an article. But we're here because we want you to know/we're more than that . . . We have so much more than poverty" (uploaded by Falcondaily, 2011). In this refusal, the students did not offer more interviews, more exposé, more data to disprove Sawyer's assertions. They showed themselves in classrooms and hallways, on basketball courts, in libraries and chemistry labs, with words magic-markered on their arms and hands: pride, humor, intelligence, determination, creativity, humility, appreciation, optimism, respect, and hope, hope, futures, futures, futures. The video made by Pine Ridge students is both a rejoinder and a refusal. It doesn't say "come back and get the story right"; it doesn't offer a new object of study; it objects to the gaze; it keeps the objected children out of reach.

At the crossroads of communicating findings, that is, the analyses, theories, and propositions the researcher puts in print/public, the refusal stance pushes us to *limit* settler territorialization of Indigenous/Native/community knowledge, and *expand* the space for other forms of knowledge, thought-worlds to live. Refusal makes space for recognition, and for reciprocity. Refusal turns the gaze back upon power, specifically the colonial modalities of knowing persons as bodies to be differentially counted, violated, saved, and put to work. It makes transparent the metanarrative of knowledge production—its spectatorship for pain and its preoccupation for documenting and ruling over racial difference. Refusal generates, expands, champions representational territories that colonial knowledge endeavors to settle, enclose, domesticate. We again insist that refusal is not just a no, but is a generative, analytic practice.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

ABC News Productions, Films for the Humanities & Sciences (Firm), & Films Media Group. (2011). *A hidden America: Children of the plains*. New York, NY: Films Media Group. Retrieved from https://ezproxy.uu.edu/login?url=http://digital.films.com/PortalPlaylists.aspx?aid=13753&tid=52814

Claim. (n.d.). In *Online Etymology Dictionary*. Retrieved from http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/claim

Deloria, V. (1988). *Custer died for your sins: An Indian manifesto*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Falcondaily, (2011, December 12). *More than that . . .* [Video file]. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FhribaNXr7A&feature=plcp

Ferguson, R. A. (2004). *Aberrations in Black: Toward A queer of color critique*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gonzales-Day, K. (n.d.). Erased Lynching series [Webpage photographs and postcards]. Retrieved from http://www.kengonzalesday.com/projects/erasedlynching/

Gordon, A. (1997). *Ghostly matters: Haunting and the sociological imagination*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Halberstam, J. (2005). *In a queer time and place: Transgender bodies, subcultural lives*. New York: New York University Press.

hooks, b. (1990). Marginality as a site of resistance. In R. Ferguson, M. Gever, T. T. Minh-ha, & C. West (Eds.), *Out there: Marginalization and contemporary cultures* (pp. 241-243). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hurston, Z. N. (1928, May). How it feels to be colored me. *The World Tomorrow*, *11*, 215-216.

Kelley, R. D. G. (1997). Looking for the "real" nigga: Social Scientists Construct the Ghetto. In R. D. G. Kelley (Ed.), *Yo' Mama's disfunktional! Fighting the culture wars in urban America* (pp. 15-42). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Lim, L. (Writer). (2009, June 30). Director seeks to capture life in modern Tibet. In NPR (Producer), *All things considered*. Retrieved from http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=106089201

Lipsitz, G. (2007). The racialization of space and the spatialization of race: Theorizing the hidden architecture of landscape. *Landscape Journal*, *26*, 10-23.

Moten, F. (2003). *In the break: The aesthetics of the Black radical tradition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Schmidt, R. (2011). "Children of the plains" was little more than "poverty porn." *Indian Country Today Media Network.com*. Retrieved from http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/ict_sbc/children-of-the-plains-was-little-more-than-poverty-porn

Sedgwick, E. K. (1990). *Epistemology of the closet*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Shakya, T. (2011, November 1). Old Dog (Khyi rgan) directed by Pema Tsetan & The Sun-Beaten Path (Dbus Lam Gyi Nyi Ma) directed by Sonthar Gyal. *Tibet Writes*. Retrieved from http://www.tibetwrites.org/?Old-Dog-Khyi-rgan-directed-by-Pema

Simpson, A. (2007). On ethnographic refusal: Indigeneity, "voice," and colonial citizenship. *Junctures*, *9*, 67-80.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. Dunedin, NZ: Zed Books.

St. Pierre, E. A., & Pillow, W. (2000). Introduction: Inquiry among the Ruins. In E. A. St. Pierre & W. Pillow (Eds.), *Working the Ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education* (pp. 1-21). London, England: Routledge.

Terrance, L. L. (2011). Resisting colonial education: Zitkala-Sa and native feminist archival refusal. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *24*, 621-626.

Tseden, P. (Writer & Director). (2011). *Old Dog* [Khyi rgan] [Film]. China: Dragons and Tigers.

Tuck, E. (2009). Suspending damage: A letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, *79*, 409-427.

Tuck, E. (2010). Breaking up with Deleuze: Desire and valuing the irreconcilable. *Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *23*, 635-650.

Tuck, E., & Guishard, M. (2013). Scientifically based research and settler coloniality: An ethical framework of decolonial participatory action research. In T. M. Kress, C. Malott, & B. Porfilio (Eds.), *Challenging status quo retrenchment: New directions in critical qualitative research* (pp. 3-27). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

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

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2014). R-words: Refusing research. In D. Paris & M. T. Winn (Eds.), *Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and communities* (pp. 223-248). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Veracini, L. (2011). Introducing settler colonial studies. *Settler Colonial Studies*, *1*, 1-12.

Wolfe, P. (1999). *Settler colonialism and the transformation of anthropology: The politics and poetics of an ethnographic event*. New York, NY: Cassell.

Author Biographies

Eve Tuck is assistant professor of educational foundations and coordinator of the Native American Studies Program at the State University of New York at New Paltz.

K. Wayne Yang is an associate professor in the Department of Ethnic Studies, as well as an affiliate of the Urban Studies and Planning Program and the Department of Education Studies at the University of California, San Diego.