Abstract

This paper weaves the warp of inextricable concepts and ideas in an Australian Indigenous creative work with the weft of its processes, practice and articulation. A contribution to conversations with contemporary ‘First Nations’ art and literature in relation to questions of visual sovereignty, visuality and ethics, it is what I define as a ‘rendition of transmotion at the ‘tree line’, reaching to what Vizenor (1998) says are “other contexts of action, resistance, dissent, and political controversy (p. 182)”.

Key Words

border thinking, coloniality, creactivity\(^1\), delinking, sui generis sovereignty, survivance,

Transmotion at the ‘Tree Line’

To Gerald Vizenor (2008)

“The theories of survivance are elusive, obscure, and imprecise by definition, translation, comparison, and catchword histories, but survivance is invariably true and just in native practice and company. The nature of survivance is unmistakable in native stories, natural reason, remembrance, traditions, and customs and is clearly observable in narrative resistance and personal attributes, such as the native humanistic tease, vital irony, spirit, cast of mind, and moral courage. The character of survivance creates a sense of native presence over absence, nihility, and victimry (p. 1)”.

Introduction

In offering a paper for any publication, an Indigenous person’s scholarly approach is to firstly check the efficacy of the publication in relation to the traditions and aspirations of our own knowledge systems, inducing a borrowing of Franz Fanon’s (1967) prayer: “Oh my body, make of me always a man who questions (p. 232)!” The chosen range of topics and critical essay formulas for publications calls to mind Freya Schiwy (2009), who, in considering “the colonial burden” in “… the efforts of Indigenous individuals and organizations to make use of literary testimono, academic discourse and its institutions” asks, “Does cultural studies want to deepen the division between theory and its object or point to the relations of power and colonialism inherent in our own modes of thinking?”

Bakhtin’s (1993) analysis of theory in “The Philosophy of the Act” can be used to elaborate on this notion, by considering how Indigenous ontology and epistemology is filtered through, and if it is held hostage in, the framework of Western scholarly disciplines:

\(^1\) The word creactivity is discussed in detail at pages 4 and 5.
“... the world as object of theoretical cognition seeks to pass itself off as the whole world, that is, not only as abstractly unitary Being but also as concretely unique being in its possible totality. ... In that world, we would find ourselves to be determined, predetermined, by-gone and finished, that is, essentially not living. Any kind of practical orientation of my life within the theoretical world is impossible; it is impossible to live in it, impossible to perform answerable deeds. In that world I am unnecessary; I am essentially and fundamentally non-existent in it. The theoretical world is obtained through an essential and fundamental abstraction from the fact of my unique being and from the moral sense of that fact, as if I didn’t exist (p. 89).”

In this regard the work of Gerald Vizenor (1998) reveals

“textual and graphic depictions [of ‘First Nations’ people] preserved by scholarship, consumed by the dominant culture, and steeped in a modernist aesthetic of romantic victimry, tragedy, and nostalgia” wrought by settler colonialism.”

Such representations, celebrating
“the absence rather than the presence of the Native” are “... fugitive poses captured in photographs, portraits, translations, official documents, New Age stories, blood-quantum counts, captivity narratives, and museum objects” which “simulate Native peoples rather than reveal them (p. 182)”. Through his notion of ‘transmotion’ and depictions of fugitivity, Vizenor (1998) offers the concept of a “sui generis sovereignty” from which to communicate, that I suggest, renders ‘the efforts of Indigenous individuals and organizations to make use of literary testimonio, academic discourse and its institutions’, what Martineau and Ritskes (2014) consider “illegible to power, incommensurable with colonialism, and opaque to appropriation, commodification and cultural theft (p. v).”

Further, Walter Mignolo (2011) speaks of “border epistemology”’ that goes “hand in hand with decoloniality. Why? Because decoloniality focuses on changing the terms of the conversation and not only its content (p. I).” The following extensive quote from Mignolo serves to complement both the concept of Vizenor’s ‘transmotion’ and my own ‘positionality’ (Sack, 1974) and also poses a rationale for discourse to dissuade habitual binary perception.

“How does border epistemology work? The most enduring legacy of the Bandung Conference was delinking; delinking from capitalism and communism, that is, from Enlightenment political theory (liberalism and republicanism – Locke, Montesquieu) and political economy (Smith) as well as from its opposition, socialism-communism. Now, once you delink, where do you go? You have to go to the reservoir of the ways of life and modes of thinking that have been disqualified by Christian theology since the Renaissance and which continue expanding through secular philosophy and the sciences, for you cannot find your way out in the

---

2 Mignolo writes: In 1955, 29 countries from Asia and Africa gathered at a conference to find a common ground and vision for the future that was neither capitalism nor communism. That way was “decolonization.”
reservoir of modernity (Greece, Rome, the Renaissance, the Enlightenment). If you go there, you remain chained to the illusion that there is no other way of thinking, doing and living. Modern/colonial racism, that is, the logic of racialization that emerged in the sixteenth century, has two dimensions (ontological and epistemic) and one single purpose: to rank as inferior all languages beyond Greek and Latin and the six modern European languages from the domain of sustainable knowledge and to maintain the enunciative privilege of the Renaissance and Enlightenment European institutions, men and categories of thought. Languages that were not apt for rational thinking (either theological or secular) were considered languages that revealed the inferiority of the human beings speaking them. What could a person that was not born speaking one of the privileged languages and that was not educated in privileged institutions do? Either he or she accepts his or her inferiority or makes an effort to demonstrate that he or she was a human being equal to those who placed him or her as second class. That is, two of the choices are to accept the humiliation of being inferior to those who decided that you are inferior or to assimilate. And to assimilate means that you accepted your inferiority and resigned to playing the game that is not yours, but that has been imposed upon you – or the third option is border thinking and border epistemology (p. I, II).

Australian Indigenous community media-arts practice, viewed from this perspective, is a fundamentally different experience to a Western-Christian idea of creativity. The word creativity derives from Latin *creare*, to make or produce. It means original and innovating in the general sense, and productive in the special sense (Williams, 1983). The concept of ‘creativity’ is an integral part of the Christian (and other) belief system - the divine Creation of the world – creation, creature (p. 82-84). My processes and practice are embedded in land, law, Place³, culture, spirituality, politics, social and community management/governance/connectivity and development and are thus not activities which occur in isolation. Praxis in this way, is also an act and broad representation of an Indigenous concept of sovereignty. These elements are all related parts of creative practice simultaneously and no separation or rigid definition is necessary. This is captured in the Australian Aboriginal Turrbal language where “gahrr” meaning breath or spirit, is the closest word to ‘creativity’ (Bell, 2005); and is also confluent with the concept that Aboriginal creativity, as Ambelin and Blaze Kwaymullina (2010) assert, “is an act of being in the world where since the whole is in all its parts, there is no distance in creation (p. 197)”.

Such creative praxis also takes into account the importance of the ‘act’ (Mikhail Bakhtin (1993), *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*) explained by Gardiner (2000) as:

“... the "eventness" of the everyday social world" and "the phenomenological nature of the "act" as the essential "value-centre" for human existence. This in turn, involves an understanding of the alterity between self and other, insofar as we can only construct a unified image of self and engage in morally and aesthetically productive tasks through our reciprocal relation to each other (p.1-2).”

³ The uses of ‘Place’ denotes an Indigenous concept, and ‘place’ the Euro-Western meaning.
In contrast, creativity within the European tradition of arts patronage is the invention and production of art and aggrandisement of artists (or theorists and intellectuals) as discrete entities. Consequently, throughout this paper will be used a term I invented and used in my Masters Exegesis (2009) and PhD Treatise (2014) - ‘creact/creation/creactive/creactivity’, to contrast and differentiate this perceived ontological and cultural experience. ‘Creative’ speaks to Indigenous origins of creativity - that communal/community, participatory, collaborative and shared process of custom, experience and imagination in reflective, reflexive and broadly representational expression.

As conveyed throughout his work, the use of Vizenor’s concepts of inventive, dialogic and felicitous discourse is essential to the survivance and progress of the Indigenous contribution to global conversations, and indeed to the conversations themselves; particularly that communicated in a scholarly environment where the conventions of a Western knowledge system, steeped in perspectives framed by social science, are dominating intellectual exchange. Discourse excited by the objectives of decolonisation has creacted a wave of pedagogical exchange to address that domination, engaging in global conversation people whose long histories include the relatively recent violently disruptive experience of imperialism and colonisation.

Such advocates of decolonisation (in Andreotti et al, 2011) call for the recognition of an “‘ecology of knowledges’ (Santos, 2007) based on a recognition of the plurality of heterogeneous knowledges (one of them being modern science) and on the sustained and dynamic interconnections between them without compromising their autonomy (p.11) (p. 42).” According to Santos, Nunes and Meneses (2008) “there is no global social justice without global cognitive justice ... which has not only economic, social and political dimensions but also cultural and epistemological ones (p. xix)”. Santos, Nunes and Meneses also propose the answer to problems posed by these circumstances “cannot be accounted for by any general theory of society ... because ... A politics of cultural diversity and mutual intelligibility calls for a complex procedure of reciprocal and horizontal translation (p. xxv”).

Vine Deloria Jnr (2012) reminds us, “even transformation of attitudes, is not an end in itself unless it leads to a more profound and comprehensive idea of the meaning of existence (p. 18); while John Drabinski (2012) speaks of “the problem of futurity – a theoretical and existential problem of how to make the world meaningful again or for the first time – how it is crucial for any thinking of beginning after catastrophe; and that the articulation of the terms and stakes of beginning again are indispensable for imagining another possible world (p. 227).” (Catastrophe including the ultra-violence and devastation inflicted upon the colonised, the dehumanised, displaced identity of the coloniser and the inevitable outcomes.)

In regard to the effects of transitivity in ideas emanating from creative works, Barry Freeman (2014), discusses the concept of Clarke Mackey, author of Random Acts of Culture: Reclaiming Art and Community in the 21st Century (2010), who, he says, “argues for a more expansive view of the arts that includes what he calls ‘vernacular culture,’ the everyday creative, expressive practices such as bedtime stories, community art-making, or street art - practices that don’t necessarily have a place in the world of the institutional fine arts. Adopting a stark view of the ‘now’ as one wracked by ‘the dire consequences of a two hundred year experiment in industrial capitalism’, Mackey envisions a cultural landscape in which the sole aim is not the production of commodities for circulation and sale, but of art that occasions meaningful social encounter and relationship forming. ‘It is the form and context of artistic works that must change,’ Mackey says, ‘even more than their content. Radical times call for
radical forms and radical contexts. This is precisely where ideas about vernacular culture begin to take purchase.” This perspective, to people whose creative processes and praxis are imbedded in ‘everyday creative, expressive practices … that occasion meaningful and social encounter and relationship’, in particular in ceremonies and gatherings, would seem rather obvious; but it is nevertheless one place where cultural differences are conversing, converging and changing. I will later return to this discussion which is a definitive aspect of my creativity.

Subsequent to the issues raised in this introduction, my paper continues in the vein of Mignolo’s notion of ‘border thinking’ and Vizenor’s (1998) concept of ‘transmotion’ “the sovereignty of motion … the vision to move in imagination and the substantial rights of motion in native communities (p. introduction).”

Introducing myself

I speak as an Australian Indigenous woman claiming authority vested in the sovereignty and stewardship of genetically related ancestors of the Samsep Clan, village of Isem, Erub (aka Darnley), in the eastern islands of what is now known as the Torres Strait in Queensland Australia. I have a lifetime of experience in participatory, collaborative, community performance, media-arts, and more recently creative practice-led enquiry. I articulate my knowledge and experience in an accountable first person from understanding derived from my customs; and not without relative hindsight as an attribute of age.

My customs affect self-identification and also ensure I am never alone or without a Place in the world, an inherent aspect of the participatory and collaborative function of my creative praxis. I am affected by the extremely diverse dimensions of experience in and with peoples of all countries and places I have lived, acknowledgement of which assists others to decipher my knowing, intent and values; such transparency an attribute of ethical relations. The following placement mapping indicates the pattern of relational experience and connectivity.

**Samsep, Isem - Erub-Darnley Is – Meriam Mir (saltwater):** ancestral country of my Mother, Eva Salam - ancestry includes Tudu, Suri-Lanka, Denmark, Indonesia; born **Waiben** on **Kaurareg** country.

**Coolamon-Wiradjuri:** birthplace of my father Jack Peacock - ancestry includes England, Ireland.

**Mareeba–Kuka Yalanji-Djubuganji (freshwater):** birthplace 1951; early childhood.

**Cooya Beach–Kuka Yalanji (saltwater):** early childhood with relatives.

**Redcliffe-Ningy-Ningy (saltwater):** Mother and Father took up residence; childhood (seven siblings); primary and secondary school 1955 - 64.

**Brisbane–Turrbal-Jagera:** commercial business employment, 1965-68.

**Sydney-Eora:** community theatre performance practice 1969-73.

**Britain (U.K.):** theatre - performance, directing and producing, 1974-80.

**Cairns-Irukandji, Mossman–Kuka Yalanji (saltwater):** connecting family, 1981-82.

**Sydney-Eora:** film and TV production training at ABC TV, 1983-85.

**Thursday Is.-Waiben and Murray Is.-Mer (saltwater):** community radio training (conscious of the transformation of experience to knowledge), 1985.

**Brisbane-Turrbal-Jagera:** community film and video production development, 1985-2003 (media-arts praxis became definitive).


Long kept memories of country reveal the impotence of manipulative, political tactics of divide and rule colonial boundaries in the face of Indigenous remembrance, survivance and connectivity, securing our place so we are not ‘lost in space’. Countless memories preserve that resilient connectivity, life experience and ways of adaptation to and acceptance of change, as eloquently expressed in the biography of one local Aboriginal Ngugi elder (Anderson, 2001):

> I often reflect on the days of my boyhood, eating at the common table at the One Mile on Minjerribah when I lived with my Gr andmother, where meals were served with the Grannies present, smoking their pipes and speaking softly in language. Those images constantly revisit me and are the source of my strength. During the full impact of what was happening beginning with the colonial era – warfare, massacres, confiscation of the land, dispersal of families – somehow throughout all this they retained their capacity to endure, their elegance, serenity and dignity. In the midst of this overwhelming hardship this was remarkable and astounding (p. 6).

**TRANSMOTION**

> “fat green flies
> square dance on the pink
> grapefruit
> honor your partners
> (Vizenor, in Dialogue with A. Robert Lee, 1999)

Vizenor (in Madsen and Lee, 2010) says, “The connotations of transmotion are creation stories, totemic visions, [and] reincarnation. . . . [T]ransmotion, that sense of native motion and active presence, is sui generis sovereignty (p. 48)”. In this regard, Mary Graham (1999) a Kombumerri-Wakka Wakka philosopher, posits:

> “Aboriginal Australia’s perspective on the nature of existence is that the Sacred Dreaming is the system of creation that brings the whole of existence into being and ensures its continuance. The Dreaming, with the Ancestral Beings as intermediaries, brings into being Place, and, along with the emergence of Place, comes the Law for that Place. Australian Indigenous relationships to land she states are explained through the Dreaming. “Aboriginal people have a kinship system which extends into land; this system was and still is organised into clans. One’s first loyalty is to one’s own clan group. It does not matter how Western and urbanised Aboriginal people have become, this kinship system never changes. (It has been damaged by, for example, cultural genocide/stolen children/Westernisation etc. but has not been altered substantially.) Every clan group has its own Dreaming or explanation of existence. (p. 106.)”

Similarly, with poetic wisdom and visuality, Gerald Vizenor (1999) speaks of:
“Postindian consciousness … a rush of shadows in the distance, and the trace of natural reason to a bench of stones; the human silence of shadows, and animate shadows over presence. The shadow is that sense of intransitive motion to the referent; the silence in memories. ... Shadows are honoured in memories and the silence of tribal stones (p. 64).”

I have for many years enjoyed conversation and collaboration with Mary Graham which brought a deeper understanding of the philosophical underpinnings of Indigenous Australia. I had been able to engage with the ideas of Gerald Vizenor due to the practice-led enquiry conducted for my PhD (2014) at Queensland University of Technology in Brisbane, Queensland, Australia. A combination of the relational work of Mary Graham on Place and Australian Indigenous philosophy, the literature and language of Gerald Vizenor’s trickster discourse, as well as the intellectual discourse of a multitude of writers and other creatives whose expression carries a sense of ‘transmotion’, and engages ‘border thinking and epistemology’, had a remarkable impact. It strengthened my understanding of the depth to which coloniality obscured and corrupted the distinctive ingenuity of Indigenous creativity - thought, imagination, expression and communication; and consequently gave reassurance to confidently maintain the ‘aesthetics of survivance’ across praxis, which included my Masters and PhD creative projects and the articulation of its research, processes and practice.

Vizenor’s ‘trickster discourse’ in particular, legitimated and liberated sophisticated, progressive and relevant Indigenous ontological thinking that has, what Zembylas and Michelides (in Richardson, 2006) identify as, “a built in sense of mystery, of something that is inexpressible (167)”. Vizenor’s description (1993) of the trickster as “a sign a communal signification that cannot be separated or understood in isolation; the signifiers are acoustic images bound to four points of view, and the signified, or the concept the signifier located in language and social experience, is a narrative event or a translation (p. 189)”, accords with my thinking and an etiquette of conversation peculiar to our customs. The concept that “the listeners and readers become the trickster, a sign and semiotic being in discourse”, and that “the trickster is a comic holotrope in narrative voices, not a model or a tragic configuration in isolation (p. 189)” also liberated epistemological and methodological approaches to the practice-led enquiry of my PhD creative work and processes and practice, which I articulated in the form of a ‘Treatise’ rather than a critical, analytical exegesis. It also released the visuality in ontological concepts of knowing being and doing.

As Vizenor (1993) imparts through his work, allowing “The author, narrator, characters and audience” to be “the signified and comic holotropes in trickster narratives”, discourse as the signified “becomes a comic chance in oral presentations”; whereas “in translated narratives the signified is rehearsed in hermeneutics and structural lections, causal theories and comparative models in social science (p. 188).” This point-of-view is that at which Indigenous scholars can question, interrogate and depart from the conventions of Euro-Western forms of creativity, enquiry and ‘knowledge production’, to include the inventions of imagination and creativity arising from a world of heritage.

This point is captured in the lyrics of renowned Afro-American jazz lyricist and vocalist, Abbey Lincoln (1930 to 2010): “music is the magic of a sacred world, a place where the spirit is home, a world that is always within (2007)”. This, I believe, is analogous to the imaginary and visionary world that is always within creativity, and
as Scott N. Momaday says “as a moral idea of ourselves, to be realised completely, has to be expressed (in Jahner (1993) p. 164)

At the borders of all these concepts arising from the ethos of origins not diminished or possessed by a dominant colonial society, a partnership occurs, not unlike Vizenor’s ‘fat green flies’ on the ‘pink grapefruit’, transforming the consciousness of the Indigenous scholar as we create a new dance in an old place of knowing and custom. This creates a transmotion to liberate the creative spirit whose creativity emerges from a sui generis sovereignty.

**A ‘Sui Generis Sovereignty’ (Vizenor, 1998)**

D’Arcy McNickle in Native American Tribalism (1973), notes that long before the concept entered the literature of social science, Native Americans clearly recognised the function of “ethnic boundaries”, complete with political identity, governance and an acceptance of cultural diversity (p. 85). This is counter to the tactic inherent in European concepts of sovereignty, where unitary power is exerted over relationships within and between national boundaries. In her article “The Sovereign Being”, Professor Wendy Brady (2007) exemplifies common Australian Indigenous response to Western determination of sovereignty in countries where Indigenous ontology overrides notions of European legal possession of country:

“Exclusion and denial of Indigenous Australians’ right to sovereignty and self-determination are as effective as the previous attempts by governments to deny our humanity and existence.”

She continues:

“Whether we are in urban, rural or remote regions, we continue to exercise our right of recognition of our ancestral rights and our modern forms of kinship recognition. We may not have legal recognition of our sovereignty, but in the way in which we conduct ourselves and our relationship as individuals, communities and nations, it remains a constant in our lives.”

This position sustains Indigenous people as a real and constant political nemesis to the false history and legal assumptions in Australian sovereignty (p. 150).

Certain movements within global politics, signalling there is a gradual recognition of the distinctive form to what Indigenous people deem to be “sovereignty”, are expanding the means whereby Indigenous peoples are entering and creatively contributing to the conversation. Two such events were “Alternative Sovereignties: Decolonization through Indigenous Vision and Struggle”, May 8-10, 2014, at University of Oregon in the United States; and “In the Balance: Indigeneity, Performance, Globalization”, 24 – 27 October 2013, funded by the European Research Council and organised by the Centre for International Theatre and Performance Research based at Royal Holloway, University of London.

The Oregon conference proposed to address the concept of sovereignty as “both an international political norm and expression of cultural distinctiveness and political autonomy central to American Indian and First Nations discourse in the United States and Canada. It deems: Yet this language is often an imperfect reflection of the goals that tribal nations seek to pursue, suggesting rigid political and social boundaries
around and within indigenous nations. This stands in stark contrast to political relationships based in tribal epistemologies that acknowledge social flexibility, interdependence, reciprocity and non-coercive, respectful relationships between and within national communities (http://blogs.uoregon.edu/alternativesovereignties/).

The objective of the London conference was the progression of “a transnational and interdisciplinary project that explores how indigeneity is expressed and understood in our complex, globalising world. The aim is to determine what indigeneity has come to mean in particular places and at key moments over the last several decades, and what kind of cultural, political, ethical and aesthetic issues are negotiated within its canvass.” It came also with a somewhat dubious motive, “While the research will focus on regions settled during the great era of European imperialism, notably Australia, the Pacific Islands, the Americas and South Africa, the project also addresses the transnational circulation of indigeneity as a highly marketable commodity, particularly in Europe (www.indigeneity.net).”

Édouard Glissant (in Drabinski, 2012) joins this conversation in offering a means of revising the way in which exchange takes place at the borders of this thinking:

“… thought of the Other is sterile without the other of Thought. Thought of the Other is the moral generosity disposing me to accept the principle of alterity, to conceive of the world as not simple and straightforward, with only one truth – mine. But thought of the Other can dwell within me without making me alter course … the other of Thought is precisely this altering. Then I have to act. That is the moment I change my thought, without renouncing its contribution. I change, and I exchange. This is an aesthetics of turbulence whose corresponding ethics is not provided in advance (p. 243)”.

It is in and from a ‘sui generis sovereignty’ that the Indigenous creative can inhabit the ‘transmotion’ of our customs and traditions, within which is enacted the ingenuity of being, knowing and doing. There Protevi’s (in Margaroni, 2005) “chance, change and motion, fundamental to the self-ordering potential of an all separating, connecting, halting, diverting, scattering, transforming dynamic (p. 85)”, developed within the propensity of both cultural orientation and creative practice, intertwines with Ambelin and Blaze Kwaymullina’s (2010) idea of

“the purpose of knowledge [within Aboriginal systems] which folds back into the underlying principle of balance ... both constructed and transmitted around the idea of balancing relationships between all things in the universe (p. 196).”

AT THE TREE LINE

Sound
Writer, sound artist and designer Paul Carter (2004), writing about when the interpretative sciences (or humanities) came into being says:

“From the seventeenth century, at least, the guardians of knowledge and their political masters have stigmatized poetic wisdom as a rebel against reason. The rise of modern science encouraged a critical rationalism, whose categories, general principles and facts have created an illusion of stability but are unable to explain ‘the reality of inevitable epistemic change’. This, as Feyerabend points out, represents ‘a failure of reason’. A similar fate has overtaken discourse. Poetic wisdom, the capacity to yoke apparently dissimilar things through a striking figure of speech, has been denigrated. The metaphorical expressions of ingegno have become associated with perversion rather than insight (p. 9).”

Walter Mignolo, (2011) in writing about ‘border epistemology’ (quoted at length above) said: “Now, once you delink, where do you go? You have to go to the reservoir of the ways of life and modes of thinking that have been disqualified by Christian theology since the Renaissance and which continue expanding through secular philosophy and the sciences, for you cannot find your way out in the reservoir of modernity (Greece, Rome, the Renaissance, the Enlightenment) (p. I, II).” Providing a catalyst for transmotion and border thinking and as a ford between what Mignolo (above) regards as the ‘reservoir of modernity’ and ‘ways of life and modes of thinking that have been disqualified’, I quote below the Kombumerri-Wakka Wakka perspective of Mary Graham (2006) from Aboriginal Australia:

Multiple Places = Multiple Dreamings = Multiple Laws = Multiple Logics = Multiple Truths = All Perspectives (truths) are Valid and Reasonable (p. 9).

In my Indigenous community media-art processes and practice this equation allows perspectives to merge, and each perspective is defined by the other, all of which are open to interpretation and furtherance.

Furthermore, ignoring or suppressing Indigenous customs of congenial, informal, oral exchange can cause unnecessary conflict and offence confining us to superficial, argumentative and one-upmanship relations. The largely impersonal and hierarchal system of Western academic institutions (despite inclusion of Indigenous knowledges) renders conditions for altercation, and thwarts the opportunity to move us on: firstly away from the dominance of Western knowledge systems and the assumed proficiency of both its thought and elucidation; and secondly out of a field of extraneous academic endeavour that will continue to misrepresent the subject and misinform the public, until it is conceded Indigenous cultural, social and political insight cannot be simulated.

Indeed, as Baudrillard (in Vizenor, 1994) believes, “To dissimulate is to feign not to have what one has. To simulate is to feign to have what one hasn’t. One implies a presence, the other an absence (cover page).” It is an essential and valuable life (and research) skill to follow a custom where one relies upon and trusts a tradition of valuing knowledge communicated in the etiquette of conversation which applies insight, intellect, humour, intuition and periphery vision that serves to broaden perspectives and extend relations.
Sight

The visuality induced by the expression the ‘tree line’, prominent in Vizenor’s work, creates a vantage point from which creativity can be enacted when an Indigenous work is set in motion; and the consequences of Carter and Mignolo’s observations come into play. I now proceed in ‘transmotion’ and ‘border thinking’ to convey how an Australian Indigenous creative project is placed and engages with the world from the ‘tree line’. Without such designs to creatively discuss and apply the semiotics of Vizenor’s trickster discourse, I suggest, we remain inhabitants of the world of the social sciences, relating only through translations and interpretations of his work.

In a colonised country, like Australia, where no Treaties exist, the tree line is a significant part of everyday life. We travel along highways and byways between tree lines that trace the relentless coveting of our lands, resources, and sorrowfully signal all which that impacts. In other places the trees are scattered by the pastoral industry, where landscapes resembling the English countryside symbolise both settlement and unsettlement; while in towns and cities, the congested traffic in holiday season, resembling ants as the population evacuates, reveals a silenced hungering for the erased tree line. These are the signs of the double consciousness of belonging and not belonging in the transience of the society of the wheel and real estate market; a condition Paul Carter (2006) ascribes to “emancipated from all traditional obligations, heirs to modernity’s dispensation seek to conceal their origins … and the important thing is not to come from somewhere but to have successfully left it behind (p. 6)”.

Perhaps too, at the constantly retreating tree line of modern society, and within that double consciousness, has grown a constant subconscious fear of death? An imagined but conceivable imminent, stealthy, drone like attack, representing the perils of technological civilisation, which at the tree line, replaces the fear of hidden dangers of the forest/bush and an imagined Native primitivism? The tree line makes visible Camus’ perception that “The order, the strength, the economic power are there. The heart trembles in front of so much admirable inhumanity (quoted in Manifest Manners, Vizenor, 1994, cover page).”

Creativity

“Colourise Festival 2013: eARTh” arose from a concern about the absence of the majority of the Indigenous population at the cultural interface of Brisbane, but where Indigenous art is captured in galleries, theatres, cultural centres, libraries, museums and ‘culturally inclusive’ events; a story of stasis, a narrative of ‘manifest manners’ invented by the coloniser for the coloniser, as Vizenor depicts. After over 30 years of creative work, that included public television and community performance, film-making, writing and media-arts, I took flight from the debilitating constraints and mediocrity induced by such captivity. A progression of survivance in the legal challenges for Indigenous land rights, had brought transmotion to the borders of Turrbal, Jagara and the city of Brisbane, returning to country Vizenor’s idea of ‘creation stories, totemic visions, [and] reincarnation . . . that sense of native motion and active presence, a sui generis sovereignty’, causing ripples of latent creative energy seeking renewal and new beginnings.

It all began in conversation, a ‘reservoir of the ways of life and modes of thinking that have been disqualified by Christian theology since the Renaissance’. A discourse in Place mulling over, in particular, the pros and cons of Western art, knowledge systems, paradigms and research methodologies, from an Indigenous perspective.
Twenty years of creative work on Turrbal and Jagera countries, had revealed and established local Indigenous customs in Brisbane which put the concept of Place in a significant position in relation to that ‘chance, change and motion, fundamental to the self-ordering potential of an all separating, connecting, halting, diverting, scattering, transforming dynamic’. One conversant with the “transformative dynamics of growth” (Willis, 1990) within the community, articulated this phenomena (Graham, 2006) in saying:

“Not only history but meaning arises out of place whether place is geographically located or an event in time. The saying “the past is another country” is, from Aboriginal logic, pertinent to multidimensional time, that is, all events that have occurred and are occurring within any of the range of senses of time occupy a place (in time). … Place is a living thing, again whether place is geographically located or an event in time. … If chance is the fundamental nature of reality of existence, as described by Heraclitus, then place is the fundamental quantifier, that is to say, Place is a measuring device that informs us of ‘where’ we are at any time, therefore, at the same time, it’s also informing us who we are (p. 7).”

What emerged from discussion was recognition of the Places of significance in the city, which ostensibly marked an Indigenous and colonial social and political interface from which to create a project, to further renewal and new beginnings. Creativity arising from the Place where colonialism and Indigenous sovereignty coincide, converse, collide and potentially converge, it became clear, is dynamic; not just as protest, contention or demonstration of political analytical prowess and courage, but for nourishing the seeds of ingenuity, envisaging and realising the power of our own continuous revolutionary processes, and limitless ideas. It also accords with Kerby’s (cited in Vizenor, 1999) reasoning that:

“our identity is that of a particular historical being, and this identity can persist only through the continued integration of ongoing experience” (making Indigenous sovereignty as alive today as at any time in our past), “because we bring our history along with us, as a more or less clearly configured horizon, new experiences will tend to flow into this story of our lives, augmenting it and adapting themselves to it (p. 64).”

The initial proposal was a website project, “site\sight\cite”, to be constructed by community media-arts creatives, depicting the complexity of contemporary sites of significance to Indigenous people in Brisbane. A response to the destruction of traditional ceremony and historic sites was to identify where Indigenous people and culture are visibly present, or presence is denied, contesting a premise of Indigenous absence and invisibility. Those sites are where Indigenous and colonial society converse, coincide, collide and converge:

Musgrave Park South Brisbane, a traditional Place of Turrbal/Jagera gatherings - St Mary’s Catholic church South Brisbane, an archetype of theological/spiritual controversy - the city’s cultural centre on the south bank of the Brisbane river, where marketable forms of Aboriginal Art are revered – across the river in Brisbane city on Turrbal country, police headquarters on Roma Street, representing historic relations of
coloniality - law courts, also on Roma Street, symbolic of the deep divide between Indigenous and Australian societies – the Anzac war memorial on Ann and Adelaide Streets, evincing the ruthlessness of power - the civic centre, also on Ann Street, and parliament house on George Street, the sites of instituted rudimentary oppositional governance devoid of the harmony in consensus and the ethical resolve for enacting sustainable living. (Note the British claim to sovereignty in referencing their ‘sovereigns’ when naming city streets.)

Site\cite uses the response of the media-arts creatives, to those contemporary sites of significance, to act as a catalyst for cyber-conversation at the interface of colonial and Indigenous society, using a ch@ place on the website. The website provides a virtual tour of Brisbane, a site seeing cyber-walk from an Indigenous point of view, to balance notions of life on Turrbal and Jagera countries. The site also provides access to relevant texts, music, information about Turrbal and Jagera peoples and countries and national and international Indigenous web-based digital creations.

As well it acts as the on-line connection point for both a participatory physical walking tour across Jagera and Turrbal countries in Brisbane, to the sites (listed above) creatively depicted on the website; and promotes participation at an interactive installation in Musgrave Park, in a tent constructed to simulate a touring boxing arena. Surrounded by projections of a mixture of relative natural and creacted images and sounds, participants are matched by a comic Spruiker to go several rounds, digitally addressing contentious social issues. The website is still in progress as the realities of arts funding make such work long term projects.

However survivance progresses us beyond these conditions, to resilience and endurance, ensuring the project continues to develop and be realised. This led to the staging of the physical walking tour aspect of site\cite, in the events Colourise Festival 2013: eARTh, July 2013, and 2014: eARTh – renewal, October 2014, a collaborative and participatory mobile-live-media-art performance and exhibition. The eARTh 2013 documentation is accessible at www.colourise.com.au in the Events tab. The material comprises a video documentary (accessed on Vimeo) of the participatory tour (locations described above), photographic documentation of the event (accessed on flickr), information about Creactives, creative works, photographs and videos projected onto footpaths and buildings during the walk (accessed on flickr and Vimeo), event program with map, as well as participants commenting on their experiences. eARTh 2014 details are also accessible, although the walking tour at that event was shared with a focus on Indigenous produced screen works to inspire our imaginings.

TRANSMOTION IN CREATIVITY

So how do we experience the idea ‘transmotion’? How is this idea enacted so it is tangible and its power touches our lives and seeps into our experiences enticing and implementing ‘chance, change and motion, fundamental to the self-ordering potential of an all separating, connecting, halting, diverting, scattering, transforming dynamic’? N. Scott Momaday (from The Names in Jahner, 1973) speaks of man’s idea of himself as having old and essential being in language. “The verbal tradition by which it has been preserved has suffered a deterioration in time. What remains is fragmentary: mythology, legend, lore, and hearsay – and of course, the idea itself, as
crucial and complete as it ever was. That is the miracle (p. 163).” If as Vizenor says ‘the connotations of transmotion are creation stories, totemic visions, [and] reincarnation. . . . that sense of native motion and active presence’, then creativity can follow suite.

Place and community have always comprised my collaborative and participatory creative processes and practices across time. The concepts of Colourise Festival eARTh events arise from Place and time and are not an isolated, individual creative act, but a continuum of creative ideas for Colourise Festival gathering events, within and for the Indigenous community, past, present and future, and the entire population of Brisbane city on Turrbal/Jagera country. The city construct, subject to profane and constant civic re-design, represents a temporary existence continually renewing itself out of a conflict between the old and new, that can alienate relationships and connectivity. Conversely the permanent land beneath the concrete orientates being, relationality, connectivity in the law and culture of Turrbal/Jagera country.

Sites toured during eARTh 2013 were re-named to mark the continuity of Indigenous society, denoting an Indigenous system of governance and symbolising an act of sovereignty; the mapped tour route with the re-named sites on the Colourise Festival event program, highlighting the absence of justice, lawful coexistence and connectivity in the colonial presence. Their presence exposed a dimension of city experience sensed but often unrecognised or ignored, as eARTh participants walked city streets using hand held mini-projectors, with clothing, footpaths and buildings serving as screens for images of the once life giving and yielding land beneath their feet. The city was repopulated by projected historic Images of Indigenous and coloniser alike, and archival and contemporary video footage of Indigenous people at community gatherings, concerts, celebrations, meetings, ceremonies, corroborees, in their homes, at protests, funerals and so on. An exhibition of visual art by walk participant creatives projected outside the portentous state Art Gallery offered an escape from, and alternative to, institutional captivity. The ingenious articulation of the Indigenous and colonial condition in the ‘Ancestress Rap’ of a young creative at each of the tour sites, inspired an intellectual clearing where participants reflected on past present and future relations and the potential for change.

During the eARTh 2014 tour, at Musgrave Park and the imposing Commonwealth Court and Parliament House buildings in particular, sound recordings were played of historic quotes from imperialist ‘explorers’ and judicial authorities making claims to unceded Indigenous lands. These were juxtaposed with recorded responses of Indigenous people working to remedy these injustices, and footage from archival videos of Indigenous community events, symbolising the on-going dichotomy existing in the active presence of Indigenous society and denial by colonial society of Indigenous rights in sovereignty. Video clips of Ancestress Rap, voicing the social and political realities of city life, articulated the relational conditions of participants and the potential for change in connectivity. This composition of sound, image, place and people created a ceremony inviting reflection and inspiring reflexivity.

Young people lead the walk and projecting, older people enjoying engagement with the city from a new perspective, with some offering comic but informative commentaries when the tour took participants past significant sites of colonial dominance; like statues honouring imperialist rulers and the births deaths and marriages registry, where not so long ago Indigenous people were renamed and identified in English to execute usurpation and assimilation. Following are impressions offered by participants of the 2013 walking tour:
“Being initially involved with organising wreath and leaf prop making workshops for Colourise Festival eARTh brought an interweaving of feelings of reverence and ritual, gathering and belonging, and respect and excitement about what was to come. Then at last we gathered to venture into city night life in recognition of Country, Traditional Owners, Ancestors and community life of Aboriginal peoples; placing wreaths at certain sites to also remind us of our present; witness to powerfully confronting, lyrically astounding Ancestress RAP verse; serenaded by recorded sounds of the bush and Aboriginal music; visually entranced by haunting images of land and people across the night sky projected onto buildings, ceilings, footpaths and clothing; chalk leaves and silent charcoal drawings left on pavements. All brought new freshness an altered state of awareness as never experienced in Brisbane city streets before … and a longing for more.”

“…a journey like no other through a territory, though familiar, maps itself in a myriad of other ways, both sensitive and outspoken ways - sensitive to Aboriginal families, voices, culture and history, and this in contrast to (in co-incidence with) the noise and congestion of the white Australian territory; I felt a part of an Indigenous creative community; I made some friends and was introduced to others; I appreciated the physical exercise; I journeyed through the city from a central (centred?) Aboriginal hub which created a Brisbane city walking experience in another dimension; I felt I experienced Brisbane city anew, in a way that felt connected to Turrbal country, Aboriginal people and places past and present (future's in there too of course); giving respect as well as enhancing and enriching Fiona Foley's creative (culturally, politically and spiritually charged) public artwork (Witnessing to Silence exterior Brisbane Magistrate’s Court, Roma St.) - that's a whole other idea there.”

Drawing on the quandary of the “sovereignty” issue participants were invited to a new website related to the eARTh event. “LANDED Indigenous Sovereignty Australia” was designed to creatively address this contentious issue by making prominent the work of local Indigenous elders writing on ethics and guidelines for a sustainable planet and providing access to other ideas, material and sites that inform and inspire thinking reflection and conversation. The site symbolises a renewed creation story and totemic vision with ‘a sense of native motion and active presence’. The website can be accessed at http://www.indigenoussovereigntyaustralia.com.au/.

The performance of eARTh is dependent upon engagement of collaborator and participator creatively with the idea and framework of the event. An informal and fluid method of working makes creativity sustainable and inclusive, and the development and realisation of projects attainable without total dependence upon funding sources; where criteria is often biased toward idealised Western aesthetic excellence and technological competence limiting comprehension or support for complex socio-political creative content and experiment within a ‘cultural vernacular’, and therefore also impeding capacity. Colourise Festival has gained the attention of a growing number of Indigenous media-arts creatives attracted to participation in community created events outside institutionalised arts environments, that offer the chance for limitless imaginative and
conceptual contribution, and in so doing reinforce a survivance aesthetic. This transmotion is part of the motivation for change in the local community, with access to more local, participatory creativity that are acts of a ‘sui generis sovereignty’, “an ethical presence of nature, native stories, and natural reason (Vizenor in Blaeser, 2)”. The eARTh events are part of a performance of intrinsic connectedness in temporal and spatial relationships creacted in eARTh, a small chronotopic contribution to the vast body of creactive and theoretical work produced by Indigenous people over the last century. Indeed such creativity and periods of development can be regarded as what Bakhtin (1981:84 cited by Basso, 1984) determines is:

“… a Chronotope in the life of a community where time and space intersect and fuse. Time takes on flesh and becomes visible for human contemplation; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time and history and the enduring character of a people. ... Chronotopes thus stand as monuments to the community itself, as symbols of it, as forces operating to shape its members' images of themselves (:44-45).”

SUI GENERIS SOVEREIGNTY IN CREATIVITY

The developments outlined above involve the continuity of Indigenous creative practice demonstrated in many discrete ways, and are part of what King-Boyes (1977) describes as “the total pattern of existence, these art forms cannot be sectionalised but must be considered as an integral part of the whole (p. 88)”. At Yuendumu in Central Australia, for example, where Warlpiri people engage in electronic media, producing community videos, Michaels (1987) writes, they “demonstrate their own invisibility in order to assert the work’s authority and continuity with tradition. They do not draw attention to themselves or to their creativity (p.34)”. Similarly, when video and film production development commenced in the Brisbane Indigenous community in 1985, the production company name, “Murriimage” was used and not individual credits: but this was eventually changed as film funding criteria required that film-makers were publicly acknowledged and credits used as a form of guarantee of the practitioner's ability. Murriimage production – seamless processes, practices and outcomes – arose from the social fabric of the community. Contributing to the wellbeing of society, and the ability to relate and communicate in an Aboriginal way, to inform, educate and entertain is as important a skill component as aesthetic ingenuity and technological ability. Mary Graham (1999) believes that “a person finds their individuality within the group. To behave as if you are a discrete entity or a conscious isolate is to limit yourself to being an observer in an observed world (p. 106).” However, as the move toward market driven product and a national Indigenous broadcasting television station was realised, production support waned, pressing organisations like Murriimage, to seek other ways and means to continue to create community/self-determined media arts product.

Thus creativity, as Louis Owen (1993) prescribes, “insists upon a tradition of community versus individuality, upon syncretic and dynamic values versus the cultural suicide inherent in stasis, upon the most delicate of harmonies between man and the world he inhabits, and upon man’s ultimate responsibility for that world” (p. 143). Also, as the Mexican novelist, the late Carlos Fuentes proposes (cited in Jahner, 1993): “… moral heritage and artistic creations have a staying power that persists, that remains
ever the living past’s threshold to a forbidden future. Artistic creation embodies the moral heritage, formalises it, encodes it in ways that elude conquerors and allow communal recollection (p. 63).”

Spheres of consistent interaction between Indigenous people over millennia have sustained development of processes and practices from our customs and countries that excite the potential of multiple, holistic, sustainable, socially and politically relevant forms of creativity, evidenced by the increasing presence of Aboriginal creativity locally nationally and globally. As such, Place generates, germinates, fosters and nourishes the core values and principles of creativity evoked in the creative work Colourise Festival eARTh. A collaborative and participatory mobile-live-media-art performance and exhibition event, eARTh intervenes monologist practices of portraying Indigenous people as simple, tragic and/or heroic protagonists encapsulated in the on-going (and relatively recent in Indigenous terms) historic political event of colonisation; or as vying for an esteemed place in the philosophical, artistic, cultural and political empires of Western civilisation.

The dynamics of Indigenous ontological representation in eARTh combines multi-arts practices and performs congenial social gatherings with participants collaborating in immediate, public, innovative, contemporary ceremony and rites, on unceded country. The participatory walk across country - perhaps one of the oldest Indigenous customs maintaining familiarity, reviving memory and enacting caring for country and kin - on a tour of the above listed sites, specifically locates transmotion and border thinking, where Indigenous and colonial societies converse, coincide, collide and potentially converge. Brisbane on Turrbul and Jagera countries represents the local origins of that meeting Place.

SUMMARY

In closing the discourse a statement from Robert Berkhofer (1978) brings us to the coalface of social conditions which continue to generate paramount concerns in the lives of Indigenous people still living with the long shadow of colonialism.

“The emphasis on individualism and liberal institutions, more-over, placed Indian tribalism in direct opposition to Americanism even more under democracy than under republicanism. Indians must join American society as individuals in the liberal state and economy rather than as tribes. Cultural assimilation, likewise, must proceed according to the values of individualism and not those of tribalism. What the proper White individual should be and therefore what the proper Indian individual must be represented an absolute antithesis to how Americans assumed Indians lived as tribal members. By definition, the tribal Indian lacked the industry, the self-reliance, and the material desires and success appropriate to the good American. Throughout the nineteenth century, missionaries and philanthropists, government officials in Washington and on the frontier, military offers and Western settlers measured the tribal Indian by their standard of Americanism and found him wanting (from “The White Man’s Burden”, in Vizenor, G.,1981, p. x)."
Such ideas framing the implementation of human services, act as a restraining yoke, not dissimilar to that used in slavery which millions endured in the same era (and continue to endure). Its continuous long term affects generate cycles of poverty, destitution, violence, despair and denigration. It is a measure of both Indigenous presence and absence in modern society, as clans, tribes, communities, families work to identify variable means of restoring balance to places across their countries. This condition is almost a universal experience for Indigenous people whose lands were colonised during ‘the great era of European imperialism’; a condition informing and influencing the ingenuity exercised in Indigenous literature and other creative work. Vizenor’s ‘remembrance’ and ‘survivance’ provide a psychological platform from which to enter these cycles for assessment that activates dynamic thought, creativity and change.

In Australia constant and complex, Indigenous creative development, part of dynamic action for change, is located in the parallel cultural and aesthetic dimensions of diametrically opposed ontological perspectives, most obvious in the different relationships to land and between people. The ontological perspective Indigenous to this continent in the Asia Pacific, occupies a small but not insignificant place in the consciousness of Australian society, due to the colonial population remaining nostalgic about a settler version of history, delinquent in its perversion of those rights pertaining to the status inherent in unrelinquished Aboriginal sovereignty, and consequently largely resistant or impervious to the salubrious influence of an Indigenous world view and knowledge.

Palestinian historian and intellectual Edward Said (1992) provided a concise summary of what underwrites this social condition; variations of this observation also found in the writings of many other Indigenous scholars.

A civilised man, it was believed, could cultivate the land because it meant something to him; on it accordingly, he bred useful arts and crafts, he created, he accomplished, he built. For an uncivilised people, land was either farmed badly or it was left to rot. From this string of ideas by which whole native societies, who lived on American, African, and Asian territories for centuries, were suddenly denied their right to live on land, came the great dispossessing movement of modern European colonialism and with them all the schemes for redeeming the land, resettling the natives, civilising them, taming their savage customs and turning them into useful beings under European rule ... land was there for European exploitation, because Europe understood the value of land in a way impossible for the natives (p.75)."

In the current social environment these disputes, in the consciousness of colonial society, are relegated to the vestiges of their past, those issues surpassed by fear of and concern for the growing technological capacity for large scale military offence and destruction and associated policing, defence and surveillance, with political brinkmanship distracting attention from the perils in dwindling resources, imminent and spectacular economic failure and crisis, and devastating effects of climate change. The majority of the population fail to make the obvious causal links to imperialism and colonialism which evolved to corporate globalisation; with any political analysis skill or ethical remorse weakened by the overwhelming problems of modernity. Indeed in these times of hyper-security there is also the fear of being subjected to that repeated historical tactic where dissenting voices are liable to be
listed, if not already, as enemies of the state and dealt with one way or another placing them out of sight and out of mind.

The effects of assimilation policy, as outlined in the opening quote to this summary, are also another dimension of the long term effects of colonialism which Indigenous people are dealing with as our younger generation, when they succeed in adopting the values of individualism, are seduced by the seeming rewards of materialism and escapism. Constant adjustment to the effects on family when responsibility for children-land-old people cease to be at the core of our values, generates a simultaneous tension and weakening, creating an emotional vortex and spiritual vacuum that undermines social relations and cohesion, setting future generations up for increased hardship and failure. Perhaps the words of American/British writer T.S. Eliot (1943) offer some consolation in regard to these recurring horrendous crimes against humanity and the planet, that are seemingly passed off as misdemeanours (V).

“We shall not cease from exploration
And the end of all our exploring
Will be to arrive where we started
And know the place for the first time.
Through the unknown, unremembered gate
When the last of earth left to discover
Is that which was the beginning;
At the source of the longest river
The voice of the hidden waterfall
And the children in the apple-tree

Not known, because not looked for
But heard, half-heard, in the stillness
Between two waves of the sea.
Quick now, here, now, always--
A condition of complete simplicity
(Costing not less than everything)
And all shall be well and
All manner of thing shall be well
When the tongues of flames are in-folded
Into the crowned knot of fire
And the fire and the rose are one.”

Vizenor intercepts the doom and sense of gloom emanating from conditions wrought by imperialism, colonialism and modernity, with the invention of characters and stories with insight derived from an innate sense of a dimension of life imbued with the dynamics of living transformation. Trickster discourse is the language of that dimension which speaks to a shared ‘sense of mystery, of something that is inexpressible’. In that pervious, adaptable, flexible place we can live inclusivity and never mind the thought police.

During my PhD research Vizenor became my support for eluding the demands and constraints of academic convention. Earth Divers (1981), Manifest Manners (1999) and Narrative Chance (1989), The Trickster of Liberty (1988), became my companions who I introduced to others (and who may also be my children’s and grandchildren’s companions) because they hold the keys to the cell which awaits the
unsuspecting who walk through an unknown gate into a reservoir of assimilation and conformity.

I finish with another quote from T.S Elliot’s (1943) poem *Little Giddings*, the last of his Four Quartets, the ‘incantatory elegance of this symbolist verse’ complementing the topic, style of thinking and arrangement of this paper and also providing closure rather than the exclusiveness of a conclusion.

“What we call the beginning is often the end  
And to make an end is to make a beginning.  
The end is where we start from. And every phrase  
And sentence that is right (where every word is at home,  
Taking its place to support the others,  
The word neither diffident nor ostentatious,  
An easy commerce of the old and the new,  
The common word exact without vulgarity,  
The formal word precise but not pedantic,  
The complete consort dancing together)  
Every phrase and every sentence is an end and a beginning,  
Every poem an epitaph. And any action  
Is a step to the block, to the fire, down the sea's throat  
Or to an illegible stone: and that is where we start.”
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