1 Introduction

Comparing Histories of Education for Indigenous Peoples

Brenda J. Child and Brian Klopotek

One of the essays in this book tells the story of a remote Indian population living in northern Minnesota who, in 1900, took a radical position against the construction of a government school in their Ojibwe community. An important geographical feature in this region is a peninsula that divides a large lake into lower and upper bodies of water, and the peninsula was an excellent vantage point to observe any newcomers making their way across the lake. When workmen hired to build the school disembarked from their boat on the southern shore of the peninsula, onto a sandy beach lined with tall grass and towering hardwoods, they were immediately surrounded by a guard of armed Ojibwe men asking them to leave.[1]

This unexpected assertion of sovereignty, while common to this people and place, was not well received when agents of the US government learned of the event. For these Ojibwes, one of a number of small, self-sufficient villages on the reservation, each with a traditional governing system of hereditary chiefs, the indisputable reality was that only they had autonomy over their lands, water, and children's education. In contrast, the Indian agents assigned to administer Ojibwe reservations interpreted this episode (as they did in detailed reports) as an act of hostile Indian rebellion on American soil. In the end, there was a peaceful resolution. No blood was shed, the school was built after a great deal of negotiation, and Ojibwe children dressed in uniforms and attended the new school for many years thereafter. The community incorporated the school and the English language into their ongoing life, retaining their distinctive traditions of culture and spirituality while growing increasingly bilingual throughout the twentieth century. After a few

decades, the school closed when the political winds shifted so that it was more practical for children to be bused to public contract schools on the reservation.[2]

It is intriguing to read official reports and try to interpret this small moment in history that was part of the founding of the Crosslake Boarding School in Ponemah, Minnesota, on the Red Lake Indian Reservation. Themes common to indigenous history and settler colonialism are immediately apparent. In 1900, the United States was still in the throes of allotting Indian lands and pursuing a policy of coercive cultural assimilation. Even the people of remote Ponemah had sent some young people to Carlisle and other Indian boarding schools. By the turn of the century, Indian people had enough experience with mission and government schools to view their establishment as threatening—either personally jeopardizing the health, well-being, and security of their children, or collectively endangering their political institutions and cultural survival. The Crosslake Boarding School is one tiny ripple in a sea of examples whereby indigenous people—communities, families, parents, and children—expressed autonomy even as others positioned them as dependent subjects to be controlled through education. This struggle—a contest over the position of indigenous peoples as *colonial subjects* versus indigenous peoples as *conscious subjects* striving to shape their own world—animates the histories examined in this book. *Indian Subjects: Hemispheric Perspectives on the History of Indigenous Education* delves deeply into how in the United States, Canada, and Latin America, education has been a central domain for the contestation of these issues of subjection and subjectivity.

Indigenous Education Before Colonization

Prior to the arrival of Europeans, the peoples of the Americas had their own educational systems, or ways of transferring knowledge from one generation to the next. While some peoples, such as the Maya, developed systems of writing, most knowledge was transmitted orally, most often from one family member to another. The language, of course, would be taught simply through speaking it, though at times individuals might specialize in oratory or storytelling practices if they had a particular talent, or they might be tasked with learning other languages for diplomatic purposes. Many kinds of knowledge would come through participation in a community of shared values, customs, kinship, language, and territory. Knowledge of gender systems would come from living them as well as from origin stories and other cosmological sources. Ceremonies might be taught through participation, or, for more elaborate ceremonies, a person or group of people might be apprenticed to a mentor or mentors who would teach them how rituals should be conducted,

along with the religious justifications for them. Knowledge of food production, whether it be through agriculture, fishing, hunting, or gathering, would often be encouraged with celebrations of a child's first basket of berries or first buffalo kill. Knowledge of homebuilding, tool making, weaving, arts, and other kinds of manufacturing would typically come from participation in these activities with older relatives. Travel near and far provided knowledge of the land, its resources, its peoples, and its history, and groups developed deep and abiding ties between their land, their religion, their history, their values, and their culture, as Keith Basso documents so powerfully in his work with Western Apaches. Some people specialized in medical knowledge and would catalog the uses of herbs and minerals that would provide foundational knowledge for many modern pharmaceuticals. Knowledge of a community's political system and values, of clan and kinship, of stars and seasons, of heroes and tricksters, of laws and customs—all of this knowledge was passed down orally, through participation in community life.

One of the ways indigenous peoples have been able to retain significant amounts of knowledge despite lacking systems of writing has been through extensive use of mnemonic devices. In an early twentieth century Flathead story that ends with a tick being flattened in a comical way as the mouth of a volcano collapses, the tick becomes a mnemonic device for knowledge of a volcanic eruption witnessed centuries earlier. A Western Apache story about a geographical formation where a person acted foolishly in the past makes that place into a daily visual reminder not to behave in a similar way. A series of pictographs on a buffalo skin becomes a "winter count," used by Lakotas to keep track of the major events a community experienced every year. A person's name might carry knowledge of the migration of their ancestors from one area of the Americas to another, or it might evoke a memorable event in their lifetime. The thousands of individual beads of a wampum belt are used to recall the history of a treaty for the Haudenosaunee, with recitations of the history lasting several days in some cases. Quipus, or talking knots, could be used in the Andes for recording transactions or other numerical information. Mnemonic devices help people retain memory of events that have taken place over extraordinary amounts of time, as well, as in the case of the Klamath tribe, who retain a story of two volcanoes erupting simultaneously in their homeland at the time of the creation of Crater Lake. Their description of the event has been verified by geologists, who date the eruption to seven thousand years ago.[3]

Many of these knowledge systems have been destroyed or significantly interrupted through colonial educational institutions designed specifically to interrupt the intergenerational transfer of knowledge. A near consensus developed among Anglo-American policy makers in the late nineteenth century

United States that Native children must be removed from their communities entirely in order to effectively strip them of the ways of thinking of their parents and their communities. While Native students and families resisted these efforts, colonial educational institutions used every conceivable means to eradicate indigenous knowledge and lifeways, keeping children away from their families and communities during times of their lives when they would typically learn vital information about what it means to be Ojibwe, Mohawk, or Hopi. As the colonial takeover of Native lands progressed, many of the skills that used to provide food and shelter for people became obsolete, pushing indigenous peoples to seek out educational opportunities so their children could survive in the new world order, but even in these circumstances, the kinds of education Native people received in colonial educational institutions never matched their hopes.

Colonial Education and Indigenous People and Their Languages

Across the hemisphere, colonial education for indigenous people was initially designed to contain them, to make them into safe neighbors and subjects of the state, with the expectation that with enough effort on the part of pupils and their "superiors," they might eventually become integrated citizens in some degree. In the United States, the land policies of the late nineteenth century were the impetus for the establishment of off-reservation government boarding schools; it is doubtful that a national system of segregated, off-reservation schooling for Indians would have ever been considered, let alone actually built across the country, without this compelling interest. Assimilation, in itself, was the stated rationale, guided by naturalized assumptions of European cultural superiority, but the desire for unimpeded access to indigenous land and resources had always been the less obvious driving force.

At a time when Indian people in the western United States were still defending their homelands and moving to reservations, Indian education was drawn into the political process whereby the United States and its growing population gained access to Indian land, casting a long shadow over Indian self-sufficiency. Those who planned the new schools sought to actively produce new social, economic, and political worlds, not just prepare younger Indians for jobs and life in the English-speaking United States. *Indian Subjects* argues for a view of indigenous peoples, and often the students themselves, as understanding that Indian education was a fundamentally political process, which is why they participated in it, and in the end remembered it, in the extremely diverse ways they did.

Several of the authors in *Indian Subjects* address one of the most pernicious aspects of an education focused on spreading and upholding the colonial cultures, which is that schools emerged as primary sites for attack on indigenous languages. In the United States, Canada, and other countries in this hemisphere, Indian languages were regarded as a threat to Christianity and the security and unity of the nation, so schools effectively outlawed them and punished children for expressing themselves in their indigenous languages. In the United States, the Bureau of Indian Affairs only began to close boarding schools and promote public school education more widely for American Indians in the 1930s, by which time Indian people had lost most of their former lands and a great deal of autonomy. Following this vast dispossession, Indian languages were no longer so threatening, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs seriously considered for a time the practical benefits of bilingual education in their remaining Indian schools. Once Indian languages no longer posed any real threat to the land claims of the nation, bilingual reading materials could be prepared, as they were in some Navajo schools, and today, indigenous language revitalization is often funded by state and federal programs.[4] While the correlation is starkly evident, the eradication of indigenous languages was tightly linked to the dissolution of indigenous sovereignty and the assertion of colonial sovereignty over the land.

In Latin America, similar trends prevailed. Debates from the earliest years of conquest about whether to use Spanish exclusively or to allow the use of Native languages tilted toward the exclusive use of the colonial language at moments of political unrest in the Andes, for example.[5] Mandatory Castilianization was deployed as a weapon to undermine indigenous resistance and proclaim absolute Spanish authority. In later years, the predominantly Spanish creole elites who fought for independence from Spain also sought to distinguish themselves from local Native populations, leading to similarly assimilationist policies on indigenous languages.[6] As in the US, only after indigenous land tenure and political systems had been effectively contained was there a commitment from state actors to protect languages in any degree.

As a result, indigenous communities are trying to preserve or resuscitate their languages throughout the Americas and the Anglo settler states, but they face a dilemma: European languages are politically, economically, and socially empowered, while indigenous languages are consequently disempowered. In order to access power for indigenous communities in their relations to the state and to the global economy, indigenous people need to be educated in colonial languages. And yet education in colonial languages is the very problem they are fighting against, and there is considerable debate over the extent to which bilingual education (versus immersive education) defies or promotes assimilationism in different contexts. It is clear in all cases, however,

that the economic, political, and social structures of colonialism place a significant burden on indigenous languages. *Indian Subjects* illuminates the multifaceted and changing history of language in indigenous education, and encourages comparative perspectives. Once linked solely to language decline and endangerment, educational institutions now appear to some to be a potential stabilizing force in the recovery of our languages.

Race, Segregation, and Indigenous Education

A core understanding within *Indian Subjects* is that race and the ideology of white supremacy are fundamental to indigenous educational history. Any story involving education that separated Natives from Europeans, African Americans, and others must involve a conversation about race, regardless of region or country. Some scholarship has already demonstrated the value of attention to racial thinking in comparative work on indigenous education. Margaret Jacobs reveals that although policies calling for the removal of indigenous children from their homes in the United States and Australia were remarkably similar, "it was the specter of 'miscegenation' between white and black Americans, not the American government's treatment of American Indians," that guided ideas about indigenous educational policy in Australia.[7] It is almost baffling that the influence of racial thinking beyond the Indian-white dyad has been so understudied in US Indian educational histories, as well. One of the strengths of comparative work is that it illustrates the complexities and contradictions of colonial education worldwide and allows us to draw new and larger conclusions about these projects.

While broader race relations are rarely discussed in histories of indigenous education, neither is the establishment of federal boarding schools for American Indians included in the historical narrative of segregated education in the United States. Rendering segregation as almost entirely a black and white story passes over significant opportunities to better understand how race functioned in conjunction with educational policy. For example, a significant court case in 1924, *Piper v. Big Pine*, illustrates the ways that Indian families undermined some local white supremacist educational policies, even as the courts confirmed the "separate but equal" doctrine. Alice Piper, an American Indian girl in California, fought for her right to attend the local white school instead of a nearby Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) establishment.[8] She had been excluded from enrollment on the basis of her race under the California separation of the races statute, which stated:

> *The governing body of the school district shall have power to exclude children of filthy or vicious habits, or children suffering from contagious or infectious diseases,*

> *and also to establish separate schools for Indian children and for children of Chinese, Japanese, or Mongolian parentage. When such separate schools are established, Indian children or children of Chinese, Japanese, or Mongolian parentage must not be admitted into any other school.*[9]

Arguing that the state was obliged to provide education for all children, the California Supreme Court ruled that Indian students must be admitted to public schools in California, even if their parents lived on reservations and paid no taxes to the state, and even if there were a BIA school available to them. The court affirmed that the school district could set up a separate school for Indians, but ruled that unless and until that happened, Indian students were to be allowed to attend school with whites. While not exactly a crushing blow to white supremacy, the case did manage to integrate Indian students into some white schools, and established the right of Indian students to attend public schools in the state of California. Moreover, it stands as evidence of the ways in which Indians were grouped with people of other races in local (rather than federal) segregation policies, and the ways Indians fought against those policies.[10] Educational policy, in fact, was a central means of establishing, protecting, and contesting the privileges of whiteness throughout the country, so bringing these bodies of literature into conversation with one another will certainly prove fruitful for scholars of race and the history of education.

Exploring and Comparing Regional Histories

Perhaps because of the need to understand the complexity of indigenous experiences with boarding school education on the mainland of the United States, scholars have focused less on the broader history of public school integration, and excluded the fascinating development of indigenous education in Alaska and Hawaii until recently.[11] Any survey of colonial education systems demonstrates their similarities and differences, contradictions and complexities. In the United States, Canada, and Latin America, these educational projects typically began as mission schools or other proselytizing methods, determined to "civilize" children and often adults through religious instruction and other efforts to convince indigenous peoples to emulate European lifestyles. Unevenly, colonial state powers intervened to gain control of indigenous education, with the US government asserting control over every aspect of Indian education by the late nineteenth century and the Canadian and Venezuelan governments leaving the job to religious orders as late as the 1960s and 1970s. Schools in every region favored a gendered manual labor curriculum, where children would spend a portion of the day

learning traditional subjects, such as math and reading, before receiving lessons in sewing, cooking, and cleaning for the girls, and trade skills such as carpentry and farming for the boys. Such schools usually completely suppressed indigenous languages as part of the "civilization" process. Over the course of the twentieth century, indigenous peoples slowly regained some control over their children's schooling, and most of the historiography points to the 1960s as a turning point in colonial education, with the founding of Native studies departments in the United States and Canada, the eradication of the Native Schools system in New Zealand, and the rise of indigenous movements in Latin America that pushed for bilingual, bicultural community schools to replace state-sponsored, Spanish-only schools that were designed to nationalize the indigenous population.

Canada's long history of colonial indigenous education begins with schools established by missionaries accompanying the first French settlers. These efforts often focused on providing day schools for First Nations peoples. The Indian Acts of 1876 and 1880 changed indigenous status, however, as they unilaterally abolished First Nations self-governance and placed social services, such as education, under government control through the newly established Department of Indian Affairs. In addition, the government commissioned a report in 1879 to evaluate the US policy of creating boarding schools for Indians that would remove children from the influence of their families and communities for the majority of their formative years. The Davin Report advocated for similar institutions in Canada with the recommendation that they would be run by missionaries. As in the United States, curriculum in these schools focused on practical training in order to prepare children for their future roles as farmers and housewives, and children attended for ten months of the year. In Canada, the results of this system were more complicated than the government anticipated. Often students returned to their reserves to become leaders, while others entered the labor market and competed with Euro-American workers. As one minister for Indian Affairs noted in 1897, "we are educating these Indians to compete industrially with our own peoples, which seems to me a very undesirable use of public money." The government, perceiving Indian education as too generous, reduced the services available to First Nations peoples beginning in 1910 and emphasized low cost schooling thereafter.[12]

Education for Indians was not mandatory in Canada until 1920, long after compulsory attendance laws were passed in the United States, although families frequently resisted sending their children to the residential schools. Many protested the lack of decent educational opportunities available, but the government took little action until after World War II, when European-Canadians first began to acknowledge discriminatory treatment toward

Indians. In 1951, the Indian Act was revised, permitting Indian children to attend public and private schools educating Euro-Canadians, with government financial support. By the early 1970s, following protests by the National Indian Brotherhood, the Canadian government recognized in principle that control over First Nations education should return to those nations, although in reality this process has been hindered by bureaucratic and legal issues. Some individual bands have taken full or partial control of many of the reserve schools, however, meaning that control over Indian education in Canada is returning to the First Nations.[13]

While there has been significant scholarly comparison of indigenous experiences in English colonial settler states, to date there has been little comparison across the Spanish-English colonial divide, one of the reasons we have pushed for a more hemispheric focus in this book. Nonetheless, a brief synopsis of historical events in New Zealand and Australia is in order, since the parallels are striking and, again, provide evidence of common racial and colonial scripts being enacted in multiple contexts. The points of divergence and local specificity also provide reason to pause and consider what other futures could have been possible in each place.

As an example of the surprising variety of experiences, colonial schools established for Maoris in New Zealand/Aotearoa ended up helping *preserve* Maori language and culture in some ways, despite their overall assimilationist effect. As in both the United States and Canada, Maori education began with a period of mission schools, established in 1816 and designed to assimilate children into British culture. In the 1830s, Maori learned through missionaries how to read and write their own language and eagerly embraced the new technology. A number of nineteenth century Maori language newspapers and manuscripts have survived, providing a valuable resource for contemporary Maori people. Mission schools lasted until the Land Wars of the 1860s forced their closure. In 1867, dissatisfied with the existing arrangement, the Crown passed the Native Schools Act, establishing the centrally controlled Native Schools system that existed for almost a century. The Act placed the responsibility for these schools on the Maori themselves. Communities had to write to request a school, gift a piece of land for the building, and help pay the cost of a teacher and schoolhouse. The geographical location of the schools often meant that Maori could and did undermine the Crown's assimilationist objectives, as they were isolated from bureaucratic centers. As such, Native Schools sometimes promoted Maori culture, despite their otherwise assimilationist curriculum, and the Native Schools system was finally dismantled in 1969.[14]

While Maori schools contributed to the survival of Maori language and communities in New Zealand, Aboriginal education in Australia has a far

more troubled history. While mission schools existed, until the mid-twentieth century, educational opportunities were either nonexistent or restricted to lower elementary school levels taught in mismanaged and segregated schools. Through much of the twentieth century the Australian government forcibly removed many thousands of mixed-blood Aboriginal children from their homes to be educated in assimilationist schools. The aim and policy of these schools was to *never* send the children back to their families and communities, but rather to force them to marry whites and breed out their Aboriginal features over multiple generations.[15] During the Depression, efforts to control indigenous peoples intensified as Aboriginal people continued to be forcibly relocated to reserves on the basis that they needed to be "trained" for citizenship. This education, like that of other indigenous peoples, focused on manual labor and preparing children for futures in working-class trades.

In 1951, the Australian government introduced a new assimilation policy, designed to ensure Aboriginal people could join Australian society. During this period, Aboriginal children began to enter mainstream schools, but faced issues of racism and discrimination in the classroom as teachers were deeply influenced by dominant racial theories about them. Despite a policy shift toward self-determination in 1972 and self-management in 1975, educational issues continue, as racist attitudes persist and high dropout rates remain for Aboriginal youth.[16]

Shifting back to the Americas, we see similar ways of thinking about indigenous peoples and their education. In Mexico, history is again replete with examples of missionization in the early years to convert Native peoples into Christians who would speak a European language, adopt European practices, and reject indigenous lifeways. After Mexico won independence from Spain, missions were secularized and the treatment of Indians varied widely, with President Benito Juarez being remembered as a protector of Indians and the dictator Porfirio Diaz known as a scourge of Indians and campesinos. In the post-revolutionary period, indigenous education focused on rural schools, reflecting a distinct Mexican understanding of what it meant to be an *indio*. In particular, education debates centered on the roles Indians would play in society. Conservatives maintained that Indians needed separate communities, whereas liberals thought that Indians needed to be assimilated into a national culture. Both groups therefore considered Indians a problem, but debated over whether separation or inclusion would be the best solution. After the Mexican Revolution, from 1910 to 1920, the government focused on reorganizing the country through nationalism, incorporating indigenous peoples into a larger Mexican identity, in which Mexicans were the best of both indigenous and European races, with African heritage virtually absent from nationalist narratives. In doing so, they also appropriated Indians of the

past as Mexican heroes, thereby laying claim to an indigenous heritage, but simultaneously placing that indigenous identity firmly in the past, a practice Philip Deloria has also noted in the United States.[17] As historian Alexander Dawson has phrased it: "Indians would contribute their artistic sensibilities and glorious past, but would be assimilated into a civilization defined by science, rationality, and modernity."[18]

The links between Mexican and United States' policies towards indigenous peoples were made more concrete in the 1930s, as John Collier traveled to Mexico to advise its president on Indian policy. Consequently, the Mexican government created Indian boarding schools, which were typically located close to Indian communities and did not force attendance. M. Bianet Castellanos points out in her essay in this volume that for Yucatec Mayan youth who were accustomed to early hard labor, boarding schools were sometimes viewed positively as an alternative to working in the fields at home.

As in other indigenous communities worldwide, the 1960s and 1970s were significant to education in Mexico, as Indians sought increasing control. In the state of Oaxaca, for example, Zapotec communities coordinated social movements often organized around taking control of local schools. Indigenous communities throughout the Americas have recognized the political and cultural stakes of language in education, and thus, language use was an important goal for Zapotecs, who published magazines in their indigenous language in order to teach it to their children.

In Peru, indigenous peoples have conducted a similar campaign for language rights. While some parents actively resisted sending their children to schools, others decided that schools offered valuable opportunities, particularly for learning Spanish. As María Elena García has noted, for example, some Quechua-speaking people in Cuzco believe that "climbing the Peruvian social ladder is possible only by learning Spanish" and so they have advocated for Spanish-language education in opposition to indigenous language activists.[19]

An important issue in indigenous education throughout Latin America lies in defining who is "indigenous." With a high proportion of the population having indigenous ancestry in some degree, indigeneity has typically been defined by resorting to measures of class, location, and culture more than blood quantum, the old standard in the United States. Often, indigenous identity has simply been associated with rural peasantry, which shapes indigenous educational endeavors in powerful ways. As Alexander Dawson has argued, it played an important role in the foundation of the Casa Del Estudiante Indígena in Mexico City in 1926. Hailed "as the centerpiece of the government's commitment to Indian education," the school was designed to take "a culturally diverse student population, speaking mutually unintelligible

languages," and transform them into "models of the national culture."[20] In recruiting prospective students for the school, however, class issues seemed more important than race. While the students had to be "racially pure," this designation had little to do with a pupil's indigenous heritage. Rather, prospective students were considered to be "without culture," individuals "with little education, little knowledge of science or the implements of modern living, and a 'backwards' mental state."[21] Thus, cultural elements typically associated with class distinctions seemed more important to definitions of indigeneity in Mexico than genealogical factors. In Latin American countries and the Anglo settler states alike, the preoccupation of nationalist regimes has often been to erase cultural distinctions in a misguided effort to impose "equality" through forced homogeneity, and education has often been a central means of imposing such policies.

Public schools have dominated Native education in the United States, Canada, and New Zealand in the postwar years, though white and indigenous students shared a longer history of integrated school attendance. In some regions of the United States, nineteenth-century public schools were more diverse than in the early twentieth century. In Minnesota, American Indians living near the early city of Saint Paul attended public school in the territorial period, and segregation began somewhere after statehood and with the establishment of Indian boarding schools. In addition, until 1850, First Nations children in Canada were permitted to attend Euro-American schools, though policies after that time emphasized residential schools, and not until the late 1940s did public school integration again become a significant focus in Canada. Still, little is written about what this education policy shift has meant for Native students.

New Directions in Comparative Indigenous History

Indian Subjects seeks to open up the discussion of indigenous education in ways that challenge some of our deeply held beliefs, as contributors explore new scholarly directions and themes in indigenous education, including sexualities and gender assimilation in boarding school, the connections linking education to wage labor, indigenous educational rhetoric, healing and the law, bilingualism, and traditional systems of knowledge. One of the central tenets of *Indian Subjects* is that multinational, comparative research will reveal new understandings of the history of indigenous people. While there is some scholarly information gathered under the rubric of "the history of indigenous education" in Latin America, much discussion of assimilationist processes has fallen under a general history of colonialist practices. Combined with indigenous educational histories in the United States and Canada, such

histories help us see the broad patterns of assimilationism and a global white supremacy firmly entrenched in histories there. Similarly, waves of resistance and *indigenismo* in Latin American countries complicate those narratives, revealing alternative possibilities for indigenous-settler relations elsewhere. We can see multiple dominating relationships in Hawaii and transpose those to understand other contexts. Indian segregation policies all over the United States force us to reconsider the role of race in Indian education and the role of colonial relationships in shaping racial segregation in other contexts. Even our fundamental beliefs about how we define indigeneity and easy assumptions about the indigenous-settler dichotomy need to be examined. Expanding indigenous educational histories beyond the walls of the federal boarding schools and outside the United States helps us see assimilationism happening in multiple ways in multiple places, perhaps leading us to feel less safe in our assumptions that the assimilationist period has ended. After all, is the curriculum of most public schools that indigenous students attend today really radically different from the curriculum of the boarding schools in the 1930s? In the United States, curriculum is still taught almost exclusively in English, it teaches students to participate in a capitalist, individualistic society, teaches Anglo values, still speaks of "our founding fathers," and for many Indians in reservation and urban communities, is still not on par with schools in middle-class, white communities. In prosperous cities of Canada and the United States, Indian schoolchildren still face a daunting achievement gap, with high school graduation a less likely outcome for them compared to white students.[22]

And so we struggle, as did indigenous people in the past, to decide what the purpose of contemporary indigenous education should be. Should we train students in colonial languages in order to give them the best chance to thrive in a capitalist economy? Or should we turn resolutely inward and perhaps backward (in a positive sense) to historical tribal values, less contaminated by colonial pollutants? In a fascinating essay in *Indian Subjects*, Canadian Ojibway legal scholar John Borrows reclaims indigenous traditions of knowledge and contends that even the most mainstream institutions—Canadian, US, and Latin American schools of law—might play an important role in developing innovative curriculums that include indigenous concepts of law, and in applying those ideas to historic and contemporary issues. How do we best twine the two systems of knowledge together, as Hopi chief Loololma suggested in 1890, creating a strong connection to both our indigenous communities and our nonindigenous neighbors?[23] The Ojibwe villagers at Ponemah understood that our own systems of knowledge must be defended, even as we allow for new schools to be built. The essayists in *Indian Subjects,* many of them Native scholars, follow the path of these ancestors, and it is

our hope this book will broaden our collective understandings of indigenous education in the past, present, and future.

Notes

1. See Bureau of Indian Affairs, Correspondence of Interior Secretary Hitchcock, Leech Lake Agency, July 20, 1900. Record Group 75, National Archives.

2. The Johnson-O'Malley Act of 1934 authorized the secretary of the interior to enter into contracts and pay states for Indian education in public schools, whereas the former system required negotiation with individual school districts.

3. See Keith Basso, *Wisdom Sits in Places: Language and Landscape among the Western Apache*; Richard Erdoes and Alfonso Ortiz, *American Indian Trickster Tales*; Candace S. Greene and Russell Thornton, *The Year the Stars Fell: Lakota Winter Counts at the Smithsonian*; N. Scott Momaday, *The Names: A Memoir*; Anthony F. C. Wallace, *The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca*; Frank Salomon, *The Cord Keepers: Khipus and Cultural Life in a Peruvian Village*; Douglas Deur, "A Most Sacred Place: The Significance of Crater Lake among the Indians of Southern Oregon."

4. See David Beaulieu, "Native American Education Research and Policy Development in an Era of No Child Left Behind: Native Language and Culture during the Administrations of Presidents Clinton and Bush."

5. See María Elena García, "Indigenous Education in Peru."

6. See Alcida Rita Ramos, "Cutting Through State and Class: Sources and Strategies of Self-Representation in Latin America."

7. See Margaret D. Jacobs, "Maternal Colonialism: White Women and Indigenous Child Removal in the American West and Australia, 1880–1940."

8. See Piper v. Big Pine.

9. As quoted in *Piper*.

10. Lawrence R. Baca argues that American Indians in several states including California and Montana went to court for the establishment of public schools in their region or for integration, but it was a case involving Navajo students and families in a remote region of the Navajo Reservation in 1974, *Meyers v. Board of Education*, that was a decision most similar to *Brown v. Board of Education.* See Lawrence R. Baca, "*Meyers v. Board of Education*: The *Brown v. Board* of Indian Country."

11. Indigenous scholars have primarily written about boarding school history in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. For examples, see W. Roger Buffalohead and Paulette Fairbanks Molin, "'A Nucleus of Civilization': American Indian families at Hampton Institute in the Late Nineteenth Century"; Brenda J. Child, *Boarding School Seasons: American Indian Families, 1900–1940*; K. Tsianina Lomawaima, *They Called It Prairie Light: The Story of Chilocco Indian School*; and Judith Simon and Linda Tuhiwai Smith, eds., *A Civilising Mission? Perceptions and Representations of the New Zealand Native Schools System.*

12. As Jean Barman, Yvonne Hebert, and Don McCaskill demonstrate in the preface to their edited collection, *Indian Education in Canada.*

13. See Jean Barman, Yvonne Hebert, and Don McCaskill, "The Legacy of the Past: An Overview"; also see Andrew Armitage, *Comparing the Policy of Aboriginal Assimilation: Australia, Canada, and New Zealand*, 103–113.

14. See John Barrington, *Separate but Equal? Maori Schools and the Crown, 1867–1969*; Judith Simon and Linda Tuhiwai Smith, eds., *A Civilising Mission? Perceptions and Representations of the*

New Zealand Native Schools System; Judith Simon, ed., *Nga Kura Maori: The Native Schools System, 1867–1969*.

15. See Jacobs, 458. This history is movingly dramatized in the acclaimed independent film *Rabbit-Proof Fence,* based on the account of Doris Pilkington, one of the children stolen from her family in the 1930s. See Doris Pilkington, *Follow the Rabbit-Proof Fence*.

16. See Anne-Katrin Eckermann, "Aboriginal Education in Rural Australia: A Case Study in Frustration and Hope"; Quentin Beresford, *Reform and Resistance in Aboriginal Education: The Australian Experience*; Ralph Folds, *Whitefella School: Education and Aboriginal Education*.

17. See Philip Deloria, *Playing Indian*.

18. See Alexander S. Dawson, "'Wild Indians,' 'Mexican Gentlemen,' and the Lessons Learned in the Casa Del Estudiante Indigena, 1926–1932," 331.

19. See María Elena García, "The Politics of Community: Education, Indigenous Rights, and Ethnic Mobilization in Peru," 72.

20. Dawson, 329.

21. Dawson, 335.

22. In the state of Minnesota, nationally regarded for progressive educational programming, "two out of five American Indian students graduate from high school in four years" (Minnesota Department of Education, 14). See Pilar Gonzalbo Aizpuru, *Historia de la educación en la época colonial: El mundo indígena*.

23. See Matthew Sakiestewa Gilbert, *Education Beyond the Mesas: Hopi Students at Sherman Institute, 1902–1929*.