Justice and American Indian Education: A Reconciliation Approach

John Hopkins
St. Martin's University

INTRODUCTION: INDIAN EDUCATION FOR ALL

The relationship between Indigenous peoples and education has endured a long and acrimonious history. Recent legislation in Montana is challenging this contentious narrative by sparking a new conversation across Indian Country. *Indian Education For All* (IEFA) is the title of new legislation passed in Montana that has the potential to transform the relationship between Indigenous peoples and education throughout the state. Initially passed in 1999 and fully funded in 2005, IEFA mandates that educators and policymakers include American Indian culture and history in mainstream curricula, requiring all students to learn that curricula in a culturally responsive manner.[1] IEFA outlines seven essential understandings of learning, most of which are designed to help all students understand the cultures and histories of the twelve distinct Indigenous groups in Montana.[2] Proponents of IEFA believe that including American Indian culture and history in curricula combats longstanding misconceptions and stereotypes. Other states have recognized the impact of IEFA and have proposed similar legislations.[3]

Some educators have heralded IEFA as a paradigmatic example of multicultural education. Jioanna Carjuzaa praises IEFA's culturally responsive teaching and inclusive curriculum for enhancing the self-esteem of Native students and reducing anti-Indian bias. States Carjuzaa, IEFA is a "model for all educators dedicated to embracing American ideals of social justice and educational equity."[4] Others claim that IEFA's inclusiveness transcends the borders of education, improving Native and non-Native relations. Bobby Ann Starnes claims that IEFA has "helped us recognize that in our best moments as a nation and a people, we reject the notion that there is an us and a them."[5] Native American activist Earl Barlow agrees that "the Indian Education for All Act is a positive step … [and the decision to] fund the clause in the constitution is just."[6] For these individuals IEFA is not merely a positive step forward in inclusive curricula reform: it has the potential of creating a more just society between different cultural groups where separation and animosity have historically existed.

The inclusive discourse of IEFA has productively enhanced the conversation. Yet I want to consider IEFA as an opportunity to examine critically the meaning of justice that implicitly informs the inclusive discourse characterizing IEFA. Carjuzaa argues that IEFA creates "a space for an inclusive 'we,'" such that "educators effect social change by making curriculum more inclusive of all groups."[7] The assumption is that the more Indigenous perspectives and voices are included in mainstream curricula the more Indigenous peoples and mainstream education can move forward from the historical legacy of colonizing education and its enduring effects. However, this conception of justice premised on inclusion misses a critical step in the realization of justice. The nation-state used education as a strategy to assimilate

Indigenous children, the historical legacy of which is still pervasive within the memories of Indigenous peoples.[8] Because of this historical legacy I suggest that something more is required alongside the inclusion of Indigenous voices and perspectives. We must also address the historical injustices of colonizing education and its enduring effects directly, if Indigenous peoples are to enjoy an authentic educational partnership with mainstream education.

In this essay I critically examine IEFA's assumption about inclusion by analyzing key concepts in the literature on reconciliation. The reconciliation literature surfaces important challenges and questions that inclusive discourses entail but tend to ignore. I argue that IEFA's emphasis on inclusion fails to account for the fact that mainstream education and Indigenous peoples need to engage in conversations that confront colonization and its enduring effects. My aim is to use the insights into reconciliation to help make the conversation in IEFA more authentic. The more authentic conversation I propose situates reconciliation as a necessary step in the inclusive discourse in IEFA that would require mainstream education to acknowledge, repair, and take responsibility for the oppressed experiences of Indigenous peoples. For the conversation to be more authentic, these groups must look backward in order to move forward. I begin by analyzing the concept of reconciliation within political theory and then consider how reconciliation can help inform IEFA stakeholders to take responsibility for past injustices.

Reconciliation: A Basic Conception

The concept of reconciliation has become prominent within the social and political literature over the past several decades. Yet theorists debate what "reconciliation" means. David Bloomfield defines reconciliation as "finding a way to live alongside former enemies — not necessarily to love them, or forgive them, or forget the past in any way, but coexist with them."[9] On Bloomfield's account reconciliation requires persons or groups to find the means to live together peacefully despite their historically estranged or violent relationship, so that they may find alternatives to revenge or retribution. Whereas Bloomfield argues that reconciliation ought to bring groups together into peaceful political relationships even after acts of violence or oppression, Pablo de Greiff contends that reconciliation as co-existence fails to foster the attitudes and relationships necessary to create a more just society.[10] De Greiff argues that co-existence does not address deep-seated feelings of resentment between former enemies. Unless resentment is explicitly addressed, these groups will return to the acrimonious relationship they inhabited prior to the state of reconciliation.

The limits of reconciliation defined as coexistence suggest that reconciliation requires something more than finding alternatives to revenge. David Crocker provides a range of definitions for reconciliation, from coexistence to more "robust conceptions … [such as] forgiveness, mercy … a shared comprehensive vision, mutual healing, or harmony."[11] According to Crocker, reconciliation entails such acts as forgiveness, pardon, or mercy between citizens. The aim is to build relationships of civic trust between formerly estranged persons or groups. In contrast to Crocker, de Greiff maintains that civic trust not only entails the ability of citizens

to trust *one another*; it also entails citizens' ability to trust *institutions* to uphold the norms and values guiding society. Building trust implies that citizens and institutions can develop the capacity to be trusted. Yet trust, de Greiff maintains, is something "not merely granted but earned."[12] De Greiff argues that insofar as certain groups within society have experienced violence or oppression, distrust more accurately describes the feelings that would emerge.

While Crocker's definition of reconciliation moves beyond the basic conception of reconciliation as coexistence to more robust forms of trust-building between citizens, Elizabeth Cole argues that these definitions reduce reconciliation to the level of interpersonal interactions between individuals. Cole refers to the work of Susan Opotow, who shifts reconciliation away from interpersonal relationships and emphasizes the need for social and political change. Opotow argues that reconciliation "requires understanding, but to succeed … [it] requires an unflinching confrontation with the underlying chronic injustices faced by a society."[13] On Opotow's account we cannot build the necessary relationships of trust between citizens until we transform the social and political institutions that gave rise to those injustices in the first place. Reconciliation serves as the means by which injustices become visible, compelling citizens to change the structures that caused inequality, marginalization, and violence in previous generations. Only then can society arrange its social and political institutions "in ways that are distributively and procedurally just and genuinely inclusive."[14]

I want to extend Opotow's conception of reconciliation as social and political transformation and situate it as a strategy for democratic nation-states who seek reconciliation with Indigenous peoples. For democratic nation-states whose histories depend on the colonization of Indigenous peoples, violence and genocide are no longer explicit policies. What remains is the historical legacy of those policies, what Jeff Spinner-Halev has called "enduring injustice." Enduring injustice refers to the fact that the "challenge for some peoples is not just the injustice of the past but that they still suffer from injustice."[15] This insight suggests that the aim of reconciliation for democratic nation-states is not simply to transform the hearts and minds of persons or groups, bringing them closer together into trusting civic relationships after war or violence. The aim, rather, is to illuminate the enduring injustices within social institutions and take responsibility to transform them. Unless institutions that embody enduring injustices are transformed, they will become sources of tensions between groups and the possibility for authentic political partnerships will remain elusive.

The Politics of Reconciliation

In "Accommodating Historically Oppressed Social Groups: Deliberative Democracy and the Politics of Reconciliation," Bashir Bashir defines reconciliation as an "intergroup process that is embedded in power relations."[16] Social groups are different from social associations, Bashir maintains. Unlike social associations such as political parties or civic organizations, all of which are voluntary, a social group "is typically involuntary and from birth." For the most part individuals do not choose their ethnic and national backgrounds — they find themselves born into these social

groups. What is significant about certain social groups, Bashir explains, is that their historical and contemporary circumstances are not due to luck or happenstance, but rather to longstanding unjust practices and policies within social, economic, and political institutions. Historically oppressed social groups present unique challenges to the nation-state that inclusion policies cannot fully accommodate. Indigenous groups, for example, demand land reclamations and sovereignty recognition that "go beyond familiar multiculturalist mantras of recognizing or accommodating 'diversity.'" Including them within the rights discourse without accounting for these unique experiences misunderstands their struggles for justice.[17]

According to Bashir, the politics of reconciliation must include three principles. The first principle recognizes "the significance of the collective memory and history of exclusion." This principle takes seriously the stories of oppressed social groups and situates them as counter-discourses to the dominant group's legitimacy and presence in the national story. The second principle "necessarily involves acknowledging the occurrence of historical injustice and seeks to repair them." This principle implies that unless the dominant group acknowledges and repairs the historical injustices toward oppressed groups it will be unlikely that these groups would want to participate in the political process — distrust will persist. The third principle "requires the oppressors and dominators to take responsibility for causing these injustices and offer a public apology." Historically oppressed social groups, Bashir argues, cannot perceive the actions from this principle as symbolic gestures: they must regard these as authentic attempts of atonement by the dominant group. This principle places the burden on dominant groups to repair the historical injustices committed against historically oppressed social groups, in the form of apologies, memorials, or monuments.[18]

Bashir's principles provide a meaning of justice that can better accommodate the circumstances of Indigenous education. The federal government's forced removal of Indigenous children from their families and communities to off-reservation boarding schools is a unique history of colonizing education. These historical events created the conditions of oppression that still linger in the lives of Indigenous communities — and they remain in the background of educational policy. Including Indigenous peoples in political partnerships without addressing the link between historical injustices and their enduring effects renders the experiences of Indigenous peoples insignificant. Bashir refers to the example of Native Americans who will remain distrustful of attempts by the nation-state to establish democratic inclusion until "the past wrongs against their ancestors are acknowledged as an integral part of American history."[19] For many Indigenous communities the enduring legacy of educational practices and policies not only persists within their lived memories but colors their perceptions of education. According to Opotow and Bashir, reconciliation can and must foreground Indigenous experiences and perceptions in order to make them politically visible within educational conversations.

The form of democratic theory that Bashir finds most appropriate for facilitating reconciliation is deliberative democracy. Deliberative democracy facilitates reconciliation, because it aims to "provide the most justifiable conception for

dealing with moral disagreements in politics."[20] Consensus between citizens is not the endgame of deliberative democracy. The goal, rather, is to develop mutual respect among and between citizens. State Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson, deliberation "cannot make incompatible values compatible, but it can help participants recognize the moral merit in their opponents' claim when those claims have merit."[21] Gutmann and Thompson move deliberative democracy beyond procedural processes wherein citizens agree to a set of abstract principles of justice. Deliberative democracy instead consists of an ongoing dialogical process imbued with moral disagreements and tensions. Negotiating disagreements and tensions, deliberative democracy fosters mutual respect between conflicting moral concerns among majority and minority groups. In so doing, it can secure the voice of minority groups, allowing those with different perspectives and moral claims to move forward in open-ended political relationships subject to further revision and deliberation.

While deliberative democracy offers the possibility for oppressed groups to voice their concerns within the public sphere, Bashir criticizes it on two main grounds. First, Gutmann and Thompson's conception of deliberative democracy presumes that citizens regard each other as equals in order to deliberate effectively. Although the historical contingencies of individuals can play a role in the deliberation process, in the case of historically oppressed social groups equality has not been achieved. States Bashir, "the difficulty is that [Gutmann and Thompson] assume that political adversaries in divided societies mutually accept and respect each other as equals." Yet this is precisely what is lacking between dominant and oppressed social groups. Second, deliberative democracy centers on the interaction between equal individuals, not social groups. Consequently, deliberation is applicable to individuals apart from their group membership. Yet the struggle for historically oppressed social groups centers on collective organization, activism, and experience. For Bashir, justice is a collective struggle. Focusing on justice at the level of individuals "depoliticizes social struggles and prevents collective action."[22]

In light of these criticisms regarding deliberative democracy, Bashir argues that reconciliation and deliberative democracy fulfill different yet complimentary roles. Reconciliation supplements the deliberative process by linking the backward-looking strategy of reconciliation with the forward-looking decisions of deliberation processes. By "backward-looking," Bashir highlights the idea that reconciliation acknowledges enduring effects of past injustices; and by "forward-looking," Bashir refers to the role of deliberation in making future-oriented decisions between groups engaged in political dialogue. States Bashir, because reconciliation "lacks regulative norms and procedures for decision-making," the "norms of deliberation become an essential supplement for reconciliation." The addition of reconciliation develops a "thicker notion of deliberation, one which views modes of speech, such as storytelling, testimonies, and greetings, as legitimate modes of speech." This "thicker" notion of deliberation offers a comprehensive framework for acknowledging, repairing, and taking responsibility for the injustices endured by historically oppressed social groups, such that estranged or acrimonious groups can deliberate more effectively over specific policies.[23]

I suggest that Bashir's marriage of reconciliation and deliberation presents an opportunity for a more authentic conversation about IEFA. One of the significant contributions of IEFA is that it brings groups together in a deliberative process to determine how an indigenized curriculum should be developed and implemented. In the words of one legislative mandate, the "education system should work cooperatively with Montana tribes when providing instruction and implementing any educational goals."[24] This mandate requires groups to cross cultural, political, and geographical borders and engage in educational conversations, despite the fact that their history has been entangled in colonizing practices and policies. To be successful, deliberation requires not only that Indigenous communities be included in educational curricula, but, following Bashir, it must acknowledge the fact that Indigenous perspectives historically have been excluded from curricula, which now seek to include them. Failing to acknowledge historical experiences of exclusion does not *include* Indigenous perspectives: it *minimizes* them. Such deliberations will be "thin" and hence less authentic than Bashir's "thick" deliberations, which look both forward *and* backward.

This is not to say that IEFA's assumptions about inclusive deliberation are unimportant. But reframing deliberation according to Bashir's principles would compel education policymakers to do more than find new strategies for inclusion. Bashir's notion of reconciliation can broaden the meaning of justice for IEFA in two ways. First, reconciliation illuminates the conditions that gave rise to the educational inequalities of Indigenous peoples in the first place and prevents the deliberation process from smoothing over the enduring effects of past injustices. Testimonies from those whose lives were greatly impacted by educational oppression would ensure that the colonizing experiences of Indigenous peoples are neither minimized nor erased within the deliberative process, but instead remain central to the conversation. Second, foregrounding both backward-looking and forward-looking approaches entails that acknowledgment, reparations, and apologies are just as important in the deliberation process as the inclusion strategies proposed by IEFA. Reconciliation would demand that to have an educational partnership that realizes justice we must *both* repair the damages engendered by colonizing education *and* include those voices that have been excluded from the conversation.

RECONCILIATION AND TAKING RESPONSIBILITY

IEFA presents an important and well-intentioned legislation. Yet, as I have argued, the inclusive discourse that characterizes IEFA requires Indigenous peoples to ignore their experiences and perceptions of colonizing education policies and practices. The underlying assumption of IEFA is that inclusion is sufficient to overcome the historical injustices and their enduring effects — it expects Indigenous peoples to minimize their educational experiences and perspectives for the sake of deliberation. Bashir's politics of reconciliation not only surfaces IEFA's key assumptions about inclusion: it also enriches the conversation between Indigenous peoples and mainstream education by requiring groups to deal directly with the enduring effects of colonizing education. Bashir's reconciliation framework establishes the claim that no deliberation between Indigenous peoples and mainstream

education can be ultimately successful until the historical legacy of colonization has been brought into the conversation of IEFA. The conversation of IEFA becomes more authentic, I argue, because it requires groups to take the past seriously before moving forward in deliberation.

I want to pose a practical question for consideration: How might the insights into reconciliation help various stakeholders of IEFA take responsibility for the enduring legacy of historical injustices? While Bashir does not specifically consider the issues related to American Indian education, reconciliation's emphasis on taking responsibility suggests strategies that may be applicable to IEFA. For Bashir, one strategy for taking responsibility is helping "members of stigmatized and excluded social groups to reclaim, re-describe, or transform their self-understanding and self-image."[25] Bashir recognizes that the lingering effects of historical injustices have distorted the oppressed group's sense of identity and humanity. Despite IEFA's effort to correct stereotypes and misconceptions of Indigenous peoples, Bashir's description of taking responsibility reveals something more basic. I suggest that reconciliation involves dominant groups working with oppressed peoples to recover their identity and humanity from the legacy of injustices.[26] This resonates with what some Indigenous scholars refer to as the project of decolonization for American Indian education.

Nelson Maldonado-Torres distinguishes between two concepts — colonialism and coloniality — to signal what is needed for specific decolonizing strategies. Colonialism, states Maldonado-Torres, refers to the political, cultural, and economic power of one nation over a particular group through acts of violence, domination, and possession, whereas coloniality refers to the "longstanding patterns of power that emerged as a result of colonialism."[27] Important in Maldonado-Torres's distinction is the fact that coloniality survives in the everyday discourses, experiences, and structures of colonized peoples distorting their self-images and aspirations, such that "as modern subjects, we [colonized peoples] breathe coloniality all the time and everyday."[28] For Maldonado-Torres, the project of decolonization not only refers to the "confrontation with the racial, gender, and sexual hierarchies that were put in place or strengthened by European modernity."[29] But it also refers to the recovery of colonized peoples — what he calls the *damnés*, "condemned of the earth"[30] — from these everyday discourses and structures, restoring their full humanity and being in the world.

The project of decolonization within American Indian education is an attempt to recover from the experience of coloniality in the lives of Indigenous peoples. Recent studies show that Native American students lag behind in nearly every category of academic success, including test scores, graduation rates, and college attainment in comparison to their peers.[31] Indigenous scholars point to the legacy of colonization as the significant reason why academic success remains elusive, from the pervasiveness of Eurocentric curriculum to the experience of racial prejudice and low self-esteem.[32] Challenging coloniality within educational spaces entails situating Indigenous issues and concerns in the foreground of the discourse, such as the aim to revitalize Indigenous languages and cultures. Donna Deyhle and Karen

Comeau emphasize the need to promote and teach Indigenous languages "as a critical means to enhance American Indian students' school experience."[33] These claims point to the political aim of American Indian education: it is less about the inclusion of Indigenous history and culture into mainstream curricula and more about the "indigenous project of sovereignty and indigenization."[34]

These basic insights into decolonization highlight what the meaning of taking responsibility for past injustices would entail for mainstream education. Stakeholders in IEFA would do well to acknowledge the need to create opportunities for Indigenous students that help them reclaim their sense of identity and humanity and recognize the political aims of Indigenous communities to realize greater sovereignty. Mainstream education would take responsibility for past injustices and their enduring effects by partnering with Indigenous peoples to establish various decolonizing projects that reframe the aims and goals of education to align with the aspirations of Indigenous communities. These could entail educational strategies, such as providing Native American students opportunities for Indigenous language immersion or rooting curriculum more specifically within Indigenous values, epistemologies, and traditions. Reconciliation would not only help stakeholders confront the enduring effects of colonizing education — it would help them conceptualize education to be by and for Indigenous peoples.

Conclusion

The politics of reconciliation offers a compelling framework of justice that helps move the conversation forward in IEFA. The question of reconciliation, in fact, has been posed within Native American scholarship. Speaking to Native and White relations, American Indian scholar Vine Deloria, Jr. echoed a similar call for reconciliation four decades ago: "Before any final solution to American history can occur, a reconciliation must be effected between the spiritual owner of the land — the American Indians — and the political power of the land — the American white man."[35] Perhaps the time is right for both Indigenous peoples and mainstream education to consider the full implications of reconciliation. Certainly legislation like IEFA has the potential of fulfilling reconciliation and opening a new discourse for political and educational partnerships — at the very least it suggests the possibility. The question is whether mainstream education and Indigenous peoples are prepared to consider all that the politics of reconciliation requires.

---

1. Bobby Ann Starnes, "Montana's Indian Education For All: Toward an Education Worthy of American Ideals," *Phi Delta Kappan* 88, 3 (2006): 184–192. IEFA began when non-Native legislators — inspired by Native American students — decided to recognize the various Indigenous groups in the state's constitution. While the language of IEFA entered the state constitution in 1972, the curricular mandate did not pass until 1999. However, the state provided no funding for its implementation until lawsuits were filed by Native and non-Native activists and educators. Funds were eventually secured in 2005. Although IEFA extends back thirty-four years from its funding in 2005, significant obstacles prevented its full implementation until recently.

2. For a full examination of IEFA's seven essential understandings, see Montana's Office of Public Instruction, "Essential Understandings Regarding Montana's Indians," http://opi.mt.gov/programs/indianed/IEFA.html.

3. In 2005, Washington State passed HB 1495. For more details, see Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, "Indian Education," http://www.k12.wa.us/IndianEd/default.aspx.

4. Jioanna Carjuzaa, Mike Jetty, Michael Munson, and Teresa Veltkamp, "Montana's Indian Education For All: Applying Multicultural Education Theory," *Multicultural Perspectives* 12, no. 4 (2010): 192.

5. Starnes, "Montana's Indian Education For All," 190.

6. Earl Barlow, "Indian Education: State and Federal," in *American Indian Nations: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow*, eds. G.H. Capture, D. Champagne, and C.C. Jackson (New York: Altamira Press, 2007), 92.

7. Carjuzaa, "Montana's Indian Education," 194.

8. For a more detailed analysis of historical trauma from boarding schools, see Maria Yellow Horse Brave Heart and Lemyra DeBruyn, "The American Indian Holocaust: Healing Historical Unresolved Grief," *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research: Journal of the National Center* 8, no. 2 (1998): 56–78. For a recent examination on the legacy of boarding schools, see Carolyna Smiley-Marquez and Jill E. Tompkins, *Boarding School Healing Symposium* (Boulder, CO: University of Colorado, School of Law, 2011).

9. David Bloomfield, "Reconciliation: An Introduction," in *Reconciliation After Violent Conflict: A Handbook*, eds. David Bloomfield, Teresa Barnes, and Luc Huyse (Stockholm: IDEA, 2003), 12.

10. Paulo de Greiff, "The Role of Apologies in National Reconciliation Processes: On Making Trustworthy Institutions Trusted," in *The Age of Apology: Facing Up to the Past*, eds. Mark Gibney, Rhoda E. Howard-Hassmann, Jean-Marc Coicaud, and Niklaus Steiner (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008).

11. David Crocker, "Reckoning with Past Wrongs: A Normative Framework," *Ethics International Affairs* 13 (1999): 60.

12. de Greiff, "The Role of Apologies," 127.

13. Elizabeth Cole, "Introduction: Reconciliation and History Education," in *Teaching the Violent Past: History, Education, and Reconciliation*, ed. Elizabeth Cole (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007), 10.

14. Ibid.

15. Jeff Spinner-Halev, *Enduring Injustice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 5.

16. Bashir Bashir, "Accommodating Historically Oppressed Social Groups: Deliberative Democracy and the Politics of Reconciliation," in *The Politics of Reconciliation and Multicultural Societies*, eds. Will Kymlicka and Bashir Bashir (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 55.

17. Ibid., 51 and 54.

18. Ibid., 55 and 57.

19. Ibid., 57.

20. Amy Gutmann and Dennis F. Thompson, *Why Deliberative Democracy?* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 10.

21. Ibid., 11.

22. Bashir, "Accommodating Historically Oppressed Social Groups," 64 and 66.

23. Ibid., 68.

24. Denise Juneau and Mandy Smoker Broaddus, "And Still the Waters Flow: The Legacy of Indian Education in Montana," *Phi Delta Kappan* 88, no. 3 (2006): 194. IEFA includes three mandates.

25. Bashir, "Accommodating Historically Oppressed Social Groups," 58.

26. A recent example is the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. In 2008, the Canadian government offered an official apology to First Nations Peoples for the residential boarding school system. It then embarked on a truth and reconciliation tour that documented the stories of boarding school policies and experiences. The goal was to bring the colonial history of Indigenous education into public view in order to reconstruct a new national narrative and the meaning of citizenship. See Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/index.php?p=3.

27. Nelson Maldonado-Torres, "On the Coloniality of Being: Contributions to the Development of a Concept," *Cultural Studies* 21, no. 2/3 (2007): 243.

28. Ibid.

29. Ibid., 261.

30. Maldonado-Torres explicitly uses Franz Fanon's concept of *damnés* to describe colonized status.

31. See Susan Faircloth and John Tippeconnic, III, *The Dropout/Graduation Rate Crisis Among American Indian and Alaska Native Students: Failure to Respond Places the Future of Native Peoples at Risk*, in The UCLA Civil Rights Project/*Proyecto Derechos Civiles* (January 2010), www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu.

32. Bryan M. Brayboy, "Toward a Tribal Critical Race Theory in Education," *Urban Review* 37, no. 5 (2005): 425–446.

33. Donna Deyhle and Karen G. Comeau, "Connecting the Circle in American Indian Education," in *The Routledge International Companion to Multicultural Education*, ed. James A. Banks (Hoboken, NJ: Routledge, 2009), 271.

34. Sandy Grande, *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Philosophy* (Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004), 29.

35. Vine Deloria, Jr., *God Is Red* (New York: Del Press, 1973), 89.