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--World Federalists Association (1978, Pg. 3)

1 Wilmer’s work as protector of the Tribal community is best exemplified in work he undertook to protect the humans and the ancestral artifacts located throughout the Rez: https://www.nrc.gov/docs/ML1523/ML15239B083.pdf
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ABSTRACT

Presented in this work is an adapted quantitative research paradigm for use in the field of education, specifically designed for work with Indigenous/marginalized populations coined “Diachronic Research Methodology” (DRM). The model is grounded in a post-positivist, decolonization model, embedded in feminist and critical race theory. DRM is presented as a counter-approach to traditional, empiricist, research methods; a process which, historically, has allowed for a limited and biased understanding of Indigenous/marginalized populations. DRM challenges Western epistemologies and worldviews which have promoted the idea of one grand narrative for all humans, a view argued as beyond problematic and unethical, particularly for Indigenous and marginalized populations. The DRM framework is comprised of three components: a quantitative analysis as a means to study educational phenomenon; a post-colonial historical overview of the participant group; and, a collaborative recourse strategy that is centered on an action plan/grant initiative which meets the needs of the community, directly related to the collaborative.

Keywords: Quantitative Research Methods, Decolonization Paradigms, Indigenous Studies, Feminist Studies, Critical Race Theory, Global Epistemologies, Marginalized Histories, Statistical Analysis in Education, Indigenous Research Design, Colonialism/Post-Colonialism
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Chapter 1. TRANSFORMING RESEARCH, OBJECTIVES & CHAPTER OVERVIEWS

1.0 Introduction

In many regions of the world, a quantitative research approach is a long-standing method of choice for researchers as it relies on the use of collected quantitative data specific to the study, i.e., the region, the participant population, and demographics. Fundamentally, a quantitative research methodology involves “the collection and analysis of numerical data to describe, explain, predict, or control phenomena of interest,” (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2009, pg. 7). This dissertation challenges traditional quantitative research methodologies arguing that such practices promote long-standing, White, Euro-centric ideologies which have, historically, undermined and diminished non-Whites (Grosfoguel, 2013; Tuhawai Smith, 2008, Brayboy, 2005). Within such a context, Natives and/or colonized populations have been placed under the microscope of Whiteness and “studied” by non-Natives, contributing to a problematic narrative in which Whites are considered superior to all others by those same people.

At the same time, it is important to note that research is necessary when used to analyze phenomenon that hinders, impacts, or debilitates a group. In the field of education that is, specifically, what researchers attempt to do: find viable solutions to phenomenon that negatively encumbers society/communities/people via the research process. Within such instances, research design requires deeper thought and innovative approaches for resolving potentially adverse anomalies that might impact one group over another. On one hand, research initiatives are instrumental in our attempts to understand phenomenon within large Westernized systems. On the other hand, quantitative research methods have been used “as an apparatus of colonization,” and, as a gatekeeper within “settler” societies (Morgensen, 2012). As a medium between these two conflicting but relevant views on quantitative research methods, in this work a new research paradigm is proposed in order to address these concerns.
It is anticipated that quantitative research methods will continue to be utilized within Westernized educational institutions because, in general, it is an effective and efficient system that works most responsively for research efforts comprised of large population sizes, as many of our public-school systems have now become. Even so, the following proposed research model, coined *Diachronic Research Methodologies (DRM)*, offers educators and education researchers, social-justice advocates, historians, academics, and others, the opportunity to readdress colonial bias in research and within public school textbooks.

I argue that the present approach and the content used via textbooks in teaching and learning, today, is comprised of narratives that promote misinformation and a skewed view and colonized adaptation of “Others” outside of the mainstream population. Moreover, as educators and academics, it is vital to recognize how this works in education. Whether instructing in front of the class or as a student sitting inside a Western public-school classroom, teaching and/or learning is rooted in a one-sided, Euro-centrist, traditionalist, White, Euro-American model long practiced within the classroom and in the arena of traditionalist research methodologies. Just as troubling is the case for reconsidering traditionalist underpinnings at the higher education levels, in particular, within teacher preparation colleges, which serve as vestibules for academic traditions.

Tuhiwai Smith (2008) and other influential Indigenous researchers and academics criticize traditional research methods and argue that traditional research practices are “highly institutionalized through disciplines and fields of knowledge, through communities and interest groups [of school] and through the academy” (Deloria, 1985; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1993; Semali & Kincheloe, 1999; Tuhiwai Smith, 2008, pg. 124; Echo-Hawk, 2010; Derezotes, 2014; Rossatto, Valles, aguon, jr., Rosario Dickerson, Erickson-Alvarado, 2020).
Furthermore, as Tuhiwai Smith (2008) argues, because of this institutionalization, accordingly, research then becomes “an integral part of political structures” (pg. 124).

For educators and researchers in the field of education, in spite of this valid position, there should be no doubt that the field of research is a necessary one in this globalized world that we find ourselves currently attempting to better understand. Nonetheless, the field of research does demand reinvention, or adaptation at the least, because the current system is

Table 1.1: Diachronic and Standard Research Methods²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Research Tenets</th>
<th>Diachronic Research Methodology</th>
<th>Traditionalist Research Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Axiology</strong></td>
<td>Is reflective and appropriate to Indigenous/ marginalized community value systems in non-Westernized, Euro-American ways, i.e., Earth is not for sale but is to be shared with ALL, including non-human life forms.</td>
<td>A patriarchal value system centered on Judeo-Christian concepts and materialism, i.e., natural land, animal/people/property, ALL are for sale. A heavy value laden system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cosmology</strong></td>
<td>Indigenous concept regarding human origin; the design &amp; development of the universe, nature/God, etc., is reflective and specific to each respective Indigenous community and tends to be nature-centered and harmonious respective to all lifeforms which are understood as interconnected.</td>
<td>A patriarchal value system centered Judeo-Christian concepts in which all is hierarchically, male-dominated, even God/this Universe and all is specific to man’s needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemological</strong></td>
<td>Unique theory of knowledge that reflects community’s traditions and values based on a naturalistic system of understanding, quite like a Western, Judeo-Christian one.</td>
<td>Knowledge reflective of traditions and values rooted on Western, Judeo-Christian concepts that are non-Naturalistic but instead a consequence of an omnipotent “God” who is man-like &amp; controls all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontologically-Sound</strong></td>
<td>Community’s “truths” dealing with the nature of being/life that are non-Euro-centric and grounded in nature</td>
<td>Community’s “truths” dealing with the nature of being/life that are grounded in Westernized, Judeo-Christian concepts, all else is deemed as “untruths/myths.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Please view section on this for furthers.
faulty as it is a residual feature of colonization when it is applied to Indigenous or marginalized communities in manners that are not constructive, and, instead, become culturally, linguistically, and spiritually destructive.

The table above offers a side-by-side comparison of the notable differences between traditional research methods and the nine components of the framework that I will be proposing in this work titled *Diachronic Research Methodology (DRM)*. The DRM paradigm centers on three main objectives and is rooted in nine ethical components, as presented in the above table. To be clear, the DRM framework is offered as a potential tool for balancing traditional, quantitative research methods by addressing the process of research itself when applied to work with Indigenous or marginalized populations. At a fundamental-level, DRM is quantitative; however, the core of the paradigm is specific to an Indigenous worldview, as opposed to a western-Euro-Ameri-centrist approach to such work. As the framework attempts to challenge the current traditionalist approaches to research and its structure, DRM is not
empirical, per se, but is offered as a theoretical approach to research for collaboratives with Indigenous/marginalized communities. As one of the framework objectives requires the use of data, traditionalist want to define it as an empirical study because it consists of some data. I urge the reader to consider it as a new approach to research that encompasses some data and, deliberately, attempts to step-away from the academic norms and expectations that come with traditional research.

Prompted by Tuhiwai Smith’s work and Freire’s early work in the field of education, Freire mandated that critical pedagogy reinvent the field of education, pedagogically and academically-speaking, as well as the institutions that support traditional systems of teaching and learning that have become one-sided or ineffective, as well as biased to the point of dys-functionalism (Freire, 1970; 1973; 1989). Clearly, dysfunctional education/systems serve as structures and systems of injustice. Unquestionably, this reinvention is especially important to do in areas where discourse becomes as difficult as it has, specifically, because Indigenous rights continue to demand attention, even in research methods. Consequently, this dissertation will present a decolonization paradigm for application in contemporary globalized schooling systems.

Throughout this work I will argue that the Diachronic Research Methodology (DRM) can serve as a means of addressing the circumstances that effect, and continue to affect, traditional quantitative research processes, beginning in the early 20th century. My concerns are, unambiguously, specific to work in educational research respective to Indigenous and marginalized populations (Vallès, 2015). Consequently, in this dissertation I will present three specific arguments in defense of the DRM framework and include a robust literature review, grounded in Critical Race Theory, Indigenous Research Methodologies, and feminism. The
intent of my arduous labor and too-long, dedication to the subject is not necessarily to present my work to others, or outsiders, in the hopes of beginning the process of academic amalgamation for the sake of my career. If that had been my primary intent I would have selected a more accepting pro-colonization dissertation topic.

Instead, my principal intent is to bring the subject of long instituted, traditionalist racist/sexist research practices to the forefront of the academy in hopes that we can seriously begin the process of reconsidering the politically-driven, economically-centered, and socio-cultural structures; the “isms” of white, Euro-American practices instituted in the process of colonization. Moreover, I intend to explain and demonstrate how these specific colonial practices have impacted, and continue to impact, the Indigenous and marginalized peoples of the world. Because of the length of the work, and the amount of time it has taken for me to complete the dissertation, I will, periodically, refer to it as a treatise, both terms used interchangeably in order to avoid repetition.

The DRM framework is centered on nine core components (See: Appendix F, p. 428 for visual) which are discussed in a subsequent chapter; however, the paradigm consists of three major criterion listed below. These three, specific, objectives are rooted in the nine core components of the DRM paradigm and consist of the following:

1.) The use of quantitative data in the research design provided by the research community upon acceptance of the research-advocate collaborative

2.) The addressing of the colonial/post-colonial experience within the body of the research report, and in any future publications related to the research project written by the research-advocate, incorporating the perspective/history of the partner community

3.) The incorporation of a third-party external partnership specific to the research phenomenon, established either
through a grant, institutional collaborative, or private funders that is agreed upon by the community partner and/or community leader/s. The collaborative should attempt to address the research subject as specified by the community. Additionally, the research advocate will address and adhere to the community’s instructions specific to the initiative.

In this dissertation, academic and/or intellectual arguments presented for consideration in support for the implementation and/or use of the DRM paradigm, will be argued centering on the following three arguments:

*Paradigm 1:* A Critique of Traditional Research Methods & the Scientific Method: Western Epistemology will be presented as a faulty “cultural broker” for work with Indigenous/marginalized populations specific to educational research initiatives

*Paradigm 2:* A Review of the Literature Specific to Research Methods: DRM will be presented as a judicious research paradigm that incorporates Indigenous Research Methods that focus on the needs of the tribal/marginalized community partnership

*Paradigm 3:* The Impact of Colonization: History, Cultural Trauma, & Continued Issues of Power. The DRM model will address the Native experience appropriately, and from the community’s perspective

For clarity’s sake, the distinction between a method and a methodology is defined according to Walter & Anderson (2013), a method is a “technique for gathering and analyzing information” such as in the use of a survey instrument or through content analysis as opposed to a methodology. Alternatively, a methodology is the “theoretical lens or worldview through which research is understood, designed, and conducted,” (pg. 41). These distinctions are important as this effort proposes a theoretical, decolonization research methodology for education studies, specifically for use in research work with Indigenous/marginalized communities. The DRM framework advocates for the use of a different “theoretical lens or worldview” in research collaboratives not currently used (Valles, 2015).
Central to the DRM paradigm is the recognition that White, European colonization has severely impacted the essence, or core, of Indigenous/Original peoples and their communities located throughout the face of the planet. To undertake a responsible and ethical research collaborative within such populations, this recognition must be a central aspect of the research collaborative, and any further collaboratives (involvement of third parties) that attempt to address Indigenous/marginalized group phenomenon, as such peoples continue to reside within a Colonia/post-colonial world system.

Addressing the Sacred in Research Methods & Methodology

“To us the ashes of our ancestors are sacred, and their resting place is hallowed ground. You wander far from the graves of your ancestors and seemingly without regret. Your religion was written upon tables of stone by the iron finger of your God so that you could not forget. The Red Man could never comprehend nor remember it. Our religion is the traditions of our ancestors. The dreams of our old men, given them in solemn hours of night by the Great Spirit; and the visions of our sachems; and it is written in the hearts of our people...”

--Chief Seattle, (Pg.493).

As the title “Border Crossing on Sacred Grounds, Indigenizing Traditional Quantitative Methods in Educational Research Design: A Proposed Decolonization Paradigm for Application in Contemporary Globalized Schooling Systems,” infers, traditional, White-European, research practices have become “sacred grounds” for Western empiricists. This fact will be challenged throughout this dissertation, precisely, by crossing over the imaginary borderlands of the “scientific” with that of the “Indigenous” borders. Similar to the Euro-American concepts specific to creating “imaginary borders,” or boundary lines, these invented, man-made, devised borders, ultimately, separate nations, states, and communities. Brazenly instituted by the colonizer; under such a premise, the traditional approaches surrounding the
empiricist scientific method cannot be challenged, or at the least, it should not be challenged as there is a negative stigma left upon those who attempt to do so, whether in the field of education or within the *Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)* fields.

Traditional approaches and concepts are presumed to be logical and the apex of truth. The problem is that this is not necessarily the truth for those who do not adhere to such premises, e.g. as viewed through the “self-evident eyes” of indigeneity, whether people of the continent of North America, Australia, or Africa. In too many ways, White-European standpoint, which is rooted in Euro-American, Whiteness, is contrary to Indigenous world views. The use of the word “standpoint” is taken from feminist studies and has been intellectually expanded upon in this work, specific to *Indigeneity*, meaning, through the lens of the collective rights centering on the First Peoples of any given continent.

In this work, *Standpoint Theory (ST)* is defined as the practice of critically analyzing socio-cultural, economic, political, and religious phenomenon from the standpoint of the Indigenous and/or marginalized peoples of this world. This analysis is achieved by combining feminist theory with critical race theory into the *DRM* framework—with the intent to challenge the “ism’s” of White, Euro-American traditionalist research standards. As discussed by Freire (1970), critical theory demands the recognition of the power of the isms, e.g., racism, sexism, classism, etc. and the structures/institutions that support them since Western institutions are embedded in them.

Also considered in this work is an expanded view of the *His-story* of humanity, which is written by the patriarchal-centered “winners” of the colonial/post-colonial world; specifically, the conquerors of the Western world who have dared to step-outside of *their* Indigenous spaces and forced themselves, and their ways, into the Indigenous spaces of
“Others.” Hence, ST requires that researchers/instructors be well-informed of these concepts “the isms,” from a critical theory perspective. Just as important, researchers and instructors are expected to know human history, not as a generalization, but as it has impacted people and geo-spaces.

One of the main arguments directed against White, Euro-American teaching and learning standards, specific to work with Indigenous/marginalized communities, is that science, for many pragmatists, has become a place of veneration wherein “truth” can only be acquired through measurements, quantification, testing, and re-testing. In so accepting this colonial/post-colonial worldview without question, rationalists have stepped away from the human, even the logical, to an extent. For example, this is best represented in the reality of daily life for marginalized population members, whose lives are circumvented with struggle, hardships, chaos, and the constant battle of dealing with colonial, modern histories; meaning that, traditionalist science norms fail to account for the daily struggles that go unaccounted for in research design, specifically, in their work/collaborations with Indigenous and marginalized population members explicit to their place in colonized spaces.

Moreover, when working with phenomenon specific to Indigenous/Native peoples, White man’s science rejects the teachings of Natives, whether Native Americans, Australians, Mexica, or Natives from any other continent, because Indigenous methods are viewed as a primitive form of pseudo-science, despite the fact that great, Native civilizations knew mathematics and cosmological phenomenon way before Europeans ever did. As most mathematicians are aware of, Mayans and other Mesoamerican communities were practicing highly sophisticated mathematics, astronomical practices and science, millennia before others;
still, those regions of the world are, currently, considered intellectually inferior to those of White Euro-American ones.

The field of White, Euro-American research refrains from implementing Native-approaches to research as they are considered numinous areas of study, as the idea, overall, is that Native knowledge systems and teachings remain as something that is saturated in myth, legend, *the mystical*, etc., making Native methods professionally risky, or not scientific enough; hence, problematic for White, Euro-Americans (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, 2012; Grosfoguel, 2013; Rossatto, Valles, aguon, Dickerson, Erickson, 2020). Furthermore, approaches to resolving issues, either in or about research, focus on the negative and/or problematic phenomenon, often times, side-stepping the fact that colonization has encumbered, hampered, and alienated the Indigenous, the marginalized, and in so doing, has contributed further to the daily struggles of Natives/marginalized peoples as a consequence of colonization—meaning, that many of the negative aspects of tribal and marginalized communities studied by non-Natives have resulted as a consequence of colonization and all that it encompasses within the lives of Natives and marginalized population members.

As an alternative to the commonplace, for many empiricists’ science has become like a God, or a way to “get to know God.” The late Stephen Hawking, (1942 - 2018), a brilliant, British astrophysicist, and agnostic/Atheist, reflects this idea in this often-used quote of his, "Then we shall... be able to take part in the discussion of the question of why it is that we and the universe exist. If we find the answer to that, it would be the ultimate triumph of human reason - for then we would know the mind of God" (1988, Pg. 175). As such, for the “rational” pragmatist, so great is science that it is deemed as a way of “knowing” the incomprehensible.
Ironically, an Indigenous worldview recognizes that “sacred grounds” are highly venerated, hallowed spaces, where humans can interact with the Great Creator, and/or the Ancestors; therefore, such places can be crossed in spite of the reverence of the space held by the people. Often times, for the Indigenous, these are “outdoor” spaces set apart from other such “sacred grounds.” They are distinct havens located throughout our planet, but they are places wherein humans’ dwell—if they so choose to. They are “natural” places of veneration, meaning they are untouched by modernity, machines, or man. Many times, “sacred grounds” are Earthly domains wherein unspeakable tragedy has befallen as a consequence of war, death, bloodshed—places wherein much tears have been shed, and because of this, these revered spaces enter an “other” worldly realm which, often times, Westerners have difficulty understanding (Grosfoguel, 2013; Tuhaiwai Smith, 2008). Chief Seattle’s 1854 Oration, as printed by the Seattle Times explains the Native and Western difference:

Every part of this soil is sacred in the estimation of my people. Every hillside, every valley, every plain and grove, has been hallowed by some sad or happy event in days long vanished. Even the rocks, which seem to be dumb and dead as the swelter in the sun along the silent shore, thrill with memories of stirring events connected with the lives of my people, and the very dust upon which you now stand responds more lovingly to their footsteps than yours, because it is rich with the blood of our ancestors, and our bare feet are conscious of the sympathetic touch. Our departed braves, fond mothers, glad, happy hearted maidens, and even the little children who lived here and rejoiced here for a brief season, will love these somber solitudes and at eventide they greet shadowy returning spirits. And when the last Red Man shall have perished, and the memory of my tribe shall have become a myth among the White Men, these shores will swarm with the invisible dead of my tribe, and when your children's children think themselves alone in the field, the store, the shop, upon the highway, or in the silence of the pathless woods, they will not be alone. In all the earth there is no place dedicated to solitude. At night when the streets of your cities and villages are silent and you think them deserted, they will throng with the returning hosts that once filled them and still love
this beautiful land. The White Man will never be alone (Smith, 1887; 1970).

Indubitably, a western worldview is the opposite of an Indigenous one as it is rooted in an ‘archive’ of Western, Eurocentric knowledge systems, according to Tuhiwai Smith (1999; 2012). This archive of sorts is comprised of rules and values that have been developed by and belong to the dominant group, who are the power holders of yesterday and today; therefore, it is their system of knowledge alone, and it is one that is employed on the “Other” by the “Other.” Moreover, in the West, this is forced upon all others by the mainstream population, who are descendants of the colonizers.

Consequently, in the instance of conducting traditional research arrangements with Indigenous populations, or marginalized groups of people, essentially, an unethical and ineffective system of measurement is utilized on non-White, participants and their communities -- in spite of its highly suspicious incorporation as a “rational” system of measuring and understanding. Clearly, as a “scientific” research method, the White “scientist” has forgotten to “factor in” the impact of colonialism. Traditional research methods, as a standard positivist research standard, is beyond problematic for Indigenous and marginalized peoples, social justice advocates, progressive academics and historians, as well as for critical research theorists because it fails to acknowledge all that falls outside of their paradigm of understanding and measurement.

In the instances that traditional research methods are used to measure group socio-cultural dynamics in order to understand their social world, i.e., teaching, learning and culture, as well as educational institutions and the invisible structures that support them; such a method of measurement and analysis must be changed, or adapted at the least, specific to Indigenous/marginalized population members because this methodology is questionable from a
purely principled standpoint—precisely, because it is a system of unfair measurement that is comfortably nestled on the value system belonging to the COLONIZER; subsequently, such a system fails to recognize and implement epistemologies belonging to other groups and cultures (Freire, 1970, 1973, 1989; Apple, 1999; Mutua & Swadener, 2004).

As it currently stands, White, Euro-centric research methods are not only a deceitful practice for work with First peoples and marginalized populations, as it is a tool positioned on a Western, worldview system of order and understanding; at the same time, it is a damning one for Indigenous and marginalized peoples everywhere! How are Indigenous peoples, or marginalized populations for that matter, supposed to be able to “measure up” to a worldview that is not a part of their worldview? In such cases, Indigenous people cannot ever “measure-up” to Whites, as Whites decimated all that was Indigenous with their forced-upon, arrival into, once upon a time, Indigenous spaces. Hence, it seems safe to say that we see the type of problematic statistics we do in education today, specific to Indigenous and marginalized population members, which attest to the institutionalized, mandated differences between the mainstream and the Indigenous. Such practices have, historically, been set by White man’s institutions and practices with the deliberate intent of marginalizing “Others.” It should be emphasized that many Indigenous peoples choose NOT to enter White spaces, even in the realm of education.

Traditional positivists, and their researchers, are willing to classify without addressing the differences in the classification systems that have been created and used, often times, to substantiate what is already understood; that is, that Western colonization has maimed Indigenous culture, language, and society. From the very beginning of the arrival of those people from far-away places in which only Whites, non-Natives, dwelled in -to continents
wherein Indigenous people roamed freely, like the bison of North America to the elephants of Africa, but are now scattered, shattered, depressed, and oppressed. Surely, it is not difficult to understand that there is something profoundly, ethically, morally, clearly, wrong with this type of research practice.

To be sure, there is a paradox in this discussion specific to this “conundrum of sorts,” which I first noted when I began studying research methods/methodologies as a master-level student in political science. It boils down to the recognition that in spite of traditional method’s long racist and sexist history, how do I modify quantitative methods for use in contemporary, racially diverse, education settings, particularly within research collaboratives consisting of Indigenous and marginalized communities?

In response, I concluded that any viable attempts to do so would require a feminist lens embedded in critical theory specific to the research grounded on the collaborative community, explicitly-- from their perspective of history, their geo-location, and the defining communal demographics in which the phenomenon takes place. Consequently, I designed a research tool that addressed these aspects of phenomenon titled, “A Critical & Analytical Framework for Studying Political/Socio-Cultural Phenomenon within Human Society,” (CAF), (2015), which I offer in this work and apply in teaching government to dual college and college students.

In this work, as well, I offer the reader the means to critically analyze the content in this dissertation by applying the (CAF) framework to the discussions that will follow. The CAF paradigm consists of two components which are explained in the following sections and in the figure above. The first component of the Vallès (CAF) Framework, (2015), zones in on the recognition that humans are at different levels of consciousness. Some
individuals are only able to perceive the world at a “micro-level,” that is to say, at the level of the self. They fail to see outside of their reality. They choose to wear blinders, so to speak. In general, they are under-educated, micro-level individuals practice the same communal ideologies as the ones they were
brought up with by traditionally-centered parents, or caretakers. From a Western perspective, the premise of the first component of the paradigm centers on the recognition that the more-educated, the more-traveled, the more exposed to the external world within an intellectual sense, the higher the levels of consciousness-attainment.

*Micro-meso* levels of consciousness reflect a more expanded level of consciousness outside of the micro. In general, micro-meso levels of consciousness are attributed to beginning public school, going to church, joining clubs, etc…, which, then, provides an environment that will, potentially, challenge a micro-level understanding of the world. I argue that once individuals begin interacting with others, their levels of consciousness will be challenged, even within homogenous communities. Similarly, within a meso-level of consciousness the process of stepping outside of our comfort zones begins. As such, the individual will encounter/be exposed to individuals unlike themselves, e.g., people who possess belief systems unlike our own or our immediate community. The once typical behaviors we are comfortable with and accepting of encounter behaviors/cultural norms outside of our micro-meso levels of consciousness. At this level of consciousness, individuals begin to see themselves outside of the community, e.g., “Texan,” “Republican from Texas,” etc…

At the macro-level of consciousness, individuals see themselves not only as a Republican from Texas, on top of the value systems we are foundationally socialized with, but we are now a Republican from Texas who is proud of being an American and understanding what “being an American” means and entails, e.g., *Bill of Rights*, socio-cultural norms, linguistic expectations, historical norms of the country, etc… Macro-levels are specific to the individuals nationality and will be, in general, fixed. Transnationals will possess a more fluid
perception of the world, precisely, because they have a unique understanding of this level of consciousness, as is expected of individuals who live in more than one country. Such people, in most likelihood, will possess a global-level of consciousness, unless they are religious fundamentalist of any type.

A global-level consciousness takes place when the individual is, or has been, exposed to other countries, other people from other countries, other socio-cultural norms outside of their macro-level of consciousness. For example, a global-level consciousness entails perceptions outside of just being an American (macro), from Texas (meso), who is a part of the Republican party (micro-meso), and was raised as a traditional White, Protestant male from Lubbock, Texas (micro). In such an example, at the global-level of consciousness, the individual should recognize that they are an aspect of a privileged population, precisely because of those attributes. Again, a global-level consciousness is, in general, reflective of people who have been exposed to, interacted-with, or belong to groups that are comprised of individuals belonging to an international community outside of our own.

A thought-provoking theme tied to the paradigm is found at the cosmic-level of consciousness which is generally a level-of-consciousness obtained through the latter processes mentioned, e.g. education attainment and/or external travel experiences, and, in general, higher levels of education; in particular, within the fields in science/Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM). Applying the CAF to a Western-view of consciousness, within this level-of-consciousness individuals who come from higher levels of education attainment in line with STEM understand the intricateness of existence, for example, a physicist will recognize that the moon impacts the Earth, as does the sun, in very significant ways; therefore, their understanding of existence is superior to those who do not understand.
As such, a 7.5 earthquake in Los Angeles is a consequence of the tectonic plates, not necessarily a punishment from “God” for being a state that legally recognizes same-sex marriages. As already mentioned, such individuals have extensive combinations of education and travel experience—with the exception of traditional Indigenous peoples who recognize this level of consciousness as a direct consequence of their traditional value system. Native traditionalist recognize the interconnectedness not only of the Earth, but of the cosmos to the Earth, as well.

This most simple aspect of Traditional Native cognition centers on the basic acknowledgement that all is inter-connected, and, at the same time, all is highly valued precisely because of that fact. Often times, for traditional Indigenous people this internal, intellectually-rooted understanding is so simplistic to the degree that it is considered esoteric knowledge by outsiders. Tribal oral history, from primordial time to the present, emphasizes the inter-connectedness of humans, one to another, and emphasizes our connection to the cosmos, as well. This acknowledgment extends itself to the inter-connectedness of humans with the creatures of the planet, the air, the water, and all life forms, which are recognized and understood as all being intertwined together. Furthermore, this Earthly entanglement, with and to the cosmological relates to all matter, even the molecules that make-up atoms. Ultimately, this critical aspect of traditional indigeneity connected to this particular epistemology intertwines every form of matter. To the most miniscule understanding of the essence of life, Traditional Native teachings, going back to pre-ancient times, emphasize the interconnectedness of human existence as found throughout all space and time, to the everyday and mundane.
As to application of the CAF for studying socio-cultural, economic, and political phenomenon, the first component of the framework—levels of consciousness-- are divided into the following six levels of consciousness, as previously explained:

**Component One: Levels of Consciousness**

*Micro-level:* At the level of the “self,” alone. The experiencer is immersed in the “self” and is incapable of recognizing or dealing with phenomenon beyond that realm, limiting their capacity to deal with, or consider external phenomenon.

*Micro/Meso-Level:* Community/city level understanding of phenomenon. The individual recognizes phenomenon at the level of the “self” but also connects itself with a community and sees itself as an interconnected aspect of that community.

*Meso-level:* State-level, the individual understands the two previous categorizations and recognizes itself and phenomenon at the “state” level. They identify and might be involved or cognizant of events taking place at this level.

*Macro-Level:* Federal/country level: the individual understands the previous categorizations and recognizes itself and phenomenon at the “Federal/national” level, identifying the “self” as an extension of the state-level. They identify and might be involved or cognizant of events taking place at this level.

*Global Level:* International/worldview: the individual understands the previous categorizations and recognizes itself and phenomenon at the “global” level. They can identify and might be involved or cognizant of events taking place at this level. This is a typical level of consciousness for transnationals as they have been exposed to a variety of phenomenon, e.g., linguistically, socio-culturally, economically, religiously, etc… which they have had to interact with as a consequence.
Cosmic-Consciousness: A universal-view of interconnectedness beyond Earth. According to the CAF, this is the highest level of consciousness in which individuals recognize and acknowledge phenomenon beyond this planet and White, Euro-centrist, traditionalist views of time.

According to the CAF, Cosmic Consciousness is considered an area of consciousness where the individual may have a background in science or fields in which science is at its foundation. Interestingly, Native Traditionalists from throughout the world, often times, have a higher-level of cosmological-consciousness, which I attribute to Native traditional belief systems. From Ancient Egyptians, the Dogon people, Hindus, to Mayans, Azteca/Mexica, Hopi, Navajo, Anasazi/Pueblo Tribes to the Lakota Sioux, it is not extraordinary, nor unusual, for traditional tribal elders to “know” and live at this level of consciousness.

Although the original levels of consciousness as described in the first component of the CAF, the terms and the concepts behind them, are borrowed from feminist theory, I have taken the liberty of incorporating them and extending them for use in my work with students as for use in the DRM paradigm based on my background in Critical Race Theory (CRT), feminist studies, political science, socio-cultural foundations in education, as well as, social justice and Critical Indigenous Theory (CIT).

The first component of the paradigm recognizes that the development of consciousness is incremental and an intellectual process consisting of rational, mental fluctuations specific to the individuals’ place in the world, e.g. race, religion, socio-economic status, educational attainment, etc..., and helps us to recognize and understand that levels-of-
consciousness further develop as we become more educated, more well-traveled, more interactive with others from outside of our existence. As we do this, we learn more about the history of the human world, our place on the planet, our planet’s place in the cosmos, etc…

*The second component* of this tool stands apart from the levels of consciousness and advocates for the practitioner to not only recognize and consider the variations specific to individual levels-of-consciousness, but to extend those aspects of intellectual cognition to the following three specific areas required for understanding phenomenon. These variables are condensed into the following, as demonstrated by the following figure:

1.) Geo-location, specific to the phenomenon

2.) History, specific to the phenomenon

3.) Demographics, specific to the phenomenon

---

**Figure 1.2: Framework for Analyzing Phenomenon**

1. **Geo-location of phenomenon**: understand the place/geo-location of the event, to include available resources, land features, land disputes, *unique* land/water/environmental features or issues of the place/location of the phenomenon, etc…

2. **History of the Community (macro/meso/micro-levels)**: Go back to the beginning of the history of the place, be sure to include differing interpretations of that history (oral & written). It is necessary to study the specific interpretation of history provided by the community in which the phenomenon is taking place, as opposed to what has been written externally about the place/community

3. **Demographics**: Use of data incorporating
   - race
   - religious make-up
   - age groups
   - gender factors
   - socio-economic levels
   - education levels
   - health (includes data on rates of suicide, smoking/drinking/drug use, etc…)
   - and other common variables
According to the Vallès Framework for Understanding Political/Socio-Cultural/Economic Phenomenon (2015), it is important to study human events through the use of the following:

1) Geo-location of phenomenon: understand the place/geo-location of the event, include available resources, land features, land disputes, unique land/water/environmental features or issues of the place/location of the phenomenon, etc.

2) History of the Community (macro/meso/micro-levels): Go back to the beginning of the history of the place, be sure to include differing interpretations of that history (oral&written). It is necessary to study the specific interpretation of history provided by the community in which the phenomenon is taking place, as opposed to what has been written externally about the place/community by “outsiders”;

3) Demographics: Use of data incorporating
   --race
   --religious make-up
   --gender factors
   --socio-economic levels
   --education levels
   --health (includes data on rates of suicide, smoking/drinking/drug use)
   --and other common demographic variables

To be clear, a feminist-lens embedded in critical theory encompasses that which is not patriarchal and rejects a synchronic, epistemological world view that, historically, is rooted in the ways of “knowing” specific to the perspectives and experiences of White, European, Christian, mainstream groups, who in the West, will eventually become members of the status quo that will, eventually, take control of Indigenous spaces as they colonize such spaces. In this regard, the tool can be a powerful means to get students, and readers, to participate directly in the simple recognition that there really are people who think differently than themselves, and to better understand, or at the least, appreciate why that might be the case.
This way of White, Euro-American, systems of “knowing” is carried, invisibly, throughout the planet as the colonizer “conquers” by military force, economically, culturally, linguistically, and, then, in its control of history and in the institutionalizing of those colonial systems of old. The White, Euro-American colonizer achieves this while, forcibly, taking away Indigenous culture and customs, language, religion/spirituality. Once conquered, Indigenous places and their people, initially, are taught to serve the “Master” while the colonizer continues the process of stabilizing and cementing White privilege in those, once sacred, and now distant, Indigenous spaces (Hegel, 1807; 1998; McIntosh, 2003; Butler & Butler, 2006).

In the following, Hegel (1998), argues that each self-consciousness belongs to the collective self-consciousness, which helps to understand the aspects of “rural” mentalities, and then to apply these concepts to “urban” mentalities, respective to community, or lack of community. Furthermore, Hegel (1998) develops further the idea that:

Culture and its laborious emergence from the immediacy of substantial life must always begin by getting acquainted with general principles and points of views, so as at first to work up to a general conception ["Gedanke"] of the real issue, as well as learning to support and refute the general conception with reasons; then to apprehend the rich and concrete abundance [of life] by differential classification; and finally to give accurate instruction and pass serious judgment upon it… the true shape in which truth exists can only be the scientific system of such truth” (pg. 3).

As an alternative conceptual lens for this work, a feminist approach to this dissertation allows us to focus on standpoint theory, which is succinctly described in layperson’s terms by Bowell (1995) who explains that “Feminist standpoint theorists make three principal claims”

---


1) Knowledge is socially situated

2) Marginalized groups are socially situated in ways that make it more possible for them to be aware of things and ask questions than it is for the non-marginalized

3) Research, particularly that focused on power relations, should begin with the lives of the marginalized.

In addition, as Harding (1993) has explained and emphasized, “starting off research from women’s lives will generate less partial and distorted accounts not only of women’s lives but also of men’s lives and of the whole social order” (pg. 56). This is especially so for groups of people who have been oppressed and marginalized, as women have been for millennia. The use of Harding’s (1983) “standpoint theory” is key to DRM’s structuring.

It should be noted, Hartsock’s (1987) “Rethinking Modernism,” discusses how standpoint theory “significantly alters the basic thesis of feminist standpoint theory by asserting that although women are not a unitary group, white, ruling-class, Eurocentric men are” (pg. 192). As explained by Hekman (1997), “The ruling class, now referred to as the "center," is defined as unitary, while those on the periphery, are the "others," are defined as heterogeneous,” (pg. 192).

Hartsock (1987) and Hekman’s (1997) argument is that we must create a politic that lets the "others" into the center, a center that will "obviously" look different when occupied by women and men of color (Hekman, pg. 201). Still, I argue, that men, like women, are different, even when they are members of the same racial or socio-economic classes, with the exception of the powerholders, who have, historically, been White males in the West. Whether king or pope, White man’s hold on the West continues and is best appreciated when one watches and monitors politics. They continue to be the leaders who wield power, both through
legislation and economically. Throughout the globe, they have been, are, and remain the powerholders.

In the West, they are the hegemony. They create, control, manipulate, legislate, and start world wars. They have created and perpetuated the “isms” that work against all others. Only self-awareness, consciousness-raising, and education can combat this historical norm. This recognition prompts deep reflection, if White, patriarchs have historically held the societal reins over men of color, women, and others, how then does social justice and the pursuit of equality establish itself? Dare I say, is this even possible?

Defining “Indigenous”

“A few more moons; a few more winters and not one of the descendants of the mighty hosts that once moved over this broad land or lived in happy homes, protected by the Great Spirit, will remain to mourn over the graves of a people once more powerful and hopeful than yours. But why should I mourn at the untimely fate of my people? Tribe follows tribe, and nation follows nation, like the waves of the sea. It is the order of nature, and regret is useless. Your time of decay may be distant, but it will surely come, for even the White Man whose God walked and talked with him as friend with friend, cannot be exempt from the common destiny. We may be brothers after all. We will see...”

--Chief Seattle (Address, Pg. 494)

In this work, Indigenous communities are described as groups comprised of individuals/ collectives that have lived and maintained their geographic place in specific regions of the world for millennia. In having done so, they have established unique language systems, distinct socio-cultural values and customs. Consequently, such groups have recognized precise and detailed distinct ethnic practices, specific communal understandings, morals and/or ethics unlike those of other communities. Overwhelmingly, such populations have close relationships with the Earth which is acknowledged in communal practices deeply embedded in protective concerns for the planet and Earth’s life forms.
This type of “nature-centered” bond extends itself to the Universe and is incorporated into an “Indigenous way of life,” as these naturalistic aspects of Indigeneity are viewed as innate and, therefore, are central to individual/group Indigenous value systems. However, in understanding the complexity of writing at a quasi-generic-level about Native populations, the following must be acknowledged early on in this work and is presented in the following.

Complexity of Indigeneity in Post-Modernity

Native populations, like all distinct communities, have grown more complex as Westernization has infiltrated society from throughout the world; consequently, it is important to note the following aspects of Indigeneity:

- Geo-location matters. In terms of global-locality, what may be true for one Indigenous community might not be true for another such community specific to where they might be located geographically.

- Natural resources located in proximity of tribes will impact Native communities. In the US, like in other White-European, colonized spaces, American government has a long history of placing Native tribes in some of the most challenging environments specific to water access, fertile soil, and/or harsh year-round climates that impact human, animal, and crops alike, only to discover later that such communities are sitting on pockets of valuable ore/s, (i.e., uranium, etc./natural elements such as gold/silver, etc.), and oil deposits.

- Native history is distinct from that of the West, therefore, it must be acknowledged specific to individual communities.

- Another “shared impact” amongst Indigenous populations located from throughout the world is the colonial aspect of human history. As Westerners have stepped outside of their original continents and “taken over” other continents, this historical precedent has destabilized Native populations, their histories, Indigenous languages, and tribal/communal socio-cultural, economic and spiritual foundations. This work will argue that this particular fact has deeply impacted Tribal communities world-wide, and that current socio-cultural, economic, and spiritual inequities found on and off the reservation reflect this fact.
• Issues surrounding Indigenous ancestry are complex and can be considered unwelcoming to Nativist-Natives, who are described in this work as groups of Indigenous peoples attempting to maintain a lasting hold on full, Native genetic ancestry; therefore, Native, mixed-ancestry is problematic for such communities.

• Post-modern practices for Native communities located in the US, and in other colonized spaces, have changed in terms of “racial purity,” as a consequence of younger Native population members leaving reservations and moving to cities/suburbs, etc., and marrying/mating outside of their respective community.

• Attending college/university changes the Native dynamic in ways that require further analysis. Aside of increasing education-attainment-levels and changing respective economic status, an argument could be made that by attending Western institutions of higher learning, Native college graduates may be stepping-away from societal/cultural Native norms. It is recommended that work in this area continue Demographics, from the 2012 US Census Report, “Definition of American Indian or Alaska Natives as Applied to the 2010 Census”.

According to the January, 2012, US Census Bureau, Office of Management and Budget, Report, in regard to the definition for “American Indian or Alaska Native,” the Census Bureau determined that US Natives are defined as a “…person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America) and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment. The report states that such populations includes “people who marked the ‘American Indian or Alaska Native’ checkbox or reported entries such as Navajo, Blackfeet, Inupiat, Yup’ik, or Central American Indian groups or South American Indian groups” (US Census Bureau, January 2012 Report on American Indian or Alaska Natives). Furthermore, The January 2012, US Census Report on Native Americans in the US

---

offers a “Native American Population Snapshot,” specific to America’s Native population. It is a quick over-view of pertinent demographical information:

**THE AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE POPULATION: A SNAPSHOT**

- The *2010 Census* provides data indicating that “the U.S. population on April 1, 2010, consisted of 308.7 million” [humans]
- Furthermore, according to the *2010 Census*, [of that number], “5.2 million people in the United States identified as American Indian and Alaska Native, either alone or in combination with one or more other races”
- “Out of the total U.S. population, 2.9 million people, or 0.9 percent, were American Indian and Alaska Native alone” (see Table 1)
- In addition, “2.3 million people, or another 0.7 percent, reported American Indian and Alaska Native in combination with one or more other races”
- Together, “these two groups totaled 5.2 million people”
- “1.7 percent of all people in the United States identified as American Indian and Alaska Native, either alone or in combination with one or more other races”
- “Almost half of the American Indian and Alaska Native population, or 2.3 million people, reported being American Indian and Alaska Native in combination with one or more other races”
- “The American Indian and Alaska Native in combination population experienced rapid growth, increasing by 39 percent since 2000”

It’s worth noting that it isn’t until the 2010 Census that Americans can self-identify as more than one race specific to Indigenous ancestry, according to the US Census Bureau. This accounted for the slight Native population increase in 2010. Individuals who

---

6 **Source Details:** “The data for this report are based on the *2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File*, which was the first 2010 Census data product released with data on race and Hispanic origin, including information on the American Indian and Alaska Native population, and was provided to each state for use in drawing boundaries for legislative districts.”

self-identified as fully Native consisted of .09% of the US population, whereas, Natives who
self-identified as more than one race, exclusive to Indigeneity reflected a .07% (mixed ancestry)
demographic, totaling a Native population comprised of .16%, as shown in the table below
(pg.23).

Table 1. American Indian and Alaska Native Population: 2000 and 2010

These numbers, as noted in the 2012 Report, are representative of a substantial increase in the
Native populations. As will be discussed in this work, at the point in which demographical
groups who self-identify as Mexica/Mestiza/Mexican/Mexican-American/
Latino/Chicano/Hispanic, etc…., recognize their native ancestry, genetically-speaking, the
Native population of the Americas will rebound in greater numbers. As statisticians and
academics, it is possible that we may begin to witness the shift in population-size for Native
Americans, recognizing that the shift is consequent of the inter-racializing of younger Native population members. This is described as follows from the 2012 US Census Report in the following:

“…Among the 2.3 million people who reported they were American Indian and Alaska Native and one or more additional races, the majority (1.4 million or 63 percent) identified as American Indian and Alaska Native and White (see Table 1). This was followed by American Indian and Alaska Native and Black, with 269,000, and by American Indian and Alaska Native and White and Black, with 231,000. Together, these three combinations accounted for about 84 percent of all American Indians and Alaska Natives who reported multiple races...”

(Historical Background Information: US Census and Native Americans)

According to the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File published in 2012, US demographics specific to race/ethnicity have been statistically collected since 1790. Beginning in 1860, the US Census data began the process of marginalization directed against Natives by identifying Native Americans as a separate racial group. One need only to recognize the importance of US American history at that time in order to full appreciate why this might have been done.

As the continent, now called America, whitened further, harsher laws and legal impediments were directed against the Indigenous of this continent, to all degrees and against all Natives (i.e., North America (Canada/US); Latin America; South America; Central America, etc…). Other notable distinctions specific to the US Census include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The 1890 Census was the first to count American Indians throughout the country
- Alaska Natives, in Alaska, have been counted in various respects since the 1880 Census, generally under the American Indian category, but were enumerated as a separate group starting with the 1940 Census

(Above Content Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, Historical Background Information on US Census and Native Americans)
● All states began collecting data separately for Eskimos and Aleuts in 1980

Again, it is worth noting that as a researcher studying demographics representative of Natives/the Indigenous living in colonized spaces, it is highly recommended that in reviewing differing tribes, demographically, the research-advocate should align the data with the legislation/laws and historical events specific to that time.

Furthermore, it is crucial and the responsibility of the research-advocate implementing DRM into the collaborative that they discuss it in their work. These results serve not only as additional data points of analysis, but will, eventually, make it clear how colonial government systems have, historically, aimed at dissolving and proliferating injustice after injustice against the Indigenous of the world. From the USA, to Canada, to India, to Brazil and Russia, White colonial systems are designed, intentionally, to produce the type of statistics currently witnessed throughout the world representative of First Peoples.

Table 1.3: American Indian & Alaska Native Population by Region: 2000 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 due to rounding.
Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Redistributing Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, Table P1.; and 2010 Census Redistributing Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, Table P1.
Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, Table PL1; and 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, Table P1.

The Significance of Urbanization: US Native Population and Geo-location

In terms of geo-location, meaning geographic locale, “The largest proportion of the American Indian and Alaska Native population lived in the West,” according to the 2012 Census Report on Native Americans (Figure 2). However; by 2012, “The proportion of American Indians and Alaska Natives living in the West declined,” whereas, “Native population in the South increased,” again, as evidenced in the table below taken from the (2012) US Census Report. As discussed in the Report (2012), although the “total U.S. population grew by 9.7 percent, from 281.4 million in 2000 to 308.7 million in 2010 (see Table 1). In comparison, the American Indian and Alaska Native alone population increased almost twice as fast as the total U.S” (U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, Table PL1; and 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, Table 1). The data indicates continued changes for Native Americans in the US, not just in genetics, but in population growth. It is expected, if no drastic interventions occur at the macro/meso/global-levels, these growth trends will continue.

United Nations and Indigenous Human Rights

One of the most prominent defenders of Indigenous rights in the US was the late David H. Getches, (1942-2011), who served as a dean, professor, Native and environmental law advocate and attorney who was critical in establishing the Native American Rights Fund (NARF), a nonprofit law firm specializing in Native American issues. While at NARF, Getches served as lead counsel in United States v. Washington, (384 F. Supp 312, W.D. Wash.

8 Figure 2: Note: Percentages may not add to 100.0 due to rounding. Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, Table PL1; and 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, Table P1.

9 The Native American Rights Fund (NARF) is a non-profit organization established in 1971. According to their website, NARF “has provided legal assistance to Indian tribes, organizations, and individuals nationwide who might otherwise have gone without adequate representation.
In 1990 Getches’ established the “Philosophy of Permanence” in the American legal system, which he also refers to as “The Indians’ Legacy for the West.” He explains that Native existence on this continent cannot be disputed to any degree. More important, Native values have guided them from the beginning to the present era, which he deems as most important for Westerners, who will need them in the future as “resource issues are intertwined with economic and social survival” (Getches, 1998, pg. 33). Furthermore, Getches explains, “Tribal peoples have made a wealth of cultural contributions, many of which have gone unnoticed (pg. 33). The Indian legacy most valuable,” according to Getches, is their philosophy of permanence which he appropriately describes in the following:

Just as tribes have maintained cohesive societies against incredible odds by living their philosophy, so can the West…acceptance of the Indian philosophy means understanding how all human activity relates to the natural world. It requires us to recognize that survival, cultural and physical, demands that we modify and limit human activity when it is not in harmony with the natural world (pg. 33)

Throughout his legal work with tribal peoples, Getches never failed to recognize how America intentionally maneuvered through the use of dubious treaty’s. In the 19th Century successive treaties carved away the ancestral lands of Natives, in so doing, the US government establishes reservations in order to “make way for white settlement and to confine tribes to areas were conflict with the settlers could be minimized” (Getches, 1998, pg. 33-34). In an act of deliberate manipulation undertaken by the American government system of that time, aside

NARF has successfully asserted and defended the most important rights of Indians and tribes in hundreds of major cases and has achieved significant results in such critical areas as tribal sovereignty, treaty rights, natural resource protection, and Indian education,” Source: https://www.narf.org/about-us/

of increasing White settlement, the US government also focused on taking the best fertile land, and, the land that housed highly valued minerals, such as gold, silver, uranium, etc. (1998, 33-34).

Getches (1998) offers perspectives on Native rights that encompass “four great occurrences that dominate Indian law, history, and policy,” as he coins them (pg. 30). He explains that they are better understood in terms of time periods, rather than “doctrines:”

1.) The existence of aboriginal culture and sovereignty during pre-Columbian times

2.) The location of separate Indian societies on reservations

3.) The imposition of assimilationist policies, including the opening of reservations to non-Natives

4.) The efforts of Indians during the last quarter century to reverse the press of assimilation by reestablishing viable, separate sovereignties in Indian country

Getches (1998) further explains that each of the above time periods require contextualizing them “with the egalitarian and libertarian laws and traditions of the majority society,” meaning, the status quo of that time and place (pg. 30). He will go on to argue that “Federal Indian law presents uniquely formidable obstacles to the development of consistent and unitary legal doctrine” (pg. 30). The fact of the matter is that colonizing society fails to acknowledge the great injustices committed against the Native peoples, not just of the US, but those located throughout the planet.

The types of injustices that can be easily cited, without any debate, deal primarily with the taking of Native lands through force and faulty or broken treaties, whether committed in US or outside of US then followed by the taking of Native language, culture, and people, either through disease, or attempted genocide. These simplest of human rights are not difficult to appreciate, even when the student of history uses White man’s textbooks to study
that same history. The marginalization of Native peoples is best epitomized by the fact that in
the US they do not have the right to vote until 1924, when they officially become US citizens
at that time. Just consider the irony: Native peoples not becoming citizens in the place they
have lived in from the beginning of time.

As to what and who is Indigenous, it is important to recognize that although
Native peoples, overwhelmingly, practice, Getches’ definition of the “Philosophy of
Permanence,” what must be understood is that each tribe--whether located on Turtle Island or
anywhere else on the planet—is distinctly unique. Sacred beginning stories, cultural norms,
language, etc. are reflective of the community’s geo-location, history, and their demographic
trends, which will continue to be discussed throughout this treatise (Vallès Framework for
Understanding Political/Socio-Cultural/Economic Phenomenon, 2015).

Now that we have defined who are and what is Indigenous, consider the
following tenets taken from the United Nations offered to the world in order to address the
US/global Indigenous experience within the context of Native people, in particular, those
living in geo-locations in which colonization has taken place:

1) in accordance with the principles proclaimed in the Charter of the United
Nations, recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable
rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice

2) in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the ideal
of free human beings enjoying civil and political freedom and freedom from
fear and want can only be achieved \textit{if} conditions are created whereby everyone
may enjoy his civil and political rights, as well as his economic, social and
cultural rights”
As to those Natives whose ancestral home has always been the continent now called “America” by the European Colonizers, to whom do Natives address their grievances against the United States of America? The point of this question reflects the recognition of Indigenous history going back to the point in which White Europeans begin the process of colonization, not just in the US, but throughout the world.

A UN Council is ineffective in the face of a US Government Systems. As I have explained to my political science students, for all its noble and notable work, the mere fact that the UN is located inside the US is problematic in terms of hegemonic power structures. Up until the Trump presidency in 2017, the largest funding came from the United States. In many ways it could be argued that the UN vision on Indigenous Rights is, currently, in a stalemate since the beginning of the Trump presidency. In 2018, Trump has removed the US and its funding out of the UN, specifically, the UN Human Rights divisions, indicating just how problematic any mandates from the UN are at this time in our history. Citing the UN’s “frequent criticism of Israel’s treatment of Palestinians,” Trumps move when unchallenged by the status quo, and the masses. In what is an incredible new component of a Trumpian-American government system, the US has joined “Iran, North Korea and Eritrea as the only countries that refuse to participate in the council’s meetings and deliberations,” specific to human rights.

Some Impacts of White Colonization

"Where the Indian kills one buffalo," said the Sioux, "the hide and tongue killers kill fifty." They said, "A cold wind is blowing across the prairie when the last buffalo fall—a death-wind for our people." (from: Jahoda, 1975, 311).

It has been estimated by archeologists, anthropologists, geologists, and other scientists, that native population demographics for the continent once called Turtle Island, and now referred to as America, were estimated to be anywhere between 8.4 million to 113 million inhabitants, Pre-Columbus, (Lord, 1997, 4; Koch, A., Brierley, C., Maslin, M.M., Lewis, S.L., 2019). As can be seen in Figure 1.3, offered by Lord (1997), Native population was decimated with the arrival of the colonizer, whether in the regions now called South America, Central

---

America, North America, or in the eastern regions of the Atlantic coastlines, up past Canada, (p. 4; Koch, Brierley & et al, 2019).

Koch, Brierley & et al (2019) explain that “The arrival of Europeans in the Americas in 1492 CE marks the onset of disease epidemics resulting in the loss of the majority of indigenous people living in the Americas over the subsequent century (Berlinguer, 1993; Cook, 1998; Crosby, 1972,1976; Nunn and Qian, 2010). The impact of the Europeans on the continent is also shared in Native oral histories located throughout the continent. Aside of the multitude of issues that surround this estimate, such as, how do we really know if no one tracked population numbers, pre-colonization--not even the Natives? I suspect, that the progressive Mayans, Aztecs, and Incans of pre-ancient times probably did so. Recall that these Natives were much more advanced than Europeans from the Common Era; after all, these were people comprised of astronomers, mathematicians, scientist, brilliant engineers, teachers, writers, artist, an amazingly distinct priest-class, etc. who establish scientific information, track time, planets, stars, and are responsible for the creation of a numerical system that incorporates the sophisticated concepts behind “0.” In short, people whose astounding architectural feats cannot be reckoned with to this day. People whose temples and pyramids, by the way, Western archeologist and archeologist claim were built by “primitives,” – or people without the type of tools Western civilizations relied on.

Lord (1997) clarifies that national census-tracking does not occur in European countries until the 18th Century. Sweden’s begins in 1749, the US conducts its first attempt in

---

14 As Lord (1997) explains, “Historian David Henige has argued that many population figures are the result of arbitrary formulas selectively applied to numbers from unreliable historical sources. He believes this is a weakness unrecognized by several contributors to the field and insists there is not sufficient evidence to produce population numbers that have any real meaning...,” and “...argues that the scanty and unreliable nature of the evidence renders broad estimates inevitably suspect, saying “high counters” (as he calls them) have been particularly flagrant in their misuse of sources...”
1790, and France and Britain begin tracking population size in 1801 (pg. 1). Interestingly, one of the most populated regions of the world, China, will begin the process late in the game, beginning in 1953 (Lord, 1997, pg. 1).

It is imperative that it be recognized that there are, still, current archeological sites just barely being discovered in this part of the world; so, even then, Western anthropologist/ archeologists are not fully prepared to answer this in any fully reliable, Western-European, “Scientific” manner. With that said; however, it should be noted that early Spanish, and other European, journal writings indicate that this part of the world was substantially more populated than the places they came from.

Beginning with Amerigo Vespucci to Columbus and Hernan Cortes, European entry into the continent now called America decimated Natives, primarily, due to the biological diseases they brought with them (Berlinguer, 1993; Cook, 1998; Crosby, 1972,1976; Nunn and Qian, 2010). Along with the diseases, such as syphilis, smallpox, and other deadly illnesses that will devastate the inhabitants of the continent, both two “leggeds” and four, these same colonizers will bring other human diseases such as greed, avarice, treachery, etc. Moreover, once Whites begin the process of takeover, they will have the power to institutionalize racism, injustice, and institutionalized genocide.

According to Lord’s (1997) enlightening read on this topic of great relevance, “Alexis de Tocqueville’s cheery assertion that America before Columbus was an ‘empty continent… awaiting its inhabitants,’ was a typical Euro-centrist, point-of-view, fully endorsed by no less than the U.S. Census Bureau. In 1894, the Bureau warned against accepting Indian ‘legends’ as facts,” and further promoted the idea that ‘Investigation shows ... the aboriginal population within the present United States at the beginning of the Columbian period could not
have exceeded much over 500,000,” according to Lord’s work (1997, 1). Tocqueville’s “cheery assertion” is typical of the socio-cultural and religious standpoints early Europeans will stand upon as they tear this continent apart and usurp every last bit of it.

What is known is that the arrival of the early colonizers, whether, Spanish, French, English, etc. was detrimental to the entire Native population of this continent. From a wide-variety of Indigenous languages once inhabiting the continent, to Native culture and spirituality, and we cannot forget the land on which their ancestral lineage begins from, all inhabitants of that time and place, will forcibly begin the process of diachronization. The safest estimates are reconciled in the 1960s, as Lord’s research explains. In Lord’s (1997) work he writes about a Berkeley geographer named Carl Sauer who refers to a 1496 census undertaken by Bartholomew Columbus, Christopher’s brother.

Following European custom, for taxing purposes, Bartholomew’s first “American” census will concentrate on what is now called Haiti, and also, the Dominican Republic, in which 1.1 million Indians are counted, according to Lord (1997). In the following, Lord (1997) explains how even then these numbers were off:

Since that sum [1.1 million] covered only Hispaniola’s Spanish-controlled half and excluded children, Sauer concluded that 3 million Indians once inhabited the island. But a generation after 1492, a Spanish resident reported Hispaniola’s Indian population had shrunk below 11,000…” accordingly, “…The island’s collapse was only a preview [of what is to come]”

“By 1650, records suggest that only 6 million Indians remained in all of North America, South America, and the Caribbean. Subtract 6 million from even a conservative estimate of the 1492 population—like Denevan’s consensus count of 54 million—and one dreadful conclusion is inescapable: The 150 years after Columbus’s arrival brought a toll on human life in this hemisphere”  

Up until the current decade, the population catastrophe experienced by the Indigenous peoples, and, consequently, all life forms in this region of the world, is a matter that has been played down, negated, and/or is under-appreciated by academics, politicians, demographers, etc. not to mention, public/private and higher education systems, hence, the masses.

In the fall of 2015, on behalf of the Roman Catholic Church, Pope Francis apologized to the Native peoples of the world for the Churches long-standing, intentional attempts to genocide Natives, their culture, their history, and their language, even their respective approaches to spirituality and existence\textsuperscript{16} (Rossatto, Vallès, & et al, 2020). This was an extraordinary accomplishment taken on by Pope Francis on behalf of the Catholic Church considering the Church’s involvement in early Native history in the Americas, as discussed throughout this work. Still, it has taken a substantial amount of time for even this to have been done. Similarly, in Rossatto, Vallès & et al., (2020), the authors discuss the controversy surrounding the placement of a 36-foot tall, bronze statue of Don Juan Onate y Salazar that was placed in front of a community airport, as described in the following:

“…sitting God-like, on a majestic horse that stands on its hind legs as it prepares to battle against, presumably, ‘Injuns,’ this statue is perhaps better situated for those who perceive themselves through a Western cultural lens. For the Indigenous of the community, which is comprised of Mestizas (Mexican/Mexican Americans/Latinos, etc.), [and Tigua], the statue for many, represents the cruelty, coldness, and barbarity of the acts committed against First Nations people of this continent..” (2020, pg. 6)

\textsuperscript{16} Source: National Public Radio, (NPR), RELIGION, Pope Francis Apologizes For ‘Grave Sins’ Against Native People Of America July 10, 20155:41 PM ET. Heard on All Things Considered with Kelly McEvers; https://www.npr.org/2015/07/10/421826430/pope-francis-apologizes-for-grave-sins-against-native-people-of-america
As further discussed in the chapter titled, “Reclaiming Indigeneity on the US-Mexico Borderlands,” from the book titled, Manifesto for New Social Movements, Equity, Access, and Empowerment, “These deliberate historical misrepresentations of “Indigeneity” unfavorably contrasts the “injuns” with the colonizing European invaders of Indigenous lands. In such cases, colonizers are portrayed in history (orally, in text, and media) as victims, instead of oppressive occupiers, capitalist predators, and cultural imperialists that neo-historical accounts have recently began to delve into, precisely, form the standpoint of Indigenous peoples and communities,” as discussed in Rossatto, Vallès & et al, (2020: 6). Furthermore, this particular statue, like those of Confederate generals located throughout the US, serve as proof of colonial success and the usurping of intellectuality and self within the same masses that have been “conquered,” oppressed, marginalized, and educated by that same system.

In the case of Onate y Salazar, amongst other post-European invaders of the time, he, in particular, “slayed countless Natives, then preceded to ransack the continent while looting for gold, not to mention, accumulating Native lands gained by Papal Bulls…,” then, precedes to abscond “with their hard earned treasures,” back to Spain —"supported by the Roman Catholic Church of the time” (2020, pg. 6). The extent of his cruelty is best appreciated when one knows that Onate y Salazar will, eventually, be banned from the Americas, when King Phillip, a devout Roman Catholic, is told of Onate y Salazar’s evil deeds committed against early Native Americans as evidenced in the Acoma Massacre of 1598. As Spanish history accounts in early journal writings, as witnessed by Roman Catholic priests present at the time, Onate y Salazar “played a leading role in commanding the severing of hands and feet of Indigenous peoples who resisted colonization,” (Rossatto, Vallès, & et al, 2020, pgs. 6-8). How
does the community honor this history? By placing a 36-foot tall, bronze statue of Don Juan Onate y Salazar in front of their airport for all to see.

Still, it is important to note that Pope Francis’ apology, although much too late, is significant as it demonstrates acknowledgement of the Roman Catholic Church’s, and the Western world’s, role in attempts at genocide, at all levels. At the same time, it must be noted in Western Euro-American histories that under the Church’s direction numerous crimes are blatantly committed against the Indigenous peoples of the American continent. For what Francis’ called “grave sins that were committed against the native people of America in the name of God,” how are such cruel, anti-Christian, forbidden acts rectified? Confession? Apology? I think not.

It will take any leader from the US a much longer period of time to offer any type of apology for similar offenses committed against Natives on behalf of the Protestant/Roman Catholic Church. This is, precisely, why it is important to present specific tribal histories from the standpoint of the community in publications and other work directly accounted for from the Native standpoint. Interestingly, early Spanish journal entries, both from within the Roman Catholic Church and externally, also hold vital and, what is deemed by many scholars as, most-likely, actual historical accountings specific to the early European invasion of the American continent. In fact, it is in my undergraduate literature classes that I first begin to read such accountings.

**US-Native American Historical Timeline**

---

17 IBID, above reference.
In the following section, which is borrowed from a well-documented and academically respected online source titled, “History, US-Native American Timeline,” Native American history will be presented in chronological order, from a Westernized perspective. The chronology is taken directly from the source because of its accuracy, in terms of depiction, that is to say that there is no nationalistic slanting regarding the chronology. Although there is a multitude of skirmishes that could be added, the Westernized summary of major battles committed against Natives presented below adequately presents a non-biased accounting that I think is appropriate for this work.

In the research analysis (chapter 4), a diachronic accounting, taken from the perspective of the tribal community, will offer a more appropriate version of these types of historical events specific to the tribal community. Still, the Western interpretation provided in the following offers a quick overview of significant historical conflicts/wars that will begin once White settlers enter the continent. The contentions center on the beginning processes of colonization and Native resistance to that early, brutal, and deliberate part of American history that, too often, is negated, undermined, or, just plain nationalized, slanting conquest and battle as a significant aspect of American nationalism and Christian ideals such as Manifest Destiny, and the power of Papal Bulls in a time not too long ago.

What should stand out in the following and made very clear as a consequence of the chronology, is the correlation between entry of White, Christian, Europeans into this

---

18 Source: HISTORY COM EDITORS. American--Indian Wars. Editors. (November, 17, 2019). Website: https://www.history.com/topics/native-american-history/american-indian-wars

19 Source: HISTORY COM EDITORS. American--Indian Wars. Editors. (November, 17, 2019). Website: https://www.history.com/topics/native-american-history/american-indian-wars
continent and the wars that they always seem to ignite. This treatise presents arguments, case studies, and data that recognizes that Western European culture should be understood as culpable in this regard. This is not to say that Native tribes did not war against each other, because they did, and to the point that this facilitated White colonization. Instead, what is noteworthy to reflect upon regarding the Western European, Christian, colonial experience is that it has been, historically, capitalistically-centered; destructive to the planet and the creatures of the planet; is embedded in hate, injustices, racism, sexism, and divisions, all under the name of a Judeo-Christian God and the theologically Christian concept of a Christ figure, who in reality teaches the complete opposite of the White-European, colonial agenda.

The teachings of the Christ, who is also referred to as the *Prince of Peace*, undoubtedly, go against the White, European, Christian history, to the point that it is necessary to point this out. This distinction is necessary to recognize and serves as one of the primary reasons for the creation of the *DRM* paradigm. To be clear, these battles/wars are key to the *diachronization* processing of Natives, not just in the continent now called “America” by one of the first Europeans who will begin that tragic era of disease, destruction, and genocide; but, has and will continue to impact Natives from throughout the planet.

*English Arrival to Turtle Island*[^20]

- *In 1607*, English colonists arrived in Jamestown, Virginia, in 1607, they shared an uneasy relationship with the Native Americans (or Indians) who had thrived on the land for thousands of years. At the time, millions of indigenous people were scattered across North America in hundreds of different tribes.

[^20]: Please Note: The entire, following, timeline source: History Channels, Native Americans Time Line: HISTORY.COM EDITORS, Native American History Timeline, (UPDATED: APR 30, 2020, ORIGINAL: NOV 27, 2018). “As explorers sought to colonize their land, Native Americans responded in various stages, from cooperation to indignation to revolt.” Direct Website Source: https://www.history.com/topics/native-american-history/native-american-timeline?li_source=LI&li_medium=m2m-rcw-history
Between 1622 and the late 19th century, a series of wars known as the American-Indian Wars took place between Indians and American settlers, mainly over land control.

Colonial Period: Indian Wars

- **On March 22, 1622**, Powhatan Indians attacked and killed colonists in eastern Virginia. Known as the Jamestown Massacre, the bloodbath gave the English government an excuse to justify their efforts to attack Indians and confiscate their land.

- **In 1636, the Pequot War** over trade expansion broke out between Pequot Indians and English settlers of Massachusetts Bay and Connecticut. The colonists’ Indian allies joined them in battle and helped defeat the Pequot.

- **From 1636 to 1659**, A series of battles took place between New Netherlands settlers in New York and several Indian tribes (Lenape, Susquehannocks, Algonquians, Esopus). Some battles were especially violent and gruesome, sending many settlers fleeing back to the Netherlands.

- **From 1640-1701**, The Beaver Wars take place between the French and their Indian allies (Algonquian, Huron) and the powerful Iroquois Confederacy. The fierce fighting started over territory and fur trade dominance around the Great Lakes and ended with the signing of the Great Peace Treaty.

King Philip’s War

- **King Philip’s War (1675-1676)**, also known as Metacom’s War, began after bands of Indians led by Wampanoag Chief Metacom (later called King Philip) grew frustrated with their dependence on the Puritans and attacked colonies and militia strongholds throughout Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

These attacks ignited a series of battles for power along the Connecticut River Valley between Metacom’s warriors and a large colonial militia and their Mohawk allies. The war ended with Metacom’s beheading and the near decimation of the Native Americans in his coalition.

Queen Anne's War
From 1702-1713, Queen Anne’s War occurred between French and English colonists and their respective Indian allies on several fronts including Spanish Florida, New England, Newfoundland and Acadia. The war ended with the Treaty of Utrecht, but the Indians were not included in peace negotiations and lost much of their land.

From 1711-1715, During the Tuscarora War, the Tuscarora Indians burned North Carolina settlements and randomly killed colonists over treaty disputes. After two years of bloody fighting, North Carolina defeated the Indians with the help of South Carolina’s militia.

In 1715, Yamasee Indians - frustrated with the loss of their hunting grounds and the high debts they owed white settlers of South Carolina - formed a confederacy with other local tribes and forced many settlers to flee, devastating South Carolina’s economy.

French and Indian War

From 1754 to 1763, As France expanded into the Ohio River Valley it fought with Britain for control of North America. Both sides forged alliances with Indians to help fight their battles. Known as the French and Indian War, the struggle ended with the signing of the Treaty of Paris in 1763.

In 1763, Pontiac Indians of the Ohio River became incensed upon learning King George III expected them to become British loyalists. During Pontiac's War, the Ottawa Chief Pontiac rallied support among other tribes and laid siege to Britain’s Fort Detroit. When a British retaliatory assault plan on Pontiac’s village was discovered, the Indians attacked and killed many British soldiers during the Battle of Bloody Run on July 31.

In 1794, the Battle of Fallen Timbers happened on August 20, along Ohio’s Maumee River between regional Indians (Miami, Shawnee, Lenape) and the United States. The well-trained U.S. Army decisively defeated the Indians and the battle ended with the adoption of the Treaty of Greenville.

In 1759, a series of battles known as the Cherokee Wars began from the valleys of Virginia to North Carolina and southward. Two peace treaties forced the Cherokee to give up millions of acres of land to settlers, provoking them to fight for the British in the Revolutionary War, hoping to keep what land they had left.

Beginning of Early American Indian Wars
• Indians had to choose sides or try to stay neutral when the American Revolution broke out. Many tribes such as the Iroquois, Shawnee, Cherokee and Creek fought with British loyalists. Others, including the Potawatomi and the Delaware, sided with American patriots. But no matter which side they fought on; Native Americans were negatively impacted. They were left out of peace talks and lost additional land. After the war, some Americans retaliated against those Indian tribes that had supported the British.

• From 1776 through 1794, Cherokee Chief Dragging Canoe led bands of Indians against white settlers in the South from. At the Battle of the Bluffs, he led 400 warriors to destroy Fort Nashborough in Tennessee, but a pack of unleashed hunting dogs forced them back during the battle.

• In 1811, at the Battle of Tippecanoe Shawnee Chief Tecumseh formed a coalition to slow the flow of settlers into Illinois and Indiana. Territorial Governor William Henry Harrison led a force of soldiers and militia to destroy the Shawnee’s village but agreed to a temporary cease-fire. Tecumseh’s brother, “The Prophet,” ignored the cease-fire and attacked. Harrison prevailed, however, and the Shawnee retreated north.

• In 1812, the War of 1812 was fought between Britain and the United States and their respective Indian allies. Tecumseh’s defeat at the Battle of Tippecanoe led him to support the British. At the Battle of Thames (one of many battles in the War of 1812) along the Thames River in Ontario, British troops and Tecumseh’s coalition were outnumbered and easily defeated again. Tecumseh died in the battle, leading many Indians to abandon the British cause.

• In 1814, pro-American Creeks (Lower Creeks) and Creeks who resented Americans (Upper Creeks) were fighting a civil war. At the Battle of Horseshoe Bend in Alabama on March 27, American militia fought alongside Lower Creeks to defeat Upper Creeks. The battle ended with the signing of the Treaty of Fort

• In 1816-1818, the First Seminole War begins in which the Seminoles, assisted by runaway slaves, defended Spanish Florida against the U.S. Army.

• In 1830, President Andrew Jackson signed the Indian Removal Act, allowing the U.S. government to relocate Indians from their land east of the Mississippi River.

• In 1832, Chief Black Hawk led around 1,000 Sauk and Fox Indians back to Illinois to reclaim their land. The battle, known as the Black Hawk War, was a disaster for the Indians who were greatly outnumbered by the U.S. Army, militias and other Indian tribes.
In 1835-1842, the Second Seminole War begins, and Natives fought to retain their land in the Florida Everglades but were almost wiped out.

In 1838, the government forcibly removed around 15,000 Cherokee from their homeland and made them walk more than 1,200 miles west. Over 3,000 Indians died on the grueling route, known as the Trail of Tears. The involuntary relocation fueled the Indians’ anger toward the U.S. government.

In 1855-1858, the Third Seminole War was the Seminole’s last stand. After being outgunned and outnumbered, most of them agreed to move to Indian reservations in Oklahoma.

In 1864, The Sand Creek Massacre occurred after about 750 peaceful Cheyenne and Arapaho led by Chief Black Kettle were forced to abandon their winter campsite near Fort Lyon in southeastern Colorado. When they set up camp at Sand Creek, volunteer Colorado soldiers attacked, scattering them while slaughtering 148 men, women and children.

November 29, 1864, one of the most infamous events of the American-Indian Wars occurred when 650 Colorado volunteer forces attacked a Cheyenne and Arapaho encampment along Sand Creek. Although they had already begun peace negotiations with the U.S. government, more than 140 Native Americans were killed and mutilated, most of whom were women and children.

In 1866, Red Cloud’s War began as the U.S. government developed the Bozeman Trail through Indian territory to allow miners and settlers access to gold in Montana Territory via the Powder River.

From 1866 to 1868, an Indian coalition led by Lakota Chief Red Cloud attacked workers, settlers and soldiers to save their native lands. Their persistence paid off when the U.S. Army left the area and signed the Treaty of Fort Laramie in 1868.

In 1868, the US Army and the Lakota signed the Treaty of Fort Laramie.

The 1868 Treaty of Fort Laramie established the Black Hills of western South Dakota and northeastern Wyoming as part of the Great Sioux Reservation. After the discovery of gold in the Black Hills, however, the U.S. government began setting up Army posts there, leaving angry Sioux and Cheyenne warriors - led by Sitting Bull and Crazy Horse - determined to defend their territory.

In 1876, at the Battle of the Little Bighorn, General George Armstrong Custer led 600 men into the Little Bighorn Valley, where they were overwhelmed by approximately
3,000 Sioux and Cheyenne warriors led by Crazy Horse. Custer and his men were all killed in the battle, also known as Custer’s Last Stand. Despite the decisive Indian victory, the U.S. government forced the Sioux to sell the Black Hills and leave the land.

- **In 1874-1875**, The U.S. Army fought multiple skirmishes during the Red River War against Southern Plains Indians who had left their reservations to reclaim former hunting grounds in the Texas Panhandle. The war ended after intense pressure from the U.S. Army forced the Indians to return to their reservations.

- **In 1850-1886**, Driven by revenge for the slaughter of his family and the need to protect Apache native lands in northern Mexico and Southwest U.S. territory, the warrior Geronimo led his men in brutal attacks against Mexican troops, white settlers and the U.S. Army from 1850 until his capture in 1886.

- **In the late nineteenth century**, Indian “Ghost Dancers” believed a specific dance ritual would reunite them with the dead and bring peace and prosperity.

- **On December 29, 1890**, the U.S. Army surrounded a group of Ghost Dancers at Wounded Knee Creek near the Pine Ridge Reservation of South Dakota. During the ensuing Wounded Knee Massacre, fierce fighting broke out and 150 Indians were slaughtered. The battle was the last major conflict between the U.S. government and the Plains Indians.

- **By the early 20 century**, the American-Indian Wars had effectively ended, but at great cost. Though Indians helped colonial settlers survive in the New World, helped Americans gain their independence and ceded vast amounts of land and resources to pioneers, tens of thousands of Indian and non-Indian lives were lost to war, disease and famine, and the Indian way of life was almost completely destroyed.²¹

*Indigenous World Views*

“The Six Nation Confederacy played a pivotal role not only in Indian affairs but in the thinking of men like Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson when it came to drafting plans on how the United States was to be governed. And so their legacy had some effect in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, with which we live today.”

---

²¹ Native American Chronology Citation Information: American-Indian Wars History.com Editors. Website Name: HISTORY. URL: https://www.history.com/topics/native-american-history/american-indian-wars. Access Date: October 20, 2019. A&E Television Networks. Last Updated: November 17, 2019. Original Published Date: March 9, 2010. TAGS: NATIVE AMERICANS

Additional Sources for this Timeline: History of Queen Anne’s War. History of Massachusetts Blog.

Native Americans in the Revolutionary War. History of Massachusetts.

Red River War (1874-1875). Oklahoma Historical Society.

Seminole Wars History. Seminole Wars Foundation.


Tuscarora War. North Carolina History Project.

Although Indigenous peoples located throughout the world hold diverse epistemologies, ontologies, and axiological worldviews, even amongst other Indigenous communities—as collective units, unlike European colonizers, Native peoples recognition of Mother Earth is unique respective to their bond to our planet, the universe, and to one another, hence, the importance of their community is a common attribute recognized and accepted as a vital characteristic of an Indigenous worldview. As such, an Indigenous worldview differs from that of Western/modern communities, which, in general, places emphasis on capitalism; values the individual over the collective; and centers materialism as a part of daily life, at the cost of the planet and its life forms.

There is another characteristic that I connect to the Indigenous in this proposal which puts forward the idea that Indigenous peoples located all over the world also share a “colonial” history, although the extent of this might vary region to region. I will offer this idea throughout this proposal as this will play an essential part in the development of DRM--precisely, because the colonial experience has left an everlasting and devastatingly tragic imprint on Indigenous people from throughout the world—and--there is nothing that can be done, ever, to recalibrate, or justify, that fact. This fact is best exemplified with simple statistics.

It has been estimated by the United Nations (UN) Fact Sheet titled “Indigenous Peoples, Indigenous Voices” (IPIV), that there are more than “370 million indigenous people spread across 70 countries worldwide,” which is a miniscule fraction of the original population size of the Natives inhabiting what is now called the American Continent (2012). Stephen J. Anaya (2012), former specially appointed UN author-delegate of the “Report of the Special
Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples,” explains the situation of Native populations of the world in the following.

Figure 1.4: Contemporary U.S. Map of Federally Recognized Indigenous Communities, US Bureau of Indian Affairs

**Indigenous peoples in the United States of America as follows:**

“The United States presently recognizes and maintains what it refers to as *government-to-government* relations with approximately 566 American Indian and Alaska Native tribes and villages, of which, approximately, around 230 of these being Alaskan Native groups...”; however, it must be noted that even in this UN descriptor, this is far from the truth (*UN IPIV Fact Sheet*, 2012, Pg.1; Anaya, 2012, Pgs. 104-105). To the contrary, because Indigenous nations are viewed not as Nations, but as the “wards” of the federal government; consequently, further disempowering Natives, to this day. The map above is offered as a visual aide in assisting the reader in visualizing how federally recognized, Native populations have been misplaced, downsized, and contained.

Moreover, the *UN IPIV Fact Sheet* states that because of the extent of diversity that exists within globalized Indigenous communities today, when attempting to describe the
term “Indigenous,” the UN council opted to not define the term “Indigenous,” and, instead, stated that “an official definition of ‘indigenous’ has not been adopted by any UN-system body” (UN IPIV Fact Sheet). As an alternative to understanding the term “indigenous,” the UN system has developed a modern understanding of this term based on the following:

- Self-identification as indigenous peoples at the individual level and accepted by the community as their member
- Historical continuity with pre-colonial and/or pre-settler societies
- Strong link to territories and surrounding natural resources
- Distinct social, economic or political systems
- Distinct language, culture and beliefs
- Form non-dominant groups of society
- Resolve to maintain and reproduce their ancestral environments and systems as distinctive peoples and communities

Still, in an attempt to define “Indigenous” further, it is important to emphasize that in the US many indigenous groups, still, have not been federally recognized, which includes Mestizos located in the Southwest Borderlands, although some Indigenous groups have been recognized at the state level, according to Anaya (2012, Pg. 279). Currently, Anaya (2012) reports that according to the United States Census, “people who identify as Native American represent approximately 1.7 per cent of the overall population of the United States, with 5.2 million persons identifying as American Indian or Alaska Native” (Pg. 280).

Anaya further elaborates that these numbers “exceed the number of those who are enrolled or registered members of federally recognized indigenous groups,” with current
estimates placing the total population of Indigenous peoples “from 220 million to 350 million;” whereas, the total amount of humans populating the Earth is, approximately, 7.7 billion (2012, Pg. 1; Worldometers, 2019).

**United Nations and the Rights of the Indigenous**

“...The Expedition you are appointed to command is to be directed against the hostile tribes of the Six Nations of Indians, with their associates and adherents. The immediate objects are the total destruction and devastation of their settlements, and the capture of as many prisoners of every age and sex as possible. It will be essential to ruin their crops now in the ground and prevent their planting more...”

--George Washington, 1779

On September 13, 2007 the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* was adopted as a consequence of the 2006, 107th plenary meeting which culminated in the publication of the UN’s *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (2007). With this official resolution adopted by the United Nations (UN) General Assembly, Indigenous rights at the global level were formally established. Amongst acknowledgement of other Indigenous rights and declarations, Indigenous global rights for self-determination as stated in *Article 33 of the Charter* (2007) were officially established. *Article 33 of the Charter* (2007) states the following:

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to determine their own identity or membership in accordance with their customs and traditions. This does not impair the right of indigenous individuals to obtain citizenship of the States in which they live.

2. Indigenous peoples have the right to determine the structures and to select the membership of their institutions in accordance with their own procedures.

---

The publication of this particular section not only allows for Indigenous self-determination by means of the UN, but also places all global Indigenous communities in the role of nations, under UN declaration. This is especially relevant because all Indigenous communities have established autonomy by means of the publication of the UN Charter, should they choose to pursue it, many without even having been present at this momentous event. Unfortunately, reinforcement of the mandates is beyond problematic, especially so when placed into a hegemonic framework, i.e., United States -v-First Nations peoples.

In spite of this fact, following this significant event which laid the global framing for acknowledged “Indigeneity;” in 2013, the UN participated in the “Global Indigenous Preparatory Conference for the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples”, which was hosted by the Sámi Parliament of Norway. Over six hundred Indigenous delegates/ Indigenous Tribal Nation representatives attended the event which resulted in the acceptance and publication of the “Alta Outcome Document” (AOD), (2013), which focused on four relevant Indigenous themes, listed as follows:

Theme 1: Indigenous Peoples’ lands, territories, resources, oceans and waters

Theme 2: UN system action for the implementation of the rights of Indigenous Peoples

Theme 3: Implementation of the Rights of Indigenous People

Theme 4: Indigenous Peoples’ priorities for Development with free, prior and informed consent

These four themes are, clearly, establishing the beginnings of the launching of international judicial prudence, which allows for the establishment of “precedence,” meaning that at some point in the near future, Indigenous rights-via-White man’s “Just-us” will, ultimately, be
challenged by means of White man’s judiciary systems, potentially, marking the historical point in which Natives will have their day in court. Moreover, establishment of the AOD will serve as antecedent for future important Native court hearings, which will then initiate a robust legislative arsenal of sorts for future Indigenous communities, better allowing for the, possible, negotiation of Indigenous rights, worldwide.

This is witnessed by Stephen James Anaya’s (b. 1960) work outside of his UN effort. Although it could be easily argued that his role at the UN is a vital part of as an awesome long-term decolonization project of sorts, Anaya’s exertion as lead counsel in *Awas Tingni v. Nicaragua* Source: 24, (2001), without a doubt, has begun the process of decolonizing the court systems of the world. *Awas Tingni v. Nicaragua* is the first time that the Nicaraguan court upheld Indigenous land rights.

Although no longer serving the UN in his former capacity, Anaya is now serving the “Indigenous Peoples Law and Policy Program of the University of Arizona's James E. Rogers College of Law,” and serves as the 16th Dean and as “University Distinguished Professor” at the University of Colorado Boulder Law School25 Most recently, Anaya’s expertise in this specialization of law prompted another “win” for Indigenous peoples, this time in Belize. The case focused on Mayan land rights, going before the highest court in Belize. The Caribbean Court of Justice acknowledged Mayan land rights based on their indigeneity. There is no doubt that Anaya’s earlier hard work with Indigenous peoples and the UN have set the foundation for way-to-long, overdue, legislative progression for Indigenous people everywhere. Anaya’s work gives us hope.

---

24 For furthers see: Inter-American Court of Human Rights Case of the Mayagna (Sumo) Awas Tingni Community v. Nicaragua Judgment of August 31, 2001 (Merits, Reparations and Costs), [http://www.corteidh.or.cr/docs/casos/articulos/serieC_79_ing.pdf](http://www.corteidh.or.cr/docs/casos/articulos/serieC_79_ing.pdf)

25 Source: University of Boulder Colorado Faculty Profiles: [https://lawweb.colorado.edu/profiles/profile.jsp?id=729](https://lawweb.colorado.edu/profiles/profile.jsp?id=729).
Returning to the *UN Alta Document* and a dynamic portion of the preamble, the following global “self-identification” statement was included; which, again, laid the groundwork for Indigenous recognition. In so doing, the preamble sets the path to the reclaiming of Indigenous land, and, to potential Tribal self-sufficiency, allowing for significant progress in the decolonization of the world:

> As the original and distinct Peoples and Nations of our territories we abide by natural laws and have our own laws, spirituality and world views. We have our own governance structures, knowledge systems, values and the love, respect and lifeways, which form the basis of our identity as Indigenous Peoples and our relationship with the natural world (Preamble, Alta Document, 2013).

More important, amongst other important clarifications and acknowledgements, the charter included the following momentous statements, adding a very personalized Indigenous perspective to this historic event, at the same time, implementing historical rectification for Indigenous people everywhere, if only on paper:

> For centuries, we Indigenous Peoples have faced and continue to face colonization of our lands, territories, resources, air, ice, oceans and waters, mountains and forests. This has resulted in patterns of domination, exploitation and subjugation of our Peoples. Such patterns can be traced to claims of discovery and conquest, papal bulls, royal charters, “manifest destiny” and other erroneous and legally invalid doctrines.

> These claims have manifested in colonial strategies, policies, and actions designed to destroy Indigenous Peoples thereby resulting in the ongoing usurpation of Indigenous Peoples’ lands, territories, resources, air, ice, oceans and waters and, mountains and forests; extensive destruction of Indigenous Peoples’ political and legal institutions; discriminatory practices of colonizing forces aimed at destroying Indigenous Peoples’ cultures; failure to honor Treaties, agreements and other constructive arrangements with Indigenous Peoples and Nations; genocide, ecocide, loss of food sovereignty, crimes against humanity, war crimes and the militarization of Indigenous Peoples and our lands; corporatization and commodification of Indigenous Peoples and our natural resources; and
the imposition of “development” models that are destroying the life-
egiving capacities and integrity of Mother Earth and producing a range of
detrimental impacts of which climate change could prove to be the most
destructive.

The provisions of the Declaration that affirm the inherent rights of
Indigenous Peoples to participate fully in decision-making that affects
us, will continue to guide and frame our work for the HLPM/WCIP.

I fully subscribe to the UN’s mission in bringing attention to Indigenous populations located all
over the world. In fact, I subscribed to these ideals long before they were acknowledged at the
UN.

Anaya’s undertakings have laid out the foundation for legislative change, which
is what it is really all about. Once legislation is established, the nation state must address the
court’s outcomes, even if the nation state might be opposed to it. That’s what needs to happen.
At the same time that these momentous events are taking place, academia and public education
systems must instill productive change for Indigenous and marginalized populations. They can
do so, initially, by acknowledging in print, via public school and university textbooks, the
actual, real-life history of what is now called the United States. Such refinements should include
the Indigenous perspective.

The reality of the matter is that public school systems, which rely on the state for
financing education and, often times, selection of public-school education textbooks (as in the
case of Texas) will, certainly, be resistant to doing so. This will be the case, most assuredly, for
the majority of colonial and Southern states, many of which are still battling with the
implications of the “browning of America,” a term used to explain the changing demographics
of the US.
As such, Champagne (2009), a critic of mainstream education, adds that “Indigenous peoples are diverse in terms of culture, politics, and step-away from Western/European practices specific to capitalism. As a community, tribal nations concentrate on self-government and territoriality that other ethnic, racial, and minority groups do not. Indigenous nations do not share common cultural and political ground with mainstream institutions, including universities. Higher education should address, support, and welcome the holistic diversity of Indigenous perspectives,” in curriculum, as well as in how subject-matter is taught (Pgs. 130-154).

What is needed at this point in time specific to demands a decolonization paradigm not currently in use. Specifically, a paradigm for use in research exchanges with Indigenous and marginalized populations. It should encompass a research approach that remains quantitative, as such an approach to research design is necessary and still the only way to understand phenomenon; however, a proposed research paradigm should include the impacts of colonization, and then, a form of leveling component that addresses the phenomenon being collaborated on between the research-advocate and the community.

*A Proposed Decolonization Paradigm for Application in Contemporary Globalized Schooling Systems*

“Research’ is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world’s vocabulary.”

--Tuhiwai Smith (1999, P. 1)

Diachronic Research Methodologies (DRM) is an enhanced expansion on traditional quantitative research methods. It is not a race-based research methodology, instead, it is a decolonizing framework intended to begin the process of incremental transformation in Indigenous research methodologies by means of research projects undertaken with Indigenous and marginalized populations. Adapting Tuhiwai Smith’s (1999) definition of "decolonization"
into this academic endeavor prompts me to redefine *decolonization research design* as a
deliberate and concerted effort in Indigenous research methods designed to produce a critical
research agenda that allows for a deeper understanding, and, “rehabilitated” conceptualization
of some of the underlying communal dynamics not addressed in traditional methods, as they
currently stand.

Furthermore, in order to alleviate the type of bias, assumptions, and stereotypes
traditional methods, often times, leaves to those who read research studies about Indigenous or
marginalized populations; any research collaborative requires that the project be over-seen by
the community, and, that project results produce positive outcomes central to the needs of the
research community. DRM does not go into issues of political authority and/or Indigenous
sovereignty, except when discussed by the study participants and it is related to the research
phenomenon.

Aside of a reliance on ethically grounded quantitative research practices, DRM
relies on the integration of principled ideals established in feminist theory such as the concept
of *feminist objectivity (FO)* (also see: Smith, 1974; 2004), which is research positioned towards
a feminist point-of-view, according to Harding (1993). By incorporating a FO approach to
phenomenon, research is grounded in feminist practicality, which is useful for overall research
applications as “it stresses the continuities between conventional justifications of scientific
research and feminist ones as these would most often be understood by natural and social
scientists” (Alcoff & Potter, 1993). At the same time, an FO approach encourages researchers
to step-away from the “eyes of the colonizer” when conducting research, or, designing
Indigenous research paradigms (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999).
Although there exist several approaches to educational research methodologies, such as quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, etc. at the core of these processes are four distinct objectives, according to Gay & et al (2009). They consist of the following:

1.) Selection and definition of a problem
2.) Execution of research procedures
3.) Analysis of data
4.) Drawing and stating conclusions

DRM follows these objectives; however, there are some adjustments made in the DRM paradigm, as the center of the research exertion shifts from the defining of the “problem” by the researcher, to its being defined to the researcher by the participating community.

In academic research design, the presumption rests firmly on the understanding that any and all research approaches applied require that data be collected in precise ways—this is an all-encompassing and central aspect of research. Without it, there is no reliable source for understanding phenomenon. The data collection process kicks in from the beginning of the research project to its finalization.

In the case of quantitative research methods, numerical patterns are established that can pin-point potential areas of concern within the field of education, making a quantitative research approach common practice within education systems because it allows for the research exertion to cover large population numbers, as well as smaller sized studies. Furthermore, the approach allows for reliability and validity in the research work.

It is contended by Feminist Scholars (FS’s) and Critical Race Theorists (CRT’s), as well as Indigenous academics and researchers; social justice advocates; and some mainstream academics that, indeed, a more viable and effective approach to research collaboratives with
non-mainstream populations, such as Indigenous and other colonized populations, is needed because, overall, the paradigms are, identifiably, White, “Ameri-Eurocentric”; therefore, they are practices immersed in one-sidedness, making them unfair to those who are epistemologically and culturally detached from a Western epistemological worldview (Hardin, 1995; Cohn, 1996; Bender & Schorske, 1997; Lagemann, 2000; Sandoval, 2000; Mutua & Swadener, 2004; Spring, 2007; Tuhiwai Smith 2008, 2012; Chilisa, 2012; Kovach, 2012; Lonetree, 2012; Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2012; Walter & Andersen, 2013).

As claimed by feminist theorists; traditional, positivist-centered, research methods, specifically, have distorted and contorted what are referred to as models of reason, i.e., traditional scientific inquiry; Westernized education systems, including academia; which remain as stains in research because they have allowed, and perpetuated, bias, unfairness, and misconceptions about non-mainstream populations. This also applies to other similar research practices that are used within these types of institutions to understand phenomena, when the research paradigms encompass, or center, on traditional methods, too often, they present research findings through the lens of the status quo/colonizer (Harding & Hintikka, 1983).

These types of practices and the institutions that seek this type of work, historically, are considered by mainstream traditionalists and positivists as highly valued work, ideologically, as well as, academically. Conversely, adapting a counter view, epistemologically-speaking, from a FS perspective and an Indigenous standpoint, such research is marred with misunderstandings, and downright bias.

A feminist and Indigenous standpoint begins with the fact that White norms are abnormal to those existing outside of the parameter of Whiteness, or, Euro-centrality; consequently, such work is viewed as aspects of Whiteness, patriarchy, and privilege (Addelson, 1983; Harding &
Hintikka, 1983; Anzaldúa, 1987; Delpit, 1988; Haraway, 1988; Harding, 1991; Jaggar & Rothenberg, 1993; Hekman, 1997; Kim & McCann, 1998; Harding, 2004; Calderón, 2011; Elenes. & Delgado Bernal, 2010; Delgado Bernal & Elenes, 2011; Delgado Bernal, Burciaga & Flores, 2012; McQueen, 2014). Not surprisingly, they are, and have been, problematic structures, and practices, for Indigenous populations as a whole, and for the Others, who exist outside of the mainstream.

Defining Populations and the “Others”

“My people are few. They resemble the scattering trees of a storm-swept plain...There was a time when our people covered the land as the waves of a wind-ruffled sea cover its shell-paved floor, but that time long since passed away with the greatness of tribes that are now but a mournful memory.”

— Chief Seattle, (Chief Seattle's Speech)

Invariably, the fact that specific groups of people/communities have been intentionally, often times, forcibly displaced—in short, ousted from their original geographical region and place in the world, opens up a Pandora Box of psychological, emotional, and cultural trauma that does not go away within a generation or two. Albeit, the natural connections that humans have come to value is based on this very fundamental need, to belong to that place in which we have created history and Earthly relationships, not just amongst our kin, but with the planet and the others who live around us. Such places, homes, are regions in which humans have created culture and languages of their own.

Accordingly, humans, from throughout the planet, come to identify themselves with the Earthly spaces we dwell in. For many groups, these are sacred spaces our ancestors have inhabited for millennia. Each habitation is unique and hallowed in a multitude of ways, and we are bound to them because of that reality. The longer a group remains in a specific geo-
location, the more extraordinary that group becomes, as it will evolve in ways that only that space allows for. From the manner in which the sun rises and sets, to the unique properties the waters might possess or the harvest yield, these essential aspects of humanity vary from geo-location to geo-location.

A universalist recognition of this type of continuity and allegiance to the planet stems from this simple acknowledgement, and it is a vital aspect of Indigeneity. Furthermore, it is a worldview, traditionally, considered to be uniquely Indigenous, which is a concept that Native peoples have embraced for millennia.

Conversely, in the case of African-Americans, Native Americans, Mexicans, Crimeans outside of the US, as well as Palestinians and Jews, etc. and other similar types of “displaced” or “colonized” communities; such groups of people have been forcibly and intentionally removed from their natural spaces of existence, or they have been “genetically” infiltrated by others. These types of populations are referred to as “Others” by mainstream elites and/or colonizers because they are not a part of the status quo or the conventional population.

These populations have been affected by external events, which often times are either negated or go unacknowledged, to the degree that a type of unhealthiness manifests within such communities. The external structures, both abstract and concrete, are controlled by power holders, directed by the power holder’s policy. Over all, such populations have been forcibly removed by means of mandatory relocation, often times settled into a distinct corner of sorts in which land is not fertile, water rights are zilch, or controlled by Others, and hunting game is scarce, etc., subsequently, they become politically, socio-economically, and sometimes even psychologically “paralyzed” and disempowered.
In too many ways, such populations have been numbed, dislocated, illegally stripped of property, possessions, language, cultural belief systems, as well as psychologically disempowered. As academics, and, especially so, as researchers, we must consider what happens to humans when they undergo these types of forced-upon, life-changing, negative experiences, just as linguists do when they study the demise of languages. What really are the long-term implications of colonization and the colonial experience on Indigenous people?

In this work, the use of the term “Indigenous” is established in order to define and describe the mere fact that such peoples have resided in their geographic areas from the beginning. In short, they are indigenous to that place. No one but their people have resided in those sacred spaces. These are the original peoples, representative of the multitude of similar unique groups of individuals’ and/or community members that have lived and maintained their geographic place in specific regions of the world for millennia.

By having lived under such circumstances, such communities have established unique language systems, distinct epistemologies, ontologies, cultural values and ethnic practices, as well as specific communal understandings, morals, and/or ethics (axiological worldviews). Each of these unique attributes are what encompasses a sense of community. This is why “conquest” demands that Indigenous peoples be done away with whenever new groups of people take forcible possession of spaces not originally theirs, or, intended for them by the Creator. To do away with any one of these indigenous attributes changes the community, and it could be argued, chips away at the fabric of collectivity and a universalist reality.

Moreover, as already discussed, within Indigenous populations, such communities have close relationships to the Earth and the creatures that inhabit shared spaces. Specifically, Natives possess a deep appreciation for regional natural life, to the extent that they teach their
children and followers that they are not only a part of the collective, but of the Universe as well. Aimé Césaire (1972) reflects on this when he explains, “They were communal societies, never societies of the many for the few” (pg. 7). This aspect of deep community prompts close and beyond-personal relationships amongst their collective and the other living being of those regions that transcend the spiritual; subsequently, theirs is a relationship with the planet/universe that encompasses daily life in ways White folk fail to understand.

To attempt to “conquer” such ancient and solid epistemologies requires deliberate and calculating precision. For example, in the case of linguistics, there is the matter of long-held, socio-cultural language practices that change upon the arrival of the colonizer, who, too often, carries with them an ethno-centrist, patriarchal, agenda that demands the total annihilation of the colonized; subsequently, changes in indigenous language, cultural patterns and practices, etc. inadvertently empowers the colonizer. These historical markers of conversion impact original communal language systems in ways that changes language, and then the people, to the extent that the indigenous language of old quickly dissipates as discussed below:

Languages, to a large extent, are not only expressions of our thinking but also the medium that shapes our thinking. Often the use of the masculine word is set as the standard. One example still valid would be the use of the term 'mankind' instead of 'humankind'. The vilest insults in any language refer to female parts or to female sexuality. Certain terms and roles in our languages are gender ascriptive (where gender is in-built) like uncle-aunt, brother-sister, mother-father because they indicate the sex of the person. However, there are hosts of others that are not gender ascriptive, but it is assumed that they refer to a man or a woman. For example the jobs of secretary, nurse, kindergarten teacher [is] naturally assumed to refer to women whereas boss, pilot, manager, surgeon or farmer refer to men (Whorf, 1939)

Correspondingly, as the colonizer changes language, so do the humans that speak it undergo change. When people cross borders and learn to speak the languages respective to each region, as in the case of “Borderlanders,” language changes in an expansive way with the
first language, as spoken by the people, developing further. However, when colonizers control language, the idea is to eliminate it in the most effective and efficient manners possible, and at all costs. Like the Indigenous, Borderlanders are people who have lived in a specific region of the world that has been altered, boundary-wise, by colonization, war, nationalistic interferences, climatic or environmental changes, collapsed governments, federal/state/local policy, etc.

Other leading examples of this are found in Crimea with various invasions having taken place within its relatively short history, with Cimmerians, Scythians, invading in Ancient times, then pre-13th Century CE, Sarmatians, Goths, Alans, Bulgars, Huns, Khazars, Kipchaks invading, and now the former USSR invades their space, which is still a disputed region between Ukraine and the Russian Federation, (Former Soviet Union). Consider the magnitude of language changes that have transpired as a consequence of that history, still, there is much cultural resistance and many Crimeans resist the take overs, similarly to Indigenous communities that wrestle with the type of issues that continuously challenge their spaces as a consequence of invasion.

Fences are built by governments to keep people in, and to keep “others out as in the case of Berlin and the US. Transnationals are individuals or communities that originate from a specific country, immigrate to other countries, often times, this might include more than one country, and settle temporarily in a specific host nation. Unlike Indigenous people, these groups of people are, in general, multi-lingual, readily adaptable, and have not established a nationalistic identity like the mainstream populations in which they might reside in.
From a research perspective, reasons for migration are complex and multi-fold but include matters such as environmental factors; drug-wars; poverty; consequences of globalization; native country is undergoing war/civil war; they are asylum seekers, religious persecution; artistic persecution, economics, etc. or a compilation of many of these. In other words, there are a variety of reasons, making it difficult to ascertain or understand this reality, as many European Union scholars and academics have lamented and debated as the issue of nationalism in such cases becomes ambiguous (Vertovec, 1999; Portes, 1999; Castles, 2000). Transnationalism has opened the door to serious discussion about the nature of nationhood, the nation state, citizenship, etc., which I will not be addressing as the issues that surround this are complex and require additional addresses of topics not central to this proposal. Still, transnationals are a part of marginalized populations, therefore, as a “group”, alone, they are included in this academic endeavor, within this context.

Mexicans, who are located in the border regions of Mexico and the United States, incidentally, are also Indigenous (Weber, 1973). Likewise, they share a similar story as the US-Mexico, Southwest border regions, at one time, were borderless regions of the world, belonging to no one, then Spain, New Spain, Mexico. It used to be that Borderlanders located in these regions freely crossed over expanses now controlled by the US. I still recall how my now deceased uncle recounted to me how he used to sneak into what is now known as El Paso as a child in order to seek-out labor opportunities at the ripe age of seven years.

As we stood in downtown El Paso in front of the “Hollywood Café” in the last stages of his life, he used his fingers to point to the paths he would take and shared with me how there was one or two men who would stand at these places of entry, since there were no guard houses at the time. Being a child, he did not have what is now known as a “Green Card”
or passport. Tio Luis said that each morning when it was the darkest time of night, he would try to enter into El Paso with knots in his stomach because he did not know if he would be allowed in or not as it depended on the compassion of whomever he ran into. Later, when guardhouses begin to be established, there will be border guards blocking the entry way that was once, freely, available to him. This is the way of the White man, take, take, take, then make yours. Even during the 1980’s people could cross back and forth on the US-Mexican border by simply saying that they were “American.” Now all border crossing requires appropriate credentials.

Regarding the Texas border, it was not until Texas becomes a republic, then later joins the US, that modern boundaries were instituted on the part of the power holders. This was the beginning of many such changes and disputes between the US and Mexico. From a communal perspective, consider how this has affected long-held traditions of border crossing by disrupting family structures, economic exchange practices, etc. still, like Crimea, there has been resistance from people who identify as Mexicans, and even Mexican Americans, but this too is changing. Events following 9/11 in the US has created a new world order and the racial classification systems used after 9/11 requires reclassification as the classification terms once used are no longer appropriate to the type of nationalist ideologies that have come into play as a consequence of aftereffects of 9/11.

“Just what is a Mexican/Mestiza?”

Similar to Indigenous populations of the world, there is much confusion about “just what is a Mexican?” -- to the point that even Mexican descendants are confused or continue to deny their ancestral connections to Mexico as they perceive themselves as “Americans, of Mexican Descent.” Consequently, people of Mexican, Latin-South American
ancestry are referred to as a part of “marginalized” populations in this proposal. I chose to approach this in this way as going into the racial diversification categories that exists for such people is problematic and out-of-date. To note there are some changes taking place wherein Indigenous identity is becoming an accepted aspect of self-identification for some of these individuals that I will briefly address.

Current genetic research studies covering the past decade in the area of mitochondrial DNA in Mexicans/Hispanics is suggestive of high incidence rates of Native American ancestry, specific to the Americas, in conjunction with European ancestry, as seen in the DNA map of a self-identified “Mestiza” provided below (Basu, A., Tang, H., Zhu, X., Gu, C. C., Hanis, C., Boerwinkle, E., & Risch, N., 2008; Sandoval, K.; Buentello-Malo, L.; Penaloz-Espinosa, R.; Avelino, H.; Salas, A.; Calafell, F.; Comas, D., 2009; Silva-Zolezzi, I.; Hidalgo-Miranda, A.; Estrada-Gill, J.; Fernandez-Lopez, J.C.; Uribe-Figueroa, L.; Hernandez-Lemus, E.; Davila, C.; Barrientos, E.; March, S.; & Gerardo Jimenez-Sanchez, 2009; Kumar, S.; Bellis, M.; Zlojutro; Melton; Blangero J.; Curran, J.E., 2011; Moreno-Estrada, A.; Gignoux, C. R.; Fernandez-Lopez, J.; Zakharia, F.; Sikora, M.; Contreras, A. V.; Bustamante, C. D., 2014). It should be pointed out to the reader that there is, currently, an abundance of literature in a variety of prestigious scientific academic journals covering genetics, which, specifically, addresses the ubiquitous aspect of Native American genetic ancestry as found within Mestiza/Hispanic/ Mexican/Chicano ancestry.

DNA results for Mexicans/ Latinos/Hispanics, etc., study after study for this particular demographic, overwhelmingly demonstrates a rich genetic DNA history that centers on Native American ancestry. Often times, the substantial range of genetic diversity within this particular demographic group is not fully appreciated, even within the same population. As
more and more people from this particular demographic begin the process of genetic, self-exploration via DNA studies, I conjecture that such people will better understand their place in the current world. It is extraordinary to see the extent of genetic differences within this particular population, so I have taken the liberty of providing two genetic studies undertaken by individuals who self-identify as “Mexican-American” and, or Mestizo.

Figure 1.5: DNA Geo-history

As you can see in the following DNA analysis below, for this individual who self-identifies as Mestizo, their genetic ancestry is impressive, to say the least, as it touches on just about every demographic group from throughout the world. Using the alias “Diana,” in this particular Mestizo DNA study, “Diana’s” genetic history derives from a multitude of genetic backgrounds. From Native American, to European, to Northern African, to their Jewish genetic ancestry.
Diana’s genetic material touches upon a multitude of diverse, ethnic/Indigenous groups, including Native Americans. The especially fascinating aspect regarding their genetic background is that of their 3% Basque ancestry in conjunction with that of their larger Native American genetic ancestry of 40%, as both groups are considered Indigenous. Interestingly, 3% of “Diana’s” genetic-make up derives from the Basque people of Northern Spain/Southwestern France. It is important to point out the unique aspects of Basquiat ancestral history, language, and even the genetic disposition of this particular demographic as they are, demographically-
speaking, the largest group of people to possess the highest concentration of the “Rh- blood Type” (35% phenotypically, 60% genetically), (Touinssi, M.; Chiaroni, J.; Degioanni, A.; De Micco, P.; Dutour, O.; Bauduer, F., 2004). Just as important, in terms of blood types, the Basque people possess the largest blood type classification of “O,” as do Native Americans (Touinssi, Chiaroni, & et al, 2004). Furthermore, the Basque people have very few members of this particular demographic cluster who possess either “B” or “AB” blood types (Touinssi, Chiaroni, & et al, 2004).

Moreover, in terms of linguistic origins, the Basque language, referred to as Euskara, does NOT derive from the Indo-European linguistic family, nor is it a derivative of the Romance language schools, as is the Spanish and French language (Behar, D.M.; Harmant, C.; Manry, J.; van Oven, M.; Haak, W.; Martinez-Cruz, B.; Salaberria, J.; Oyharçabal, B.; Bauduer, F.; Comas, D.; Quintana-Murci, L., 2012; Totoricaguena, G. P., 2004; Trask, R.L., 1997). These anomalous aspects of this particular demographic classification continues to be an area of fascination and wonder for some of us. Likewise, it is important to note that the Basque people are considered the Indigenous peoples of Spain/France, accordingly (Behar, D.M.; Harmant, C.; Manry, J.; van Oven, M.; Haak, W.; Martinez-Cruz, B.; Salaberria, J.; Oyharçabal, B.; Bauduer, F.; Comas, D.; Quintana-Murci, L., 2012; Totoricaguena, G. P., 2004; Trask, R.L., 1997). The “Rh-“ blood type factor, as well as the obscurity surrounding the origins of the Basque language are, still, not fully understood. For many, this continues to be an area of needed study.

Consequently, potential health issues relative to Mexican/Hispanic Indigenous ancestry peoples can now be better understood, and prepared for, due, precisely, to those same genetic research findings originally undertaken by researchers. This is a matter that is, especially, important for Mexicans/Hispanics living in the US due to the continuous
demographic changes expected in the US, wherein Hispanics are expected to become the majority population by the year 2050, according to the Pew Research Center (PRC), the US Census Bureau (2010), and a multitude of similar population-study data banks.

The PRC study, in particular, explains that, “If current trends continue, the population of the United States will rise to 438 million in 2050, from 296 million in 2005, and 82% of the increase will be due to immigrants arriving from 2005 to 2050 and their U.S.-born descendants…” (Pew Research Center, U.S. Population Projections: 2005-2050, Executive Summary, February 11. 2018). Recognition of the data, referred to as “the Browning of America” will become a central concern of the Republican party, leading to significant socio-political, cultural anxiety, specific to the US status quo, as these changing demographics can potentially change American politics in a manner not seen in this country’s history, ever. Ironically, in many ways, it would result in the culmination of the return of the Indigenous.

Likewise, PEW’s research, the US Census (2010), and other notable sources of population studies, repeatedly, make that fact clear. PEW (2018) explains that “Of the 117 million people added to the population during this period due to the effect of new immigration, 67 million will be the immigrants themselves and 50 million will be their U.S.-born children or grandchildren…” (Pew Research Center, U.S. Population Projections: 2005-2050, Executive Summary, February 11. 2018). When I initially began this study in 2010, (dissertation defense 2015), I recognized the implications of the data at that time. In 2016, when Donald J. Trump steps into the political arena and delivers, perhaps his greatest talking point to his supporters, it only made sense to me that he would amass a significant portion of the White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant (WASP) population.
As a consequence, issues specific to the “browning of America” will begin to take center stage in 2016 and take off after that. In fact, even statistics on hate crimes will reflect that trend, as will be discussed in a subsequent chapter. The concern becomes so great with this particular demographic that Trump and his followers establish a “mantra” of sorts, “‘Build the Wall!!!’” at their “Make America Great Again” (MAGA) rallies hosted throughout the US during his presidency, which, in many ways, are reminiscent of Hitler rallies. Customarily, at the MAGA rallies, the mantra is followed by Trump responding, “who’s gonna pay for it??!” Audience response, “MEXICO”!! Mexico’s previous president, Vicente Fox will later post a YouTube video in which Fox states that Mexico “will not pay for your [America’s] fucking wall” (British Broadcasting Communications, February 2017). In fact, Fox will be correct in his assertion, and the American taxpayer (transcends all races) will, ultimately end up paying for whatever portions will be, eventually, built.

Without a doubt, an unforgettable movement will be created in the US beginning in 2016, with Trump as the leader, in which immigration policies will reflect “White Man’s” deep anxiety of the Others, to the degree that the Trump administration will resort to a “Zero Tolerance Policy,” reflective of highly disturbing, anti-Constitutional practices not seen since the country’s shameful incarceration of Japanese-Americans during World War II. What will be most astounding about this moment in time will be the fact that Mexican Americans/Hispanics will fail to act, or react, to this movement; arguably, playing into the “Scooby Doo” effect.

These types of Euro-American, xenophobic practices are not uncommon in this nation’s history, in fact, they go back to the very beginning of the nation’s founding by the White man, which at the time will be directed against First Nation’s people. Academics, politely, refer to
this tragic era of American history as the “Boarding School” period. In so referring to it as such, they too are playing into the type of rhetoric colonized nations demand.

During the “Boarding School” period of early American history, Native children are forcibly taken from their families and kept isolated from their people, much as the world has witnessed America do so with the children of migrants, refugees, and humans arriving, or, residing in this country without legal documentation. These defenseless children will be placed in cages, some will be sexually abused, and ALL will be profoundly altered at the micro-level for the rest of their lives. Some of the children will die as a consequence of neglect, mishandling, and just plain stupidity. The great irony rests on the fact that these particular immigrants/illegals/Mexicans, etc. have always resided on this continent, way long before the arrival of Europeans, and Others.

Returning to genetic studies relative to this section, regarding the Indigenous Mexica/Hispanic/Mexican American population, and this groups high incidence rates associated with diseases such as Diabetes, DNA studies allow for a better understanding of relevant information pertaining to “ancestry patterns” in medical and population genetic studies that can, potentially, curb high medical expenses, and, even promote healthier, preventative measures for the group/s.

Although European ancestry (primarily Spanish/Mediterranean) is indicated in many of these genetic studies, Indigenous racial identification explicit to this continent is slightly higher as opposed to those of European (Spanish) ancestry (Kumar, S.; Bellis, M.; Zlojutro; Melton; Blangero J.; Curran, J.E., 2011; Moreno-Estrada, A.; Gignoux, C. R.; Fernandez-Lopez, J.; Zakharia, F.; Sikora, M.; Contreras, A. V.; Bustamante, C. D., 2014). Hence, currently, Mexica (Mexican Americans, Hispanics, etc.) living in the United States are not identified, or self-
identifying, as Indigenous, or Native Americans, either by the federal, state, and local
government, nor by the individual or community.

Gunn Allen (1992) refers to this as the “disguising of Hispanics by the Anglo-
European/Hispanic media, scholars, officials, and political activists” and points to their large
numbers as a major contributing factor to the continued survival of the Native American (Pg.
195). I emphasize that “Hispanics,” as a demographic, too often, deny their indigeneity, as they
do their Mexican ancestry, as a consequence of the same factors Gunn Allen (1992) discusses in
his work. However, taking into consideration the historical moments throughout US history in
which Whiteness and fear of the Other take hold of policy, reflective of pro-
White/”Establishment” policies, i.e., voting, land-ownership, etc. and a variation of xenophobic
incidents the US has hosted throughout its history, this should not be surprising (see: Tratado de
Guadalupe Hidalgo/Treaty of Guadalupe26, (1848), for furthers).

The establishment of the treaty, after the war, will end up with colonizers usurping
land/property once belonging to the Natives/Mexica/Hispanics,27 based on long-standing, racist
practices. American policy, too many times, has focused on the promotion and protection of
Whiteness in this country’s history. I contend that this is something that Hispanics must come
to terms within order to begin the process of colonial recovery, or decolonization, otherwise,
decolonization cannot transpire, leading to continued angst and racial tensions, even amongst

26 Tratado de Guadalupe Hidalgo (Spanish), also known as, the Treaty of Peace, Friendship, Limits and Settlement between the United States of America and the Mexican Republic, was signed on February 2, 1848, by the United States and Mexico at the end of the Mexican-American War (1846–1848). Essentially, the US “purchased” from Mexico, the Rio Grande, California, Utah, Nevada, Colorado, and portions of New Mexico and Arizona; in what is now referred to as the Southwest, (SW), US. To be clear, these regions housed Natives, and the regions continue to do so up to this point in history. Consequently, the Southwest-Borderlands, (US), and the regions within this proximity, remains sacred to many Natives, to include Mexico. Aztecs believed that they originated from Aztlán, which is believed to be located in what is now called, presently, Utah. Likewise, the Four-Corner Regions of the Southwest is also sacred. For many SW First Nations, the Peoples origins stem from what is now referred to as the “Four Corners,” which encompass New Mexico, Utah, Colorado, and Arizona. As a side note, the authors largest DNA content (40%/matrarchal ancestry) originates from this same region.

27 See: APPENDIX: ITEM a-1, The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo Map
the same tribes/peoples. Furthermore, it is a byproduct of inner group racism wherein Mexican Americans might perceive themselves to better than Mexicans, etc., which is a phenomenon that is passed down to subsequent generations, implying that such groups have been, in all senses, conquered by the colonizer because they choose to self-identify in the ways that the White man/status quo/colonizer wants them to.

Indigeneity & Self-Identifying: Critical Thinking & Analysis

In this treatise, I present the idea that racial/tribal self-denial is unhealthy for the individual, and the community in which the individual might have ancestry in when it is denied, negated, or opposed by the “self.” The practice of racial self-denial is critically debilitating to one’s psychological development; therefore, it is the individual’s responsibility to recognize and understand the implications that surround the issues surrounding self-identification. This is best done by referring to the Critical Thinking & Analysis Model (Vallès, 2015) offered below.

As discussed in an earlier chapter, the model below offers the opportunity to self-recognize phenomenon based on two components. The first component (below) discusses individual conscience-levels, meaning that the way individuals view the world is reliant on the
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individual’s interactions with others outside of the micro-level, that is, the level of the “Self.” Consisting of six levels of consciousness, the model presents the idea that attention to others/or external phenomenon increases in awareness/consciousness only when individuals step-outside of the self, interact with others outside of their normal life experiences, or becomes educated. Ultimately, what the model presents is the idea that as individuals expand their life experiences, so too does their recognition of the world, and the phenomenon that surrounds us.

An interesting aspect of the model is located in the “Cosmic Consciousness level,” which explains that the highest level of consciousness comes as individuals, ultimately, understand the interconnectedness between the universe, the planets, and the inhabitants of the universe. It is important to note that such a level of consciousness is reflective of the intellectual advances of the scientific mind, and that of tribal traditionalists, who have understood this simple reality long ago.

As a critical theorist specializing in education, race, sex, and politics, it is obligatory to point out that public education schooling and higher educational institutions fail in acknowledging and supporting the issues that surround “Hispanics,” because this particular demographic is neither White, of direct African descent, nor, considered Indigenous. Instead, Hispanics continue to be “corralled” or “herded” into an identity that is ascribed to them by the colonizer. While at home, their “Indigenous ways” are an essential aspect of their daily home life. At the same time, it is necessary to point out that American nationals of Hispanic/ Mexican/ Latino ancestry, are, at times, the primary instigators of self-group negation, meaning that Hispanics of American citizenship, often times, disassociate themselves, or see themselves as different, or, at a higher socio-cultural level of sorts, then other Latinos/Latinx/Hispanics from outside of the US. Essentially, the Scooby Doo effect.
On a serious note, I urge Mestizos everywhere who might subscribe to the Scooby Doo Effect to recognize; firstly, that they are practicing “it.” Secondly, that in so doing they are disempowering the group; hence, the self. Furthermore, Mestizos, and especially those with American citizenship, do well in recognizing that their Indigeneity is a consequence of the “New World Colonial experience,” specifically, ancestral annexation from the homelands, which has been a disempowering dynamic that will place Mestizos in the margins, and, in every manner possible. This is especially so, when the status quo feels threatened by the group.

At the same time, this particular demographic continues to stay in the margins as a consequence of their reluctance to become involved in government, specifically, in casting their vote (Abernathy, 2020; Rottinghaus, 2019; Patterson, 2019; 2015; Bianco & Canon, 2016; Gunn Allen, 1992). Moreover, population expansion for this group is so great that should they ever choose to unify under this umbrella and become social-justice activist, i.e., individuals who are a part of a collective that is cognizant of US policies; is able to identify who their representatives are; then, put that knowledge to use at the voting booth--in so doing, they could change many of the dynamics discussed throughout this academic undertaking (Abernathy, 2020; Rottinghaus, 2019; Patterson, 2019; 2015; Bianco & Canon, 2016; Gunn Allen, 1992). Instead, as a racial demographic group, they choose to remain in the margins (Abernathy, 2020; Rottinghaus, 2019; Patterson, 2019; 2015; Bianco & Canon, 2016).

Aside of the issues briefly discussed in the latter, it is necessary to address, and rectify, the lack of historic validity Mestizos have been allowed in US textbooks; whether history books, Language Arts, political science/government, etc. Mestizos have been left out, minimizing their vital role in US history. There is limited scholarship on this particular subject matter, and, in the minimal instances in which Mestizos are acknowledged, it is the context of
defeat. In short, the demographic group referred to as “Hispanics, Mexicans, Latin/South Americans, Mestizos, Chicanos, Latinos, Latinx, Borderlanders, etc.” are Indigenous peoples who, as a consequence of colonization, are genetically mixed with that of Europeans.

Anthropologically speaking, at a genomic-level, results from recent DNA studies on this particular population should not be surprising considering the history of the borderlands. At the same time, there is much need to address how the “Americanization” of the world has contributed to a disenchantment of sorts with anything “Mexican,” to the point that there is a negative association attributed to such an identity. I contend that this phenomenon is consequent of the types of media/images that have inundated American and global culture by means of television, film, literature, and now, a President who offers the world false representations and negative images about this racial demographic. These are old practices rooted in the Colonizers attempt to Other this particular demographic group as a consequence of historical events that have taken place in the Americas.

Too often, Mestizos are presented as boogey men, or “bad hombres,” and they are falsely accused of “…bringing drugs…bringing crime…to the US” (Trump speeches, 2016-2020). Described as “rapists…,” by Donald J. Trump, they must be perceived as something foreign trying desperately to enter the US, when all along the ancestors of these “illegals” have populated this continent long before White folks even knew it was here. To heighten fear within the pro-Trumpian American base, his followers are told that “..they’re heading this way, (YIKES!!), and in great numbers (double YIKES!!!!). Á la caravan, they are described as “invaders,” “illegals,” who dare to, brazenly, enter spaces that belong to White America. In reality, the massive “caravans” were comprised of mostly women and children escaping political, socio-cultural, economic strife so pernicious that they felt they had no choice but to do
so. This should serve as a reminder of the types of arguments, historically-recorded, pre-18th century as to White, Europeans begin “invading” this continent.

Returning to this theme, as the Anglo-Saxon, Euro-White man forces their way westward and, eventually, will take control of the Southwest Borderlands, it is important to note that “Mestizos” have resided within these geographic areas now referred to as the borderlands since time immemorial. The original inhabitants of this unique, geo-space were Natives of Mexico/New Spain previous to the invasion of White-Anglo-Saxons. Furthermore, Mestizos were located throughout regions now called Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, Utah, California, and Colorado. Previous to this, with the arrival of 14-15th Century, Portuguese-Italian, Spanish, French-invaders, their marginalization is instituted from the very beginning of the White-European invasion by means of “Othering” them. Colonization cannot succeed without dividing groups, which is accomplished by creating an “us” -vs-“them” socio-political, cultural event.

Aside of the political aspects of this, i.e., Mexico-vs-US policy, the major difference between Mestizos and North American Natives is that Natives from Mexico/South/Latin America have already been genetically altered by the arrival of the first Portuguese/Spanish colonizers, who begin the process of colonizing the continent in the 14th Century. This monumental genetic conglomeration between the original peoples of the continent, with that of the first European colonizers, will take off with the arrival of Hernan Cortes and his men in 1519, in which case it is documented by Cortes’ acknowledgement of offspring. In fact, Cortes and Dona Marina, an Indigenous Mexica, will welcome the birth of Cortes’ son, Martin. Throughout the Borderlands, often times, Dona Marina is referred to as “La Chingada” (by Mexica in particular) as she is seen to have “sold-out” the Natives of that time and place. Cortes
will acknowledge Martin as his son, although he is married to a Spanish woman at the time, and Malinche will be acknowledged as the mother of the first Mestizo, half-breed. Martin will, eventually, travel to Spain acknowledged as Cortes’ son and will experience “Othering” at that time.

Essentially, from that point on, Natives from the continent now called America will be infiltrated from all regions, and, at a rate that will be astoundingly rapid. The continuous “Othering” of Mestizos will serve as the means of establishing the very negative stereotypes specific to this demographic, which contributes directly to their stigmatization to this day. This fact has only deepened as a consequence of Donald Trump’s presidency in 2016 and, consequently, has been heightened. Trump’s constant disparaging and anti-brown rhetoric has become a practice reciprocated, embraced, and supported by his “base.” Again, I would like to point out that in all truth, the only immigrants in the US are the non-Native, Europeans. Nevertheless, a renewal of direct and subliminal messages has reawakened, with the message screaming out, “we must keep “Mexicans/illegal/ [Brown people]” out!! In this way, Mexico, and/or people of Mexican descent living in the US, have become a vital part of the categorization “marginalized” community, which also includes individuals of Indigenous ancestry living outside of the community (i.e., urban, rural, suburbanites, etc.) or reservations (res/rez).

Similar to rhetoric coming out of a Trumpian28 world, Huntington (2004) contends that “The persistent inflow of Hispanic immigrants threatens to divide the United States into two

---

28 Authors Note: The term “Trumpian” is coined by the author. The term describes the illogical nature of the type of arguments and discussions candidate Donald J. Trump makes pre/post-presidency and are embraced by his political base. There is a consistent lack of accountability in recognizing that much of his arguments are centered on lies, misinformation, and divisive racial/cultural rhetoric that promote an “‘US’/USA”-vs- “them/non-USA” political platform essential and necessary for his connecting to his highly, anti-immigrant base/pro-White base.
peoples, two cultures, and two languages,” which is a totally xenophobic standpoint that will, eventually, begin to show its ugly head once the US status Quo places an openly racist president into the White House (pg. 30). Furthermore, it reflects, what I coin as, *Colonial Preservation*, (CP), which is best understood from the standpoint of the colonizer who must retain his White-privileged space in politics, the economy, and at the socio-cultural-level, which includes linguistics. He cannot do this when demographics shift *against* the status quo, as is currently the situation in Europe and the US. Colonizers.

Always looking out for their privileged positions, not only for themselves but for their progeny as well; “*the Intrepid class,***” from the perspective of colonization,” failed to realize early on that there is a price to pay, long-term, for the misdeeds of ancestors, whether as a consequence of invasion/conquest or having participated in a very un-Christian practice such as slavery and attempts at genocide against Native peoples (Césaire, 1972). Amazingly, within academia and within other US institutionalizations, to try to challenge these types of latter arguments is not good for your career, and, now, for your well-being as it has become acceptable to have Trump-supporters “go after you.”

Countless examples of this type of revisionist history, and the arguments in defense of it, is best appreciated in the very simple analysis of Hegel’s *Master-Slave* relationship. The “Master” requires “*slavehood***” in order to create an elitist space for themselves in which only a few have access to. Until Masters can do work for themselves and/or find another continent in which only they and their select few can live, this will continue to be the irony behind such relationships, at least for the US. The main ethical and logical issues with this type of Western standpoint, amongst many others, is that it rests on a government system that labels itself as a democratic system of government, supposedly, centered on concepts central to the *US*
Constitution that promotes a governing system comprised “of the people, by the people, and for the people.” Clearly, there are several elements of hypocrisy and illogic standpoints in Huntington’s arguments—unless you are a part of the status quo/minority racial collective.

Huntington (2004) explains that “Unlike past immigrant groups, Mexicans and other Latinos have not assimilated into mainstream U.S. culture, forming instead their own political and linguistic enclaves—from Los Angeles to Miami—and rejecting the Anglo-Protestant values that built the American dream,” which I contend is a feature of the Indigenous aspect of the culture; however, because they fail to organize as a collective they continue to be disempowered peoples who continue to sit in the margins of American society (pg. 30). Nevertheless, Huntington’s (2004) alarmist view troubles me because he fails to address how Hispanics living in the US, whether “legal” or “illegal,” continue to be living in the margins as they are essentially disempowered peoples.

Accordingly, applying this to my argument, their potential electoral voice, their buying power, amongst other significant contributions to American society continues to go unnoticed, except during voting periods wherein they are feared by the mainstream—should they ever decide to vote and/or fully participate in US government practices. Until “they” realize, as a collective, that they failed to show-up to vote, again; as a potential collective, it does not help their cause, specifically, those who self-identify as “Hispanics” and/or other similar racial-classification, labels, as there is continuous dissension amongst the varying groups prompted by orthodox, traditionalist and non-traditionalist religious views grounded in Catholicism, with non-traditionalists, in general, being members of second and third generations.

Huntington (2004) warns Americans that “The United States ignores this challenge at its peril,” which is something I do not contend with. In terms of civic/political engagement,
Hispanics’ tend to be unwilling or collectively-incapable, as a group, of becoming a potentially powerful collective, or, of maintaining the type of cohesiveness necessary for political activism that allows for orthodox, traditionalist and non-traditionalist Hispanics to collaborate together (Abernathy, 2020; Rottinghaus, 2019; Patterson, 2019; 2015; Bianco & Canon, 2016; Huntington, 2004, Pg. 30). Instead, they are fractured politically; however, as a culture, they still cling to Indigenous ideals, in spite of the fact that many Hispanics fail to recognize, or embrace, their Indigenous ancestry

Political scientists recognize that despite their rapid demographic growth rates in the US; due to their low-education attainment levels, their lack of political curiosity or participation in civics, i.e. community service, political involvement/political knowledge acquisition, lack of voting, etc., serve as indicators that, too often, they choose to remain in the margins. Otherwise, they could flip the American political system as an active demographic.

Conversely, African Americans are also a vital segment of marginalized populations because they too experience disempowerment issues and other very complex residuals from their American ancestral history in which they have become “displaced” populations who no longer identify with Africa. Often times, they self-identify as “Black” people. Clearly, this is a purely Eurocentric-American hat trick. There is no such genetic-racial classification as “Black,” or at the least, there should have never been one that should lend itself out in this way. Simply put, black is a color, not a human. As such, African Americans’ inability to self-identify within a variety of circumstances, as found in the case of “Hispanics,” likewise, serves as a means of disempowerment specific to Eurocentric, colonial practices, allowing for this demographic racial group to, sometimes, create fractures within their collective as a consequence of African negation.
European, pre-set, racial hierarchies are NOT unclear or complex, nor, difficult to establish as they center on Whiteness, which is fundamentally based on skin tone/individual coloring. Any other racial group will continue to be dismantled as long as marginalized populations fail to understand this simplistic reality. To be clear, colonization requires this type of psycho-cultural defragmentation for the process to work.

Although African Americans, or, if you will, displaced genetic descendants from the African continent currently living in the US, sometimes appear to be more cohesive, politically, than Hispanics, this too constantly changes. As Americans of African ancestry continue to experience significantly disproportionate economic ranges amongst themselves, with some “African-Americans” climbing up the social and economic ladders and a larger majority of African Americans experiencing socio-cultural phenomenon and economic challenges that continues to impede their ability to do so. I suggest, individual economic-levels/education attainment-levels create situations play havoc on group cohesiveness, creating another form of us -vs-them dynamic. This distinction manifests itself in whether they are more socially active, or not, with the more economically and educated sectors being more socially active.

Interestingly, similar to Hispanics, a strong inclination towards religion within the group keeps such groups in a more cohesive and socially active status then those within the same groups who do not affiliate themselves with a particular religion. This means that religious affiliation, in these cases, can prompt social activism— when it is instigated by the “church” or spear-headed by the religious leaders of the church. Nevertheless, there are important cultural distinctions between Hispanics and Africans-Americans, aside of the linguistic.
My analysis of this as a critical education researcher leads me to place this
distinction in the “culture” itself. As I mentioned earlier, Hispanics, or native peoples of the
American continent, practice unbeknownst to themselves often times, similar Indigenous ways
which are not the same ones that African Americans practice, in spite of their mutual oppressive
histories, with the distinction being applied that slavery is the harshest. As to the matter of
bondage, which both groups experienced to a degree; clearly, the Native and African American
experience haunts America still. Another distinction regarding Mestizos and African Americans
worth consideration lays within the context of potential relationships with mainstream
populations. African Americans, sometimes, appear to be accepted more openly than Hispanics.
A large part of this is attributed to what Huntington (2004) refers to in his article, the Hispanic
populations,’ seemingly, inability to fully assimilate to the colonizers ideal of what “they” (the
colonizer) believes they “the colonized” should be like, act like, think like, etc. This type of
“resistance” is attributed to the Indigenous aspect of the “Hispanic” culture. This type of
“cultural resistance” is something that is found within Indigenous “tribal groups” recognized by
the American federal government as first peoples of the continent. In the case of Hispanics, as a
group, their lack of tribal cohesiveness contributes to their disempowerment in spite of their
large numbers. Still, what they lack as a group, it could be argued, is compensated for by the
close ties they hold within immediate and extended family members. As such, they have a
“clan-like” aspect to their family dynamics, which is seen even in second and third generation
Hispanics. As a critical Indigenous researcher and educator living in these border regions, it is
my personal and professional observation that these types of close-knit family ties are beneficial
to the individual. At the same time, they can impede the progression of the individual in their
educational pursuits. Still, the cohesiveness is extraordinary and a rich part of individual self-
identification, that is, the individual views themselves as an intricate part of the clan, much as Indigenous peoples do.

As addressed previously, although Hispanics/Mestizo are a result of the genetic history found in this part of the world, that is, the genetic “coming together” of the colonizer and the colonized; “Hispanic” culture, in many ways, initially, was a Mestizo one. In many ways, this remains the case, especially so, for communities located in the border regions between the US and Mexico borderlands. These populations are distinct from other Hispanics living outside of this geographic space as they, culturally, exhibit aspects of Indigeneity, which I contribute to geography. In this way Huntington (2004) makes a valid point to his readers, “their” (Hispanics) large population numbers should be of concern to the mainstream, if they were a more cohesive community.

Because Huntington’s (2004) article is addressed, specifically, to members of the mainstream population; this, and other similar articles written by xenophobes like Huntington (2004) serves to exemplify the kind of “Othering” still found in media, the literature, the academy, and in our socio-cultural spaces. I rationalize that all researchers can easily do this too; however, the big difference lays in why we do it. Do we do it to divide further, or to contribute to a better understanding of phenomenon, which is something that can be achieved without having to create or contribute to an “Us” and “Them” division? This is why research design requires that it be modified when allied with differing communities. Under such circumstances, a geographic-cultural analysis is then required.

In summary, marginalized populations are comprised of people living and existing outside of the mainstream, socio-culturally, politically, education-wise, and economically. Marginalized groups, which includes Borderlanders, Hispanics, African
Americans, transnationals, and others, are also members of the disenfranchised. Nevertheless, in the US, these three particular groups best represent the “marginalized” as their presence on the continent (now known as the American continent, or the “Americas/US”), supersedes that of other racial groups, and, of course, the colonizer.

In the case of African Americans, they too arrived even before White, Anglo Saxons ever did when they enter the continent by means of Latin/South America/Mexico. Moreover, there exists anthropological proof in Veracruz, and other regions in Mexico, that they may have been on this continent even before Mayan/Aztec were Indigenous to the islands that surround the Americas. The dates are not reliable, as the Olmec heads are extraordinary in racial depiction, geographically, and they cannot be appropriately dated at this time, since they are from basalt. Although African Americans are not “feared” by the mainstream culture in the same way that Hispanics are, as discussed by Huntington (2004), they are feared in other ways by the mainstream as a consequence of America’s slave history. In 1782, Thomas Jefferson, one of the framers of the *US Constitution*, wrote, “Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever…” Annette Gordon-Reed discusses the complex nature of the role of Whiteness in the creation of the Declaration of Independence in the following:

Of all the Revolutionary founders, Thomas Jefferson has figured the most prominently in blacks’ attempts to constitute themselves as Americans. His life, in public and private, has long served as a vehicle for analyzing and critiquing the central dilemma at the heart of American democracy: the desire to create a society based on liberty and equality runs counter to the desire to maintain white supremacy. Others of the founders held slaves, but no other founder drafted the charter for American freedom. Jefferson, of course, did not invent the ideas contained in the Declaration. But it is a supreme
understatement to say that his manner of expressing them has been enormously influential.\(^{29}\)

Still, both groups are best representative of marginalized populations due to their continued disempowerment and continued oppression as a consequence of colonization. My work is an attempt to readdress the manner in which traditional research methods has been incorporated to sustain their marginality.

In adapting quantitative methods for research endeavors with Indigenous and marginalized populations, these populations will be situated into a research design specific to their histories as colonized members living in contemporary mainstream society. For communities who are epistemologically, ontologically, axiological, and ecologically distant from that of a Westernized view of the world, traditional research approaches to education are problematic. This includes the use of traditional quantitative methods in education research design, because there is a definite disconnect from an Indigenous worldview perspective; epistemologically, ontologically, axiological, and ecologically between these specific groups of people with those of the mainstream.

Arguments presented as to why this is so will soon follow, but what is important to recognize at this point is how traditional research methods has failed to fit into the specific purposes of research studies in association with Indigenous and marginalized populations. Such important work requires a rethinking of worldviews, different research lenses, and must step-away from Euro-centrist ideologies, which are a vital aspect of colonization and history.

These structures are systems created for mainstream populations and not marginalized or Indigenous populations. To the contrary, these types of classification systems, especially in

https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/jefferson/enigma/blacks.html
post-modern education systems continues to alienate and create resentment between these populations. On this alone, there is need to question these traditional methodologies because they fail to adapt to a worldview outside of their current one, which is made further problematic as we now live in a globalized world. Historically, in the US, the status quo centers on White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestants, meaning, non-Hispanics—and-- any attempts, whether deliberate or spontaneously created, to alter this political dynamic will be unwelcomed by the same status quo.

**Background on Traditional Research Methods**

“A civilization that proves incapable of solving the problems it creates is a decadent civilization. A civilization that chooses to close its eyes to its most crucial problems is a stricken civilization. A civilization that uses its principles for trickery and deceit is a dying civilization.”

-- Césaire, (1955; 1972, pg. 1)

In general, there are, traditionally, three research methods which have been relied upon by education researchers in order to ascertain learning and teaching dynamics. Of these three, it is argued in this academic proposal that a quantitative approach allows for a superficial understanding of phenomenon that lends itself to the study of large-sized populations. It is suggested that such research is undertaken in order to effectively utilize assessment scores; address issues surrounding absenteeism; as well as to implement Grade Point Averages, (GPA’s), etc.

The collection and analysis of data is, primarily, initiated in order to promote education and to allow for areas of weakness to be discovered, supplemented, and improved. Although this idea is challenged repeatedly by students, parents, teachers, administrators, precisely in relation to conducting and collecting state mandated, high-stakes testing results, etc. on the whole, education does work for the majority of students when the education system conducts
itself democratically and with the students best interests in mind; however, it is prudent to recognize that education systems and practices as we know them in the West and in countries that emulate it outside of this realm, is something that is unique to Western civilization; therefore, they are institutionalized systems created for mainstream populations and not Indigenous ones. This is problematic and must be addressed in research practices, as well in education systems and academia.

Other traditional research methodologies consist of qualitative and “mixed methods” research practices. Both are vital approaches to understanding a phenomenon; nonetheless, both require longer time periods to complete as they are cumulative in the data collection process. It is noted that such research approaches offer researchers an in-depth understanding of phenomenon; though, in general, such effort is conducted with smaller sized population participant groups, as the toil is intense and intimate. Vital aspects of these types of research methods require the studying of participants within a real-life setting; thoughtful interview sessions; audio or visual taping of events; and/or intensive analysis of qualitative data, i.e., scripts, survey results with open ended responses, etc...

A mixed methods approach is one that incorporates elements of both quantitative and qualitative methods and can be another effective, although time-consuming approach to understanding a phenomenon because there is still qualitative work to be done; however, it is something that might be approached quantitatively as it allows for larger group sizes to be used. All this will be discussed in deeper detail in the literature section of this research proposal. Also to be discussed throughout this endeavor is the idea that, overall, on several important levels, quantitative research methods within a large education setting is sometimes the most effective way to assess a learning or teaching situation that requires immediate
rectifying, or, at the least, allows for teachers and administrators to become aware of, as such a phenomenon can impact teaching and learning. This is important to understand, and then to contextualize by placing this into a large-sized education system.

Placed within the context of traditional research practices, it should be recognized by now that Indigenous and marginalized study participants are culturally distinct in many ways, yet there are no known compensations in current quantitative research practices for these groups for that fact. Furthermore, another critique about standard Western research practices and methodologies of old is that they have left a negative, or partial, understanding of marginalized populations (Sandoval, 2000; Mutua & Swadener, 2004; Spring, 2007; Tuhiwai Smith 2008, 2012; Chilisa, 2012; Kovach, 2012; Lonetree, 2012; Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2012; Walter & Andersen, 2013). The marginalized and Indigenous bond is grounded in their shared identity as colonized peoples as obtained through conquest, or, brought upon them by means of forced continent displacement as a consequence of slavery. These complex histories have become a form of collective identity, legitimized by means of a long history of injustices committed against them and culminating in oppression.

To understand the complexity of such a legacy, especially as it applies to research design, I rely on feminist theory to address these types of phenomenon. It is necessary to address these issues through the use of a feminist lens. To begin, I refer to Gunn Allen’s (1992) view that “Traditional American Indian systems depended on basic concepts that are at present being reformulated and to some extent practiced by western feminists, including cooperation …harmony…. balance, kinship, and respect,” which attributes to the practice of regarding females highly (Pg. 206). Although I will discuss Indigenous female value systems in greater detail in subsequent chapters, I concur that there is a definite affinity for the intertwining of the
Indigeneity and feminism in addressing research design. I also concur with Gunn Allen’s (1992) view that Native peoples resist feminism as they perceive it to be a part of the white world, still, from a research design perspective, feminist theory is pivotal to Indigenous research design as will be discussed in the following section.

**Incorporating Feminism in Research Design**

“In the beginning were the people, the spirits, the gods; the four-legged, the two-legged, the winged, the crawlers, the burrowers, the plants, the trees, the rocks. There was the moon, the sun, the earth, the waters of earth and sky. There were the stars, the thunders, the mountains, the plains, the mesas, and the hills. There was the Mystery. There were the Grandmothers, the Mothers, the clans, the people.”

--Gunn Allen (1992, Pg. 194)

In *standpoint theory* (ST), Hartsock (1983) has been intellectually influential and her work pivotal in my designing and creating a research framework that centers on Indigenous/marginalized groups, as ST offers the individual an external, methodologically-sound, conceptualization tool for viewing, understanding, in short, reckoning with other people’s life experiences from the vantage points, or perspectives, of the *Other* (for a clearer explanation and for arguments for the use and criticisms of ST, please refer specifically to Harding, 1991, Pg. 48; and Harding, 2004) (Alcoff & Potter, 1993). Essentially, ST considers the real-life perspectives outside of the micro-level of consciousness. ST is not empathy, but a combination of critical theory and feminism. A feminist standpoint, theoretically, rests on three primary assertions related to subjectivity, as discussed in chapter one. The first of these is the awareness and understanding of how individuals know things epistemologically, namely, how we build our personal knowledge systems, which are socially and historically situated (Alcoff & Potter, 1993). This means that these experiences are unique to the individual and to the geographic and historical placing of that individual, *that is to say*, where they live, how they

Secondly, relative to the life experiences of marginalized groups, feminist standpoint theory posits that ST facilitates a socially-situated approach and awareness mainly connected to the marginalized, or historically oppressed, which allows for a type of first-handed understanding of that experience, which in turn allows for the marginalized individual to ask questions that the non-marginalized individual cannot because they do not relate, reason, or understand the experience of the marginalized, and/or oppressed (Reference sources: Smith, 1974, 1991, 2004; Addelson, 1983; Harding & Hintikka, 1983; Anzaldúa, 1987; Delpit, 1988; Haraway, 1988; Harding, 1991, 2004; Jaggar & Rothenberg, 1993; Hekman, 1997; Kim & McCann, 1998; Wylie, 2003; Calderón, 2011; Elenes & Delgado Bernal, 2010; Delgado Bernal & Elenes, 2011; Delgado Bernal, Burciaga & Flores, 2012; McQueen, 2014).

Finally, a ST approach to research, is mainly research that focuses on the phenomenon via the use of a “power relations” lens, as argued by feminists. Such an approach to understanding phenomenon should always begin from the starting point of the lives of the marginalized, as they are recipients of the “Other” relationship established by the hegemony (Reference sources: Smith, 1974, 1991, 2004; Addelson, 1983; Harding & Hintikka, 1983; Anzaldúa, 1987; Delpit, 1988; Haraway, 1988; Harding, 1991, 2004; Jaggar & Rothenberg, 1993; Hekman, 1997; Kim & McCann, 1998; Wylie, 2003; Calderón, 2011; Elenes & Delgado
Furthering this discussion, feminists argue about issues directly related to situated knowledge, as in Haraway’s (1988) seminal piece wherein she essentializes this debate by referring to an epistemological challenge of sorts, “…in which the mainstream view reflects the idea that, “…traditionally, what can count as knowledge is policed by philosophers codifying cognitive canon law…” (Pg. 575). This is a debated discussion that continues still. This criticism is made, explicitly, relative to traditional quantitative approaches to traditional research in general (Sandoval, 2000; Mutua & Swadener, 2004; Spring, 2007; Tuhiwai Smith 2008, 2012; Chilisa, 2012; Kovach, 2012; Lonetree, 2012; Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2012 Walter & Andersen, 2013).

This detail leads to what Cohn (1996) refers to as colonial cultural hegemony, which allows for the continuation of political and economic control of colonized groups by the power elite, that is, the colonizers and their descendants, many who have inherited not only property but the practices and assumptions of the colonizer (Cohn, 1996).

Another feminist concept adopted into DRM is the analysis of phenomenon through a modified form of gender subordination, in this case, I have coined it colonized subordination (CS). In general, the practice of “subordination” is a deliberate type of marginalization of specific non-mainstream people, be it due to conquest, religious affiliation or sexual orientation. It is a phenomenon instituted by the mainstream power holders over the “Other”. Within the context of feminism, gender subordination is the historical marginalization and continued disempowerment of women because of their sex, which is specific to female biology in spite of individual gender preferences, whether, gay females or heterosexual females.
This type of subordination is manifested physically, psychologically, economically, politically, etc.... In this case, *Colonized Subordination (CS)* is the deliberate subordination of Indigenous, or marginalized, groups of people due to the simple fact that they are not part of the status quo. Ways in which the intended subordination is achieved is through the control over the “*Other*”. In the case of women, this control happens on many levels, at the micro, meso, macro, and global, either through physical intimidation, legal intimidation, etc....; however, this fact is layered with race, which requires the use of a race lens to better recognize and understand its traditionalist role in research design.

Although I have clarified that *DRM* is not a race-based methodology. I want to underscore again that DRM is a decolonial paradigm. Returning to *DRM*, the use of Critical Race Theory (CRT) allows for the promotion of counter-hegemonic discourses to take place in the literature by means of the integration of a race lens which is used for deconstructing and analyzing the *axes of domination* and power inequities experienced through colonization (Kim & McCann, 1998; Ladson-Billings, 1999; 2008). In reflecting on the power of the process of colonization, let us refer to Césaire who reflected that “…Europe has gotten on very well indeed with all the local feudal lords who agreed to serve, woven a villainous complicity with them, rendered their tyranny more effective and more efficient, and that it has actually tended to prolong artificially the survival of local pasts in their most pernicious aspects” (Césaire, 1972, pg. 8). To this day, the institutionalization of the “isms” has benefited the power holder. It is only through the use of a feminist lens, layered with critical theory, that the real history of Indigeneity can be recognized and challenged.

Likewise, feminism and CRT as research tools encourages the incorporation of experiential knowledge and encourages Indigenous/colonized, and marginalized populations to
present their life experiences as appropriate, legitimate, as these are considered central to analyzing and understanding racial inequality. Both feminism and CRT encourage a critical approach to phenomenon aimed at addressing the issues at hand, while promoting and allowing for censure over dominant orthodox epistemologies, as well as consideration of other forms of systemic oppression. In the case of colonized peoples, it is especially effective to begin the research process from a [female] standpoint approach because the method is a means for empowering and improving the situation of the marginalized and oppressed, which is especially relevant as the approach advocates that traditionally disempowered groups take the reins on such an endeavor (Alcoff & Potter, 1993).

Furthermore, these two theoretical approaches promote “a critical consciousness about the nature of our social location and the difference it makes epistemically”, as Wylie (2003) discusses; hence, promoting the feminist ideal that “knowledge is socially situated and is influenced by 'non-cognitive' factors [such] as one's gender ... and socio-economic status,” as explained by Valadez (Wylie 2003, Pg.31; Valadez, 2001, Pg. 70). In the case of DRM, the use of both of these philosophical and theoretical constructs uphold the idea that not only is knowledge socially situated, it is also additionally impacted by colonization. “I have said - and this is something very different - that colonialist Europe has grafted modern abuse onto ancient injustice, hateful racism onto old inequality” (Césaire, 1972. pg. 8). What is and will continue to be argued throughout this proposed research plan is the idea that traditional quantitative methods tell only part of the story.

In isolation, data collected, analyzed and used to measure and make decisions regarding Indigenous and marginalized populations is one-sided and it presents only part of the story, historically, institutionally, economically, and socio-culturally. Reflecting on the type of
educational challenges that are placed on such students, an Indigenous epistemological worldview is missing in education systems, both at the public-school level and in the academy, but it is also consists of vital components omitted in the research process—which is a significant aspect of identity. Think and then rethink this fact from a purely linguistic lens, then from an educational one, followed by a research design one.

Aside of the semantic changes that language goes under as a consequence of historical events, so does identity, even in times of peace, then war, then colonization. For these reasons alone, education and research design must be revisited, especially for research with Indigenous and marginalized populations. In short, DRM is an attempt to readdress how quantitative data is collected, analyzed, and presented to others within an education setting when collaborating with Indigenous and marginalized populations. The essence of DRM is rooted in what has been coined DRM’s Nine Core Components (12CC’s), specifically created for Indigenous populations, which are essential to the research paradigm. As will be discussed in greater detail in subsequent chapters, the Nine Core Components are representative of Indigenous world-views, which are specific to each community within a global context.
1.1 Statement of the Problem

“If you don't stand for something you will fall for anything.”

— Gordon A. Eadie

Not surprisingly, origins for the usage of the term DRM are derived from the study of linguistics. In particular, I reference de Saussure (2001), who reminds us that “…without language, thought is a vague, uncharted nebula…” (Pei, 1965; Metcalf, 1974; Harris, 1987; 1988; Lightfoot, 1999; Finch, 2000; 2005; de Saussure, 2001; Janson, 2002; Joseph & Janda, 2003; van Sterkenburg, 2004; Chapman & Routledge, 2005; Jessner, 2005; Crystal, 2006; Hale, 2007; Matthews, 2007; Smith, 2007; Gleason & Ratner, 2009; Végso, 2010). As such, language is argued by linguists as a central aspect of community, culture, and collective spirituality.

In historical linguistics, that is, the analysis and study of changes in human language, a synchronic approach, or analysis, incorporates an understanding of linguistic phenomena at a singular level or at a precise time in history. Such an analysis, or study, is usually viewed in “present” time, i.e., “The 21st Century Hopi Dictionary; Preservation of the original Hopi language”. In this example, the “original” Hopi language, it is presumed, is captured and documented as something that does not change after the 21st Century, therefore it is synchronic.

In contrast, a diachronic approach to linguistic phenomenon, as viewed through a historical lens respective to linguistic phenomenon and/or changes, is usually a consequence of language developments throughout variations in time, namely, past, present, and future time. An example of this could be seen in the title of the following fictitious work as used for these examples, i.e., “An historical accounting on the culmination and usage of Spanglish from 1940
to present times in the United States”. In this example, discussion relative to the origins of Spanglish, i.e., Spanish, and then present arguments as to how historical events in the US, specifically, the Bracero Program of the 1940’s impacted migrant/immigrant language usage of Spanish by adopting and adapting English to the given populations language repertoire.

Perhaps, another approach to conceptualize diachronic and synchronic is to compare them to film metaphorically. In the case of synchronic, a singular photo could be useful, as the photo is representative of one event that takes place at that one particular time, i.e., the taking of the photo at that certain moment in time. In the case of conceptualizing the term “diachronic,” the comparison could be applied to the viewing of a particular phenomenon via a film.

Consider, then, how something as basic as words and their usage changes over time respective to daily life. Then apply that idea, correspondingly to a colonial history; to the phenomenon of conflict, war, colonization and temporal “peace.” This, then, is what language alone undergoes. This type of linguistic movement is referred to as the semantic shifts of language usage. At the same time that language undergoes such shifts, the “pejoration” of words within a particular language takes place, that is to say, words in a language undergo continuous changes that then affects the language irrevocably, for one cannot go back to fix it or change the impact of these types of monumental linguistic events. Such shifts are especially heightened when colonial histories are applied to the phenomenon of language development, as the pejoration of words takes place inevitably.

DRM argues that such is the case for human beings as well. The individual, like words, changes in the course of our history; however, this is especially vital to recognize when the changes come because of colonial conquest, because, in general, those changes will be
detrimental to the individual, thus the group. Pei (1965; original print date: 1949) explains early on in the study of language that the question is often asked, “What makes for semantic change?” (pg. 148). According to Pei (1965), change “is subject to all forces, overt and obscure, of individual and mass psychology …,” for each change “there is a definite cause, which it is usually impossible to ascertain with any degree of accuracy a few years after it has taken place…” (Pei, pg. 148). Just imagine the type of changes that colonization has brought to many groups of people worldwide, yet they are not discussed in research, textbooks, academia, etc.…

Césaire, (1972) explains, that “On the contrary, bourgeois swinishness is the rule. We've been on its trail for a century. We listen for it, we take it by surprise, we sniff it out, we follow it, lose it, find it again, shadow it, and every day it is more nauseatingly exposed,“

Oh! the racism of these gentlemen does not bother me. I do not become indignant over it. I merely examine it. I note it, and that is all. I am almost grateful to it for expressing itself openly and appearing in broad daylight, as a sign. A sign that he intrepid class which once stormed the bastilles is now hamstrung

(Césaire, 1972, Pg. 9).

scholarship “analyzes the core units of conceptual systems that underlie writing stories about race. Specifically, it examines how metaphors of the self and the social have historically shaped the seeing and the narrative structure of racial stories” (pg. 50).

A DRM approach to research requires a diachronic understanding of cultural, linguistic, socio-economic, and political dynamics as experienced by the participant community because the community has undergone the experience of colonization, which has changed the community irrevocably. DRM embraces the fact that Indigenous and marginalized populations
are groups of people that have inherited undesirable legacies that have impacted the community in ways that have not affected mainstream populations due to colonization.

Under such circumstances, Indigenous communities have been impacted because the participant group has been forcibly altered by external forces which they cannot control, and/or because the community has been geographically displaced by power holders for reasons meant to control, undermine, and disempower the group; therefore, these realities are, and should be, a vital aspect of the research paradigm. In its current state, traditional quantitative research methods do not need to address these types of phenomenon, or similar politically/socio-economically motivated cultural events that continue to impact Indigenous and marginalized populations.

Regarding the DRM process, the quantitative dimension of DRM encompasses the use of collected data, which many times is easily available within education systems, i.e. State Performance Plans (SPP) and Annual Performance Reports (APR); Highly Qualified Teacher Reports (HQTR); Public Education Information Management System (PEIM) reports - Staff Full-Time Employee (FTE) and Salary Report; PEIMS - Superintendent Salary Report; Teacher FTE Counts and Course Enrollment; Public Education Information Resource (PEIR) Teacher Certification Reports (TCR), state mandated test scores, etc.…it is data that is readily available at the national, state, and district levels and is used to understand phenomenon. Additionally, DRM incorporates the use of a fifteen-page document titled “Diachronic Research Methodologies (DRM), Research-Advocate’s Pre-Project Description Packet.” The packet should serve as a guide for the novice DRM research-advocate and explains the procedures, process, and dialogue requirements, for the benefit of all involved in the research endeavor.
Concerning the actual DRM paradigm, specific sections of the body of the research publication consist of the initial quantitative section of the work. The second component of the paradigm consists of a participant group “colonial/post-colonial” section that addresses the history of the participant community, which, again, will be unique to each place and group. The colonial/post-colonial section of the paradigm is provided by the participant group, or participant community, in alliance with the researcher. On top of this, DRM requires a plan of action that the researcher offers the participant group that specifically addresses the issue, or content, studied.

In this particular section of the research paradigm the researcher must bring to the table something concrete that will be used as a means of addressing the data results. An example of this could be a funding grant that is made available to the participant group in order to address the results of the data collection. For instance, if the researcher enters into a community in which the data suggests that there is a significant change in assessment scores in reading at the second-grade level that impacts the participant group detrimentally, then the researcher, in collaboration with the community, is required to provide a means of recourse to the community that will allow for positive changes in that area.

Examples of potential approaches to the phenomena, or research results, could be an appropriately designed university tutoring program that allows pre-approved, highly specialized reading instructors/college students to collaborate, “gratis”, individually with 2nd grade students in order to improve their reading scores, or, their math scores, science scores, etc…. , whatever it is that is being studied. The main purpose of this endeavor is to create a lasting relationship with the community, while providing positive change, specifically, as related to the phenomenon studied. No doubt, DRM allows the researcher to share a vital aspect
of Indigenous history with others outside of the research study community in a way that sheds a deeper understanding of the participant community to others.

As Vizenor (1998) explained, Indigenous peoples are the original peoples of this continent, despite times passing, Indigenous peoples continue to be a vital aspect of the post-modern world. Indigenous peoples have not gone anywhere and continue to remain in their original geographic, sacred spaces of existence. Still, there are issues within these populations which the DRM paradigm allows for and requires that research results address the type of obstacles that impact test scores at the education level, and will elucidate the fact that traditional approaches to research, teaching, curriculum, textbook development, etc….is problematic for those of us outside to that worldview, because what may apply for the mainstream population, is something quite different from what might agree for other groups of people. This fact should allow and encourage a more thoughtful strategy to teaching and learning not currently used.

Finally, DRM is an attempt to change the “cut and dry” aspect of quantitative research methods because it addresses the unique history of a group, specifically, that of Indigenous and marginalized groups that have experienced and been significantly impacted by colonization, for as Lather (1993) explains, “It is not a matter of looking harder or more closely, but of seeing what frames our seeing” (pgs. 673-693). It is expected that use of a DRM approach to research allows for the colonizing event, and other important factors, to be discussed in the research work and in the publication derived from the experience.

To reiterate, Indigenous populations have been irrevocably changed from what they once were to what they have now become—and this significantly impacts the group, thus, the individual. This is something that has been deliberately left out of Western history books, research projects, research journals, academia, and in the mainstream populations understanding.
of history, and our education system as a whole (Hardin, 1995; Loewen, 1995 & 2000; Cohn, 1996; Bender & Schorske, 1997; Lagemann, 1997 & 2010; Nabigon, Hagey, Webster, & MacKay, 1999; McGovern, 2000; Lost People Films, 2010; Meusch, 2010; Ma Rhea & Anderson, 2012).

I will continue to argue throughout this work that it is the responsibility of critical researchers, academics, and all educators to recognize this fact, then, to address it in the work we do. Whether research-design, curriculum design, or teaching students of any age, the Indigenous experience must be recounted from the perspective of Natives, recognized as legitimate, and acknowledged in ways that we have not been doing. In fact, academics, researchers, and the textbook industry have all been complicit in this Euro-centric, White-centered, misinformation campaign, and, therefore, culpable in the quiet maelstrom that has worked diligently to displace, disillusion, and depress Native populations. DRM advocates that this fact be acknowledged, addressed, and altered. Indigeneity is a human right that has been negated by Euro-Americans to the extent that great harm has befallen Natives everywhere, in conjunction with massive destruction specific to our planet. This must be stopped and challenged, and DRM begins the process of doing so through means of the academy and by means of education.

Statement of the Problem

“The contradiction is this, using a Western epistemological system like quantitative analysis in order to understand Indigenous phenomenon in education today seems problematic. There is something seemingly hypocritical about this on a subversive level; yet, it cannot be argued that such a research system allows for the understanding of issues in education that can be remedied in ways that other research methods cannot...”
As repeatedly discussed in the introduction, research findings set in large public-school settings can contribute significantly to theory and practice within the field of education, both in the US and globally, because it is an effective and efficient means of working with large school populations. On one hand, quantitative data collection allows for large numbers of data to be collected quickly, and in general, rather effectively.

Whether at a public or private school, or, at the elementary or university level, research findings derived as a means of statistical analysis resultant from the collection of appropriate data respective to the study population is key to understanding potential issues that may exist within that particular education system. This is especially valuable as education systems have become large-sized institutions that serve an incessantly changing culturally, socio-economically, and linguistically, diverse school population.

Research findings acquired through appropriate and ethical methodologies allow for sustained legitimacy to the field of research studies and to the data analysis process because the practice is useful as an exploratory tool when used, precisely, and when practiced within large school populations. By itself, the researcher has access to data that allows for a basic understanding of potential educational issues resultant of the data collected. Accordingly, overall, the quantitative research process is also deemed as scientific, when findings that have resulted from “an orderly process” grounded in a number of specific steps, such as the “recognition and definition of a problem; formulation of a hypothesis; collection of data; analysis of data; and statement of conclusions regarding confirmation or disconfirmation of the hypothesis, …,” (Gay, Mills, Airasian, 2009, Pg. 5). The degree of this is that it is deemed as a
legitimate research practice beginning from the early 20th Century onward, and it has become a standard tool of choice in education and in the social sciences today (Bender, 1997).

On the other hand, researchers participating with Indigenous and marginalized populations within education settings make important distinctions relative to quantitative methods as they dispute that in spite of its usefulness as a powerful research and learning tool; research cannot answer all the questions; more important, there is a troubling paradox to this discussion. The contradiction is this, using a Western epistemological system like quantitative analysis in order to understand Indigenous phenomenon in education today seems problematic. There is something seemingly hypocritical about this on a subversive level; yet, it cannot be argued that such a research system allows for the understanding of issues in education that can be remedied in ways that other research methods cannot.

This aspect of epistemological knowledge usage is worth vital consideration in relation to these types of critiques about quantitative research methods, as it presents the idea that a presumed traditional approach to the “scientific method” can be problematic because it is contended that this type of research is supported with social constructs such as racism and sexism; therefore, traditional research methods requires discourse addressing this and further ethical analysis because these social constructs are, and have been, historically, instruments of division and disharmony between humans (Fanon, 1952; 1963; Said, 1978; 1993; Zinn, 1990, 2005; Takaki, 1993; Bhabha, 1994; Loewen, 1995, 2005; Spring, 2008; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, 2012; White, 2010; ). To be clear, sexism will be referred to as a product of misogyny.

These types of social constructs are seen as intentionally divisive and as a means of sustaining the status quo. The UN Report (2001) recognized “the negative economic, social and cultural consequences of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance,
which have contributed significantly to the underdevelopment of developing countries and, in particular, of Africa and resolve to free every man, woman and child from the abject and dehumanizing conditions of extreme poverty to which more than one billion of them are currently subjected, to make the right to development a reality for everyone and to free the entire human race from want (UN Report of the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, 2001, Pg. 12).

Applying an intrinsic lens to this dialogue, it is argued in this work, that quantitative research practices are rooted in one-sided power relations. This is achieved by means of creating Eurocentric structures, be it, academically, socio-culturally, politically, institutionally, etc……. Clearly, such structures are deliberate and are designed to negate Indigenous and marginalized populations, their histories, their cultures, their language, their spirituality; their psycho-emotional well-being; simply put, marginalized groups are on the losing end of that struggle (Fanon, 1952; 1963; Said, 1978; 1993; Zinn, 1990, 2005; Takaki, 1993; Bhabha, 1994; Loewen, 1995, 2005; Spring, 2008; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, 2012; White, 2010; Walter & Andersen, 2013). Academia, often times, facilitates the process, either because it participates in it, or as argued in Rossatto, Vallès & et al, (2020), maintains it through teacher-training programs.

These types of abstract constructs, i.e., racism, sexism, and other-isms, are epistemologically grounded in the field of sociology, which examines how individuals view and understand the world. These types of unseen constructs allow sociologists to hypothesize that our understanding of the world is developed *individually*; at the same time, conversely, it is also developed by means of human interactions with other humans, and, by the use of
language. These factors allow for the individual to create a subjective view of the world in co-creation with other human beings which is based on our individual and group experiences.

In this manner, we create individualized models (i.e., racism, sexism, etc.) that allow us to understand and function in the world. These “models” allow for individual reality which, in conjunction with other individuals’ reality, construct our worldview. A worldview is best described as the “mental lenses that are entrenched ways of perceiving the world” (Olsen, Lodwick, & Dunlap, 1992). These will vary from community to community and should not attempt to be rigid in any way, or manner. The troubling thing is that media, institutions (academic and non-academic), and power holders, in general, control those images and constructs.

Furthermore, it is contended that the constructs have been created in order to maintain the status quo by promoting division and disdain between racial groups. As such, aside of media’s great impact on this, many times they are also present in research findings; journal publications; or found in richly illustrated “coffee table” books; seen in museums; written about ambiguously in travel journals; sang about in songs that contain racist/sexist, etc. Moreover, they are instrumental in developing nationalism by means of one-sided “education” textbooks used to “instruct and enlighten” the populations that they serve.

As a result, pedagogically-speaking, curriculum is situated in racism and sexism, often times. An example of this is seen in the “evolutionary chart,” which has been incorporated into television commercials, comic strips, and even textbooks, all inferring that the hierarchical apex of the human species is embodied in what seems like a tall, White, male as demonstrated in the pictorial offered below (see: Appendix A for Derbyshire’s complete article, p. 420). Borrowed from David Derbyshire’s (2010) article located on the Daily
website titled “Out of Asia? Ancient ancestor of modern man walked Sahara 39 million years ago.”

In this pictorial, as in other numerous similar charts, diagrams, genetic maps, drawings, etc., overwhelmingly, humanity is negatively represented by creating a blatantly false and illogical, racial, ideology whose arguments specific to perceived racial superiority is best displayed as being consistently, attributed to tall, fair-skinned and light-colored, haired males demonstrating “White, European” facial features. In so doing, such work perpetuates and defends racism and is in fact, the basis of pseudo-scientific work that pretends to be scientific. Furthermore, it’s embodiment is best located, repeatedly in the “sciences” of the late 19th Century and continues to be used in the present (Carlson, 2001; Langkjær-Bain, 2019; Louçã, 2009; Motomura, 2006; Weiss & Lambert, 2010; Whisker, 1990).

Figure 1.8: Euro-American, Ethnocentrism Learning Tool

Derbyshire’s (2010) article has served as a bogus pictorial representation of the ascent of human man by means of evolution within the pages of countless school textbooks, journals, research reports, etc., and, most maddening of all, even academia!! It has been
done without any type of questioning, or challenge to its validity. Again, this reinforces earlier arguments made throughout this dissertation, “isms” are created and institutionalized by colonizers, and perpetuated through public education systems that claim to promote “nationalism.” The danger of this is that it does so freely, without questioning. Furthermore, the practice heightens in times of “nationalistic,” anti-immigration movements and racial unrest prompted by false ideals of “patriotism” promoted by false ideologues, as is currently being experienced in the Western hemisphere (Langkjær-Bain, 2019; Louçã, 2009; Motomura, 2006; Weiss & Lambert, 2010).

As seen in the Figure 1.8 (above), this type of “learning tool” is offensive to Indigenous and marginalized populations, and females, as the apex of evolution, in general, is represented by a White/European male Caucasian, who is tall, long limbed, thin, with a fair complexion, and light-colored hair; whereas, representations of earlier hominids are presented as smaller, stout, dark-skinned, hairy and simian-like males, with no females to be seen anywhere! These types of visual evolutionary learning devices were found on public school walls, on the pages of textbooks, and, in university and medical textbooks, journals, etc.… beginning in the early 19th century (Morning, 2000; 2005a; 2005b; 2008a; 2008b; 2009; 2011; Goldstein & Morning. 2002; Morning & Sabbagh, 2005; Simpson, 2001; Del Pinal, Leah, Taguba, Cresce, & Morning, 2001; Goldstein & Morning. 2002). Not surprisingly, they are still in use as noted by the use of Derbyshire’s 2010 article. These types of offensive and racially motivated devices continue to impact people’s conscious understanding of race, albeit, it is something that is easily heightened by our individual religious understanding of race. Consequently, it continues to serve contentiously as a mechanism of sorts for bogus and illogical racist ideologies (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Bender and Schorske, 1997).
Another recognizable concern is relative to the fact that traditional research methods, in spite of its attempt to adhere to the scientific method, too many times, has agendas centered on power plays of old; subsequently, issues of power surround the practice when not checked, challenged, and recognized (Hegel, 1967; 1977; Flyvbjerg, 1998b; 2003; 2004a; 2005, 2006, 2008, 2009; Rothblatt, 1997; St, Pierre, 2006). As such, the research process remains a system of acquiring important information that can allow for the addressing of that which ails an education system. This is especially significant as school systems continue to grow exponentially nationally, and as an international enterprise because of the influence it contributes to other globalized, interconnected system of sorts.

Additionally, in the case of marginalized and Indigenous populations, traditional quantitative methods fail to present the full story. This critique is directed toward traditional quantitative research methods as it is argued by Indigenous researchers and scholars; social justice and critical race theorists; and post-colonial theorists and scholars, that it has been instrumental in creating and contributing to the commodification of negative stereotypes, bias, and racial prejudice against Indigenous and non-mainstream populations (Fanon, 1952; 1963; Said, 1978; 1993; Zinn, 1990, 2005; Takaki, 1993; Bhabha, 1994; Loewen, 1995, 2005; Spring, 2008; Tuhiwai Smith, 2008; White, 2010, Tuhaiwai Smith, 2009, 2012, Walter & Andersen, 2013).

Easily arguable is the idea that American scholarship and Westernized education practices, both in and out of the classroom, on many levels is interconnected to other institutions globally. There should be no doubt in recognizing how American scholarship continues to affect scholarship and education practices as a whole, from what is studied, written, and even discussed both in and out of the US (Bordieu, 1977; 1986; Delpit, 1988;
Zinn, 1990; Bhabha, 1994; Bender & Schorske, 1997; Rothblatt, 1997; Ruderman, 1997; Becher & Trowler, 2001; Cheng, 2010; Dowding, 2011). This will be referred to as academic colonialism in this academic proposal (Hardin, 1995; Loewen, 1995 & 2000; Cohn, 1996; Bender & Schorske, 1997; Lagemann, 1997 & 2010; Nabigon, Hagey, Webster, & MacKay, 1999; McGovern, 2000; Lost People Films, 2010; Meusch, 2010; Ma Rhea & Anderson, 2012).

When adapting a traditional quantitative methodology to research, traditional research methods as they stand today negates the impact of colonization on colonized populations and fails to address this aspect, both from an historical lens and a socio-cultural one, throughout the research and analysis process. It will be argued repeatedly that this is beyond significant, and in fact this has allowed for stereotypes, as well as racial and cultural distortions to take place, specifically in regard to Indigenous and marginalized populations.

A modified quantitative research approach to analyzing phenomenon found within educational setting has the potential of becoming a viable means of creating a harmonious median of sort, one in which educational phenomenon is located, addressed, then rectified without marring further non-mainstream populations or giving birth to savage inequalities (Anyon, Kozol, Morning, Lagemann, 2000). Moreover, within such an adapted approach to education research, it is expected that the idea of one unified human race will come to replace current standards that consequently affect how race is perceived (Morning, 2000; 2005a; 2005b; 2008a; 2008b; 2009; 2011; Goldstein & Morning. 2002; Morning & Sabbagh, 2005; Simpson,2001; Del Pinal, Leah, Taguba, Cresce, & Morning, 2001; Goldstein & Morning. 2002). This has been coined Universalist Reality (UR), which is the global understanding on an individual level that all humans are a part of one humanity.
An UR worldview, both on a personal and on a professional level, recognizes that in spite of our oneness, our histories are different. As a final point, theoretically, an UR approach to research design, combined with ST, will require implementation of a critical consciousness, unlike any Euro-centrist one, which is one the serves outside of the self, the meso, the macro, and even, the global, as emphasis must recognize the uniqueness of the community the research-advocate is collaborating with. Use of an UR ST approach to research will allow for such a view to enhance research in ways that are not currently done.

Educators, in general, whether at the research-level, academic, or administrative-level, cling to the idea that as humans, education attainment allows for the potential to do great things positively. It is also recognized that “education done incorrectly” can affect countless students negatively and promote further division, resentment, and hostility between culturally diverse individuals/groups, because as it stands today, current quantitative methods has become a proponent of racial division (Cohn, 1996; Sandoval, 2000; Mutua & Swadener, 2004; Spring, 2007; Tuhiwai Smith 2008, 2012; Denizen, Lincoln, & Tuhiwai Smith, 2008; Chilisa, 2012; Kovach, 2012; Lonetree, 2012; Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2012; Walter & Andersen, 2013). For example, having children from marginalized communities being taught by teachers who are, inherently, racist, or sexist, will debilitate those same children.

Consider further how, traditionally, issues within an educational system are detected, addressed, and rectified. Imagine how an adapted approach to research methods in education can positively impact race relations and understanding because the research methodology does not problematize a race or culture on the grounds that it is unlike the mainstream one; instead, it is one that “requires places, forums, working laboratories for cognitive change, where voices can be heard expressing hopes and aspirations in the context of the possible” (de la Pena
McCook & Jones, 2002, pg. 136). When culture is central to community building, it is highly likely that individual participants, at that point in time, begins to see themselves as members of a collective, lending itself to individual and communal empowerment. This, then, is the power of research that is centered on community.

In the case of the American school system, many times we will find that even in communities wherein minority populations comprise the majority of students, data collection still adheres to a research approach that places value on the individual, in spite of the communities’ tendency to practice a “communal” approach to education. However, many times such communities have “bought into” a Euro-centric ideal system as well, which is problematic from the perspective of Indigenous and marginalized perspectives as there is a tendency to see the individual as a part of the community, as opposed to an individual-centric element. This fact creates further separation within the group, which researchers sometimes see when they begin face-to-face data analysis via focus groups, or individual discussion with the researcher.

What has been experienced from a researcher level, is a type of angst in the individual from this group when the researcher asks the study participant to define their race or culture. Too many times, when partnering with such populations, specifically, with “Mexican-Americans,” researchers will find that the question is much harder to answer for the study participant than what it should be.

Interestingly, in my work with college students from the Southwest Borderlands, individuals who define themselves as of “White” or “Black” ancestry, in general, do not find the response difficult to answer and it is not as problematic; however, with study participants who sometimes define themselves as “Mexican-American” or a derivation of that group, such
study participants have a difficult time reconciling the Mexican with the American, and the American with the Mexican, as well as with the ideas, conspicuously, hidden behind Mexican nationalism, as will be discussed in greater length in this effort. Furthermore, a greater source of confusion for research participants from this region is the lack of connectivity amongst study participants in identifying with the Indigenous, although in the case of Mexican-Americans and Mexican Nationals, Indigeneity although complex in its entirety—from a genetic perspective, such populations, in general, are comprised of both genetic worlds, the Indigenous and the non-Indigenous/European.

From an Indigenous and/or marginalized population perspective, it is acknowledged that statistically-collected data tells only part of the story of the forces at work in relation to the phenomenon being explored, especially so when viewed from an educational lens that involves teaching, learning, and the impact of cultural, racial, socio-economic status (SES), and gender differences on the two (Delpit, 1988; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999; Wilson, 2001; Deloria, 2003; Wilson, 2008; Cheng, 2010.; Elenes & Delgado Bernal, 2010; Grace, 2010; Delgado Bernal & Elenes, 2011; Delgado Bernal, Burciaga, & Flores Carmona, 2012; Flores Carmona, & Delgado Bernal, 2012; Chilisa, 2012; Kovach, 2012; Tuhiwai Smith, 2012; Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2012; Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014). This dilemma seems heightened during this period of mind-boggling Trumpist Nationalism. In this reference to The Pied Piper of Hamlin, a Trumpist Nationalism embeds itself in illicitness, illogicalness, and a fear of the loss of White privilege.

30 The term “Trumpist” is coined by the author, inferring a “Pied Piper of Hamilton” effect, in which followers continue supporting an individual (Donald Trump) without questioning, logic, or application/adherence to truth, intellect, or any type of scientific grounding. In the childhood tale.
In the latter case of “Trumpist Nationalism,” a Trumpet is referenced instead of a flute. In the Medieval, Western European, childhood tale, *The Pied Piper of Hamlin* (as interpreted by von Goethe; Brothers Grimm; Browning) the folktale centers on a stranger who comes to town and offers a rat-infected community the means of ridding the town of the pesky creatures. Using his magic flute to lead all the rats out of town, he manages to remove all the four-legged vermin in return for monetary payment. Through intentional deviousness, the town fails to pay him for which they will come to regret. Using his magic flute, which enchants not only rats but children, the Pied Piper takes the town’s children, who, eventually, will be led to their deaths. The 17th Century, European expression, “paying the piper,” infers that, in the long run, people pay the price for their actions.

Likewise, Westernized education systems grown from an updated Euro-centric agenda, such as in the case of the American education system which has been used and replicated throughout the world, a fair critique of the system is that it is comprised of values that are distinctly different from those of the Indigenous. It is argued by Indigenous researchers that it is a system that is alienating to those who do not subscribe to it, as in the case of many Indigenous communities (Delpit, 1988; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999; Wilson, 2001; Deloria, 2003; Wilson, 2008; Cheng, 2010.; Elenes & Delgado Bernal, 2010; Grace, 2010); Delgado Bernal & Elenes, 2011; Delgado Bernal, Burciaga, & Flores Carmona, 2012; Flores Carmona, & Delgado Bernal, 2012; Chilisa, 2012; Kovach, 2012; Tuhiwai Smith, 2012; Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2012; Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014). In fact, these institutions of teaching and learning are dangerous and damaging to outsiders of that institutions’ epistemological grounding; meaning, that the fundamental nature of how it is we come to know, then, self-justify and rationalize what it is we believe “to know” is critically, negatively, altered when it is a system of
“knowing” comprised of the Other’s knowledge system and not the one from which we come from and exist in.

At the same time, the colonizer’s educational systems of teaching and learning have led to a deeply problematic knowledge system (Westernized) that has “gotten it wrong” on the “Others;” meaning, First Peoples, and then fed this information to the world erroneously (Rossatto, Vallès & et al 2020). Returning to the times of American boarding schools, Rossatto, Vallès & et al, (2020), argue that this aspect of American education has not gone away, in fact, it is a fundamental aspect of de-moralizing Natives and “Others,” who are not a part of the status quo.

In the case of a Westernized education research system, focus is placed on the individual and research results attempt to center on what the individual can accomplish in terms of a Western paradigm; in spite of the student’s culture, socio-economic status; and gender. Just as problematic is the fact that individual student data results are used to compare and contrast the student’s academic “deficiencies” with that of others.

There is no need to elaborate on how this could possibly backfire against the Indigenous or marginalized student, as it should be something that is self-evident. In the subsequent two sections, the “statement of the problem” continues under two additional approaches. In one, we will briefly evaluate the role of education and research in Indigenous studies, and then brief discourse continues over opposing teaching methodologies.

_Evaluating the History of Education and Research in Indigenous Studies_

“An educational approach directed towards personal growth and societal transformation and based on the belief that human beings are essentially spiritual, however, must go well beyond a mere statement of purpose. When words and actions are not directed by a moral force, scientific knowledge and technological know-how conduce as readily to misery as they do to prosperity and happiness. But moral values are
not mere constructs of social processes. Rather, they are expressions of the inner forces that operate in the spiritual reality of every human being, and education must concern itself with these forces if it is to tap the roots of motivation and produce meaningful and lasting change.”  
(Baha’i International Teaching Centre, 1989 Jan 01, Task Force on Education)

From an historical perspective, it could be easily argued that in a globalized world, the one thing that Westernized education systems and traditional research practices have brought to Indigenous communities, overall, is the idea of individual failure. As Césaire, (1972) stated, “They were the fact, they did not pretend to be the idea; despite their faults, they were neither to be hated nor condemned. They were content to be. In them, neither the word failure nor the word avatar had any meaning. They kept hope intact” (pg. 7). Previous to implementing such a Westernized epistemological concept, or debilitating ideal, an Indigenous epistemological standpoint held that the individual did not exist as viewed from a Euro-centric concoction, instead, the individual is viewed as a vital part of the community that they come from.

From an Indigenous perspective, each member of the community is viewed as a vital link in a well fused, thick, ancient chain, in which the community member is, and continues to be, viewed as a part of the make-up of that powerful chain. The individual is an essential part of what continues to hold the group together, much as the ancestors have done.

This Eurocentric practice of separating the member of the community and making them into an “individual” is especially significant in terms of the fact that many times Westernized approaches to education, or research, places both the insider, that is, a member of the mainstream population, with that of the outsider (Indigenous/marginalized), with both placed at the same “starting line,” so to speak—without acknowledging the inequality of such an
approach because the paradigm is catered to the Westerner, to the individual that comes from that type of environment, whereas, an Indigenous communal member does not. How then is this just, equitable, or valid?

This hypothesis is worth consideration, especially in the instances when partnering with Indigenous, non-mainstream, and minority populations (Tuhiwai-Smith, 1999, 2008; McGovern, 2000; Swartz, 2009). Moreover, thoughtful reflection and analysis should be directed toward the ways in which ethical researchers recognize and come to understand the essence of the participant group. The essence of a group is something that is specifically unique to Indigenous populations throughout the world; however, to be clear, that is not to say that such population members are entirely the same, or, have the same agenda. Although, at the core, an Indigenous community is multi-varied, dynamic, and distinctively unique within Indigenous groups themselves, in general, there is still a type of group cohesiveness within such populations not seen in other population groups. Often times this is something that is misunderstood by those from outside of the Indigenous community and, consequently, has negatively impacted research methods because of that fact.

Similarly, education researchers have found that traditional K-12 education systems are “actively inculcating students with Western metaphysical constructs that are antithetical to Native culture and knowledge organization,” according to Calderon (2011). Correspondingly, for older Western population members who attended public and/or private schooling, recall the type of human evolution charts found in early biology or language arts books that showed a monkey at the beginning of that evolutionary process, with developing “evolutionary” stages culminating to what looked like a tall, thin Caucasian.
These types of Westernized school textbook and curriculum approaches developed as a consequence of Euro-centric epistemologies are nestled on Whiteness and subliminal religious indoctrinations that, too often, are a part of political agenda set in educational institutions and Westernized approaches to schooling in the U.S. Such practices alienate those who are not a part of that regime because, it is clear, that there has been and continues to exist an erroneous assumption of cultural superiority behind education, traditional research methods that subscribe to this agenda, and, similarly, NGO or education aid projects. As Césaire (1972) lamented and argued:

From Gourou, his book *Les Pays Tropicaux*, in which, amid certain correct observations, there is expressed the fundamental thesis, biased and unacceptable, that there has never been a great tropical civilization, that great civilizations have existed only in temperate climates, that in every tropical country the germ of civilization comes, and can only come, from some other place outside the tropics, and that if the tropical countries are not under the biological curse of the racists, there at least hangs over them, with the same consequences, a no less effective geographical curse (pg. 12)

*Likewise*

From the historians or novelists of civilization (it’s the same thing) -not from this one or that one, but from all of them, or almost all-their false objectivity, their chauvinism, their sly racism, their depraved passion for refusing to acknowledge any merit in the nonwhite races, especially the black-skinned races, their obsession with monopolizing all glory for their own race.

From the psychologists, sociologists et al., their views on “primitivism,” their rigged investigations, their self-serving generalizations, their tendentious speculations, their insistence on the marginal, “separate” character of the non-whites, and-although each of these gentlemen, in order to impugn on higher authority the weakness of primitive thought, claims that his own is based on the firmest rationalism-their barbaric repudiation, for the sake of the cause, of Descartes’ statement, the charter of universalism, that “reason . . . is found whole and entire in each man,” and that “where individuals of the same species are concerned, there may be degrees in respect of their accidental qualities, but not in respect of their forms, or natures” (*Césaire*, 1972, Pg. 12)
Without a doubt, Western, Euro-Amercicentric bias and prejudice makes for a large corpus of the world’s education and research systems, and they have damned “the Other” openly for too long. Moreover, we continue this undemocratic legacy when we continue to allow it to be a part of our work as educators and researchers. Likewise, it is argued by many Indigenous scholars and academics that traditional approaches to conducting quantitative research and the use of traditional teaching methods—*as they currently are*—within public school education systems, in relation to Indigenous and marginalized groups, can “maintain the ‘difference as deficit’ diversity model – a model that continues on its historic path of privileging dominant groups,” according to Swartz (2009) pg. 1067 and Delgado, Gaitán (2001). This once popular American model was hailed by the mainstream, openly supported on university websites, and taught in American teacher-preparation courses.

*Cultural Deficit Model Vis-à-vis Intercultural Learning*

“There are numerous practical challenges to the implementation of indigenous education. Incorporating indigenous knowledge into formal Western education models can prove difficult. However, the discourse surrounding indigenous education and knowledge suggests that integrating indigenous methods into traditional modes of schooling is an “ongoing process of ‘cultural negotiation.’”

--Champagne, 2009

In a *Cultural Deficit Model (CDM)*, proponents of this model incorrectly link Indigenous and minority underachievement to their respective cultures. It should be noted that students who are from minority or Indigenous groups, in general, are from lower socioeconomic (SES) backgrounds, and many times are recent immigrants or a part of a migrant or transnational community, yet, they are tested against the mainstream population and expected to be able to “compete” with them via data collected from the school population. As if placed in a race of sorts, the fact that such students are already starting off behind due to
factors such as immigration, migration, socio-economic disadvantages, and bias from the beginning is something that is not considered or discussed by people who support a CDM.

What CDM actually is centers on a bias so embedded in mainstream ideology that proponents of such models fail to see the disadvantages already placed in the way of marginalized and Indigenous student’s paths. At the university level, often times, we recognize this same type of indifference towards students who are not a part of the mainstream. Within the context of Indigenous students, Champagne (2009) reflects on this in the following:

Currently Indigenous higher education is embedded within colleges and universities that serve the ideals of Western culture and nation-state interests. Higher education is assimilative for Indigenous students and faculty. At best there is great pressure for Indigenous students and faculty to serve nation-state goals, an assimilation model, or serve both nation-state and Indigenous goals through acquiring and utilizing multicultural skills and knowledges (pgs. 130-154).

Consider how within Westernized education systems, teachers (both from mainstream populations and outside of the mainstream), as well as researchers and administrators, often times attribute minority student achievement levels and their problems with schooling as something that is a consequence of the student’s culture; their family backgrounds or a perceived lack of family support due to their cultural upbringing, in short, the student’s culture. As such, the student and their respective community is viewed as a part of the problem when in reality they are an important part of the solution to the discrepancies in test scores amongst such groups.

Indigenous academics such as Delpit (1988); Deloria (2003); Cheng (2010); Elenes & Delgado Bernal, (2010); Gonzales (2010); Flores & Delgado Bernal, (2012); Tuhiwai Smith (2012), amongst many others argue that the consequences of such practices have
contributed to the vast education gap seen in the U.S., while negatively affecting and impacting individual identity formation for members of such groups.

Champagne (2009) explains that “Schooling has been explicitly and implicitly a site of rejection of indigenous knowledge and language, it has been used as a means of assimilating and integrating indigenous peoples into a ‘national’ society and identity at the cost of their indigenous identity and social practices”; instead, he offers the idea of an “intercultural” approach to learning as a means of “building” a bridge for the educational gap, which is a model that flourishes exceedingly well with the research proposal discussed in this proposal because it makes culture difference an interactive aspect of education (pgs. 130-154). Instead of being taught about different cultures, students learn to deal, and then accept, cultural differences.

In the Bennet (1986; 1993; 2004) models of Intercultural Learning the use of what Bennet (1986; 1993; 2004) refers to as the “Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity” (DMIS) (see: Figure 1.9, p. 126), is taught in classrooms. Students are introduced to the model and then by means of classroom academic efforts, continued instruction and classroom interaction guided by the teacher, students not only learn about differing cultures, but learn to accept, adapt to, and integrate cultural differences by having to learn to deal with them.

Unlike multicultural education models, the DMIS framework places emphasis on the “learning to live” aspect of cultural diversity by addressing the underlying issues individuals might have who struggle with the acceptance of other cultures, or cultural norms unlike their own. This is undertaken by the application of Bennet’s (1986; 1993; 2004) self-analysis, DMIS plan, with the underlying premise being that “as one's experience of cultural difference becomes more complex and
sophisticated, one's competence in intercultural relations increases”, (Bennet, 2011, American Field Service Website).

As such, DMIS comprises the use of the following strategies for use in education or corporate training programs. Included is Peyre’s Illustration of the DMIS Framework which has been placed below (Bennet, 2011, American Field Service Website). The following information regarding the DMIS agenda consists of information taken directly from Dr. Bennet’s page on the AFS Website (Bennet, 2011, American Field Service Website). The first three DMIS stages are ethnocentric, meaning that one's own culture is experienced as central to reality in some way.

Peyre’s Adaptation of Bennet’s (2001) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS)

Figure 1.9: Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS)
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DENIAL of cultural difference is the state in which one's own culture is experienced as the only real one. Other cultures are avoided by maintaining psychological and/or physical isolation from differences. People at Denial generally are disinterested in cultural difference, although they may act aggressively to eliminate a difference if it impinges on them.

DEFENSE against cultural difference is the state in which one's own culture (or an adopted culture) is experienced as the only good one. The world is organized into "us and them," where "we" are superior and "they" are inferior. People at Defense are threatened by cultural difference, so they tend to be highly critical of other cultures, regardless of whether the others are their hosts, their guests or cultural newcomers to their society.

MINIMIZATION of cultural difference is the state in which elements of one's own cultural world view are experienced as universal. Because these absolutes obscure deep cultural differences, other cultures may be trivialized or romanticized. People at Minimization expect similarities, and they may become insistent about correcting others' behavior to match their expectations.

As previously stated, the DMIS is a paradigm that could, and should be, used in association with mainstream populations in collaborations with Indigenous and marginalized communities, not only within education systems, but in academia as a whole, which includes research design. It is a compatible match with DRM because both DMIS and DRM address issues relative to ethnocentric behaviors, or practices, as the status quo tends to view the world from an individualistic ethno-centric, socio-cultural lens. Therefore, the use of the DMIS is called for, as opposed to the use of viewing the world through a cultural deficit lens.

Reflecting on the fact that American mainstream populations often times seem to view the world from a cultural deficit perspective, this recognition easily leads to discussion as to how traditional research methodologies fail in addressing this aspect of mainstream socio-cultural phenomenon. As a critical researcher, this is something that I find myself analyzing and The second three DMIS stages are ethnorelative, meaning that one's own culture is experienced in the context of other cultures.
• ACCEPTANCE of cultural difference is the state in which one's own culture is experienced as just one of a number of equally complex worldviews. Acceptance does not mean agreement—cultural difference may be judged negatively—but the judgment is not ethnocentric. People at Acceptance are curious about and respectful toward cultural difference.

• ADAPTATION to cultural difference is the state in which the experience of another culture yields perception and behavior appropriate to that culture. One's worldview is expanded to include constructs from other worldviews. People at Adaptation are able to look at the world "through different eyes" and may intentionally change their behavior to communicate more effectively in another culture.

• INTEGRATION of cultural difference is the state in which one's experience of self is expanded to include the movement in and out of different cultural worldviews. People at Integration often are dealing with issues related to their own "cultural marginality." This stage is not necessarily better than Adaptation in most situations demanding intercultural competence, but it is common among non-dominant minority groups, long-term expatriates and "global nomads."

considering constantly. It is part of what has prompted the DRM model and continues to influence the research process I do. One of my primary motivations for doing so is in pursuit of advocating for a global world perspective that can allow for less differences amongst people, and less indifference, culturally, religiously, and ideologically; therefore, a new history or historical perspective is reflected post-colonization, which I hope to see happen. In the following are specific research questions relative to what has just been presented. They are central to the promotion of the DRM model.
1.2 Research Questions

“It is true that if care is taken to use only a language that is understood by graduates in law and economics, you can easily prove that the masses have to be managed from above.”

― Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*

In attempting to step-away from a Eurocentric epistemological approach to acquiring information and undertaking research, the primary question is this, “*How can research practices be applied equitably to work with Indigenous and marginalized populations in order to understand education phenomenon today, while allowing for accuracy in research methods?*” There is no doubt that such an approach to research with Indigenous and marginalized populations must allow for a realistic view of daily life in Indigenous and marginalized communities, as this is something lacking in traditional research methodologies, in particular, quantitative methods. For Indigenous and marginalized populations, this concern for equity in education research design includes the socio-cultural and economic issues prompted by the colonial legacy.

Furthermore, when it is taken into consideration that quantitative research methods has been argued as a valuable tool by both positivist and Indigenous researchers when undertaking research with large education populations, what then is missing from use of traditional methods, specifically in research projects with Indigenous and marginalized communities (Thornton, 1998; Sandoval, 2000; Lesser & Blake, 2006; Nakamura, 2010; Kovach, 2005, 2012; Chilisa, 2012; Morgensen, 2012; Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2012; Walters & Andersen, 2013)?

Similarly, it has been argued that quantitative research methods is a rich resource for attaining important information in large education systems today because of the use of statistics and statistical analysis. At the same time, as discussed by prominent Indigenous
researchers, quantitative methods has played an important role in attributing to an “us” and “them” dichotomy that feeds racism and sexism. Moreover, traditional research methods/methodologies have left a negative image those groups that fall under the “them” category, which has been a detrimental aspect in healthy research design. Research design should instill empowerment, instead of encouraging cultural indifference between the powerholders and “Others.”

For research collaboratives with Indigenous and marginalized populations, research must do more. It must become a means of transforming Indigenous realities in ways that have not been done. By the same token, by means of partnerships related to the research agenda, quantitative research methods have the potential to bring about positive socio-economic change to communities that currently lack such resources. Finally, quantitative research methods can be useful as a means to address injustices, change laws, and refresh current troubling issues found in public education today, both on and off the res/rez.

This study addresses these concerns. The questions are related to these concerns and are prompted by academic efforts that I have undertaken with Indigenous and marginalized communities in the Southwest US-Mexico Borderlands and in initial research exchanges with Mayan communities. These experiences and intellectual pursuits have been key to the creation of the research paradigm coined Diachronic Research Methodology (DRM). The questions relative to this are as follows:

1.) **Why are traditional quantitative methods problematic for use in research with Indigenous and marginalized communities?**

2.) **In what ways do current research methods accommodate Indigenous and marginalized community’s collective histories, epistemologies, axiological and ontological considerations?**
3.) *How has published research about Indigenous and marginalized communities, globally, affected and impacted Indigenous/Marginalized communities?*

4.) *How do racial and gender dynamics influence the research process?*

A need for required changes in research methods is prompted by, and attributed to, incremental globalization which has impacted human diversity throughout the world. This has led to an institutional imbalance of sorts that allows for discrepancy, bias, and inequality to be continued and maintained by mainstream academics; traditional public-school systems; current Western curriculum design; textbook corporations; and within research itself. One such example of this type of institutional imbalance is found within contemporary Westernized, traditionally-administered, global and American public-school education systems which have been experiencing variations in student population due, mostly, to demographical changes, post-1960 (Easter, Shultz, Neyhart & Reck, 1999; Brennan & Osborne, 2008; Meusch, 2010; Yang & Montgomery, 2013).

In spite of these vast demographical changes as seen in public institutions and education systems today, historical accountings of world events are epistemological out of kilter and misrepresent ideals of “truth”, as taught in the Westernized public-school classrooms located all over the world, because even in India, a western view of history has been incorporated into their curriculum, and, teaching and learning approaches. As the number of diverse student populations attending public schools continues to increase, historical accountings of important events continue to be one-sided and extremely problematic as they leave out entire groups of people and by doing so fails to acknowledge the importance of past events.
As a form of critical theory application, (as will be discussed in the following), the reader should critically consider how it is that these invisible mainstream research agendas first came to exist. It is a phenomenon that is so overwhelmingly present in society that it requires what Freire (1970; 1973; 1989) has referred to as “conscientização,” that is, the development of a critical consciousness within every individual, which is a heightened, ethical, social-justice approach to understanding human dynamics and relationships, as well as institutional ones. By developing “conscientização,” these types of practices can be recognized, acknowledged, challenged, and then changed (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1993; Kincheloe, 1999).
1.3 Need for the Study

“What westerners and traditionalists fail to understand is that Indigenous communities are not about the self, as opposed to the Western view of self. It is about the “we”…once this is fully understood then it is made clear that a valid quantitative research method for research work with Indigenous communities must be different from that of the West…”

– E. Vallès

In today’s large educational settings, research that relies on quantitative methods is commonplace because it allows the researcher a viable means to “describe, explain, predict, or control phenomena” explicitly tied to education today in ways that no other process can (Gay & et al., 2009, pg. 6). There is much need for the type of discussion within the fields of education and research scholarship, primarily because these systems continue to grow and become more culturally diverse. As this continues to transpire, it has become clear that there are not enough venues for research undertakings in the field of education that allow for equitable solutions, or first steps to addressing the impact of colonization on Indigenous and marginalized groups. What westerners and traditionalists fail to understand is that Indigenous communities are not about the self, as opposed to the Western view of self. It is about the “we” once this is fully understood then it is made clear that a valid quantitative research method for research efforts with Indigenous communities must be different from that of the West.

Subsequently and fundamentally, the need for this particular study rests on the following:

1.) There is a need to discuss and to address the inequities that exist in research that has been conducted within Indigenous and marginalized communities

2.) There is a need in education and research to attempt to address the use of power dynamics, and the issues relative to this, in education and educational research practices

3.) There is a need in education and research studies to promote and to address the process of change that takes place as a consequence of colonization and group trauma, which takes place as a consequence of colonization

4.) There is a need to create an equitable research instrument, specifically for research collaboratives with Indigenous and marginalized groups
5.) There is a need in research and education to change the attitudes and stereotypes that have been created as a consequence of traditional research methods

6.) There is a need to promote human cohesiveness, via research and education, that can be academically discussed in research findings and results

7.) There is a need in research to promote human unity, specifically as a consequence of ethical and equitable research practice, as opposed to disunity

8.) There is a need to foster intellectual development in education and research, specifically regarding the impact of colonization on Indigenous and marginalized collectives, viably through use of an updated quantitative research model

9.) There is a need in education and research practices for providing a specific approach to conducting research within Indigenous and marginalized communities that addresses the community’s unique history and worldview, especially so when that history and worldview are unlike that of the mainstream population

10.) There is need for a decolonization paradigm for education and research design for inquiry with Indigenous and marginalized populations; moreover, they should be a source for transformation and extended application within the phenomenon studied.

11.) There is a substantial gap within Indigenous studies and research design that does not address the latter mentioned concerns relative to colonization as a factor affecting educational outcomes within Indigenous and marginalized community, specifically by applying a post-colonial lens to the phenomenon studied

12.) There is a substantial gap relative to issues surrounding the dynamics of gender and race as they affect research both within, and outside of, Indigenous/marginalized communities that continues to be unaddressed in theory and in teaching research, in and outside of the university classroom
1.4 Purpose of the Study

“What is the purpose of this study the reader asks? To set right what is wrong in research, otherwise, research work with Indigenous and marginalized communities continues to alienate and further subjugate the oppressed…”

-E. Vallès

The purpose of this study is attributed to the concerns previously discussed already in this academic proposal. In addition, after having read Tuhiwai Smith (2009; 2012). I was prompted to address some of the issues discussed by the author, specifically in relation to Indigenous research methods as this is a concern of mine from a personal and professional standpoint. As a concern of these factors, what transpired was an updated version of quantitative research methods, specifically for research collaboratives with Indigenous and marginalized populations. Key to designing and attempting to validate this updated quantitative tool called Diachronic Research Methodology (DRM) was my desire to support the continued use of quantitative methods in the field of education because it is an invaluable tool when used appropriately.

The other factor that led to the creation of DRM was that the model was undertaken as a response to valid concerns made by education progressives; Indigenous research groups from throughout the world; feminists; and Critical Race theory (CRT) advocates that dealt with social justice. What is the purpose of this study the reader asks? To set right what is wrong in research, otherwise research undertakings with Indigenous and marginalized communities continues to alienate and further subjugate the oppressed.

DRM addresses issues touched upon throughout this scholarly exertion. Likewise, other relevant issues in research and academia today will be addressed throughout this paper and they will be used to support my decision to create the model and allow for discussion regarding the testing of the model within actual Indigenous communities. The research
paradigm proposed throughout the course of this academic endeavor is specifically directed at research in the field of education. This is important to note because this is a paradox of sorts. The argument could easily be made that I am stating two distinct matters in relation to its creation and use.

The first of the paradox rests on the idea that quantitative research methods is one of the best ways to understand phenomenon in education today, precisely because modern day school systems have grown exponentially, and because education systems today have become places of great diversity, culturally, ethnically, and socio-economically. It is not surprising that school systems are under much stress, with many of them disintegrating right before our eyes.

The secondary part of the paradox is this, the counter argument made throughout this proposal is that the scientific method is rooted in racist, sexist, and class issues that have, historically, tainted research findings. What’s more, I have argued that as they currently sit, quantitative research methods tell only part of the story. To be sure, education phenomenon must be studied in order to rectify issues specifically related to matters of race, classism, and sexism, consequently, I attempt to address the paradox via DRM.

In the case of research associations with Indigenous communities, unlike other quantitative research models, after the initial step of data analysis and study (DRM: 1st step), a DRM approach necessitates the need for the research-advocate to discuss the colonial history of the community within the body of the research work (DRM: 2nd step); however, this is something that must be done from the perspective of the participant group. This is a vital aspect of the study results when applying a DRM approach to the research project. In doing so, it is expected that invested participants and external entities interested in the community will
have a more realistic understanding of the phenomenon and a variety of potential approaches to addressing the phenomenon.

Another important feature related to the use of a DRM approach in research efforts with Indigenous communities requires that a “first steps” solution to the issue itself be presented to the community on behalf of the research-advocate. For example, if data results indicate that there might be an issue with attendance and that attendance rates are impacting the students reading scores negatively, then the research-advocate must propose and bring to the community a program, and perhaps a grant opportunity, that addresses the two matters.

The research-advocate must deliver to the community in written form a viable plan specifically for that particular community after much consultation with the study participants, education leaders from the community, and the tribal leaders of the community. Furthermore, this is something that must be discussed in the body of the publication (DRM: third section), and the package must be pre-approved by the community before publication of the research endeavors. In the end, it is expected that his proposal will be tailored to fit the needs of that particular community in direct relation to the study results. Another important aspect of the academic point-of-views discussed throughout this paper deals with the idea that academia today requires the development of a critical consciousness.
1.5 Significance of Study

“The business of obscuring language is a mask behind which stands the much greater business of plunder.”

— Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*

For decades, public school systems have relied heavily on quantitative data collection in order to understand phenomenon that impacts educational funding and allows for the creation of ideally, helpful, *student-centered* teaching and learning interventions and oftentimes, much needed direction. Many times, educators, politicians, academia, and researchers fail in recognizing the logical connection made between how traditional statistical results are collected and how such processes are debilitated by human interference and bias, particularly so with research conducted with Indigenous and marginalized populations. This is argued, primarily, on the viewpoint that the westernized ideal of a “scientific method” is faulty (Morning & Sabbagh. 2005; Morning, 2005a; 2005b; 2008a; 2008b; 2009, 2011). Additionally, the “scientific method” is tainted by four diseases that have plagued human civilization for millennia; racism, classism, sexism, and a quest for power.

Moreover, research practices, like education practices, are heavily stained with political agendas, many of which are rooted in colonial practices used to colonize the “Other” (Hegel, 1967; 1977; Fanon, 1967; Flyvbjerg, 1998a, 1998b, 2001, 2003, 2004a, 2004b, 2005, 2006). At the same time, within the context of educational research practices, it is argued that when collaborating with large education populations, quantitative research methods, which, clearly, is rooted in the scientific method, yet, has the potential to recognize potential issues in the field of education. This is possible when there are viable solutions, and, I must say that the solutions are always there. Researchers just need to find them, that is, if the issue/s is recognized accordingly, addressed properly and judiciously, and remedied through a variety of
means that are advocated by the community members in which the study has been conducted. When this is accomplished, it is then, that the researcher is no longer just an individual doing a study, instead the researcher becomes the research-advocate for the study group. As such, the research-advocate begins the process of addressing the studied issue as a means of equalizing the relationship between themselves and with the community studied.

As already mentioned, the practice of statistical analysis is a continued and, in fact, relied upon practice in education today because, initially, data results have the potential of being free from human error when prudently collected and inputted into software, thus, disallowing for bias and prejudice. Still, it is important to recognize and address that these traditional approaches are specifically created for mainstream populations, and as such, they have been created from within that worldview and understanding.

Imagine then, that you are not a part of that world. How does that standpoint effect data collection, and how does it affect the study results? Consequently, as a researcher, consider how this is a double-sided issue, because it also possesses the potential to negatively affect the actual community the researcher is working with. How then might this affect the ways in which the study community connects with those outside of that community?

Moreover, what type of a legacy has the researcher left the community with when they produce collaborative academic and scholarly undertakings together that is, then, interpreted from their personal subjectivity? And, how will the study represent the participant group historically? In what ways will the study results contribute to knowledge systems and institutional structures?

The primary significance of this study rests on this view and the idea that in order to measure phenomenon within large Indigenous/marginalized populations when applying the use of statistically-grounded research processes and analysis, which should be of major
significance and consideration from the point-of-view of a researcher is the history and impact on the community in which the study is grounded. Again, as previously discussed, the main reasons for the use of quantitative research practices with research exchanges conducted in large education settings is the efficiency and effectiveness, in general, of this approach when it is conducted in a careful and ethical manner that adheres to a scientific process in which measures have been taken to secure the validity and reliability of the academic endeavor. However, it is contended that even within this cautious approach there are human interventions that can conflict with study results and with how data is produced, interpreted, and, eventually published. Our history as a modern, world-leading, westernized culture prompts us to question and then understand how race, sex, and politics have marred this process.

Research, whether outside of a quantitative approach or not, is besotted with power issues from its inception. One such issue is centered on the idea of race, particularly within the context of power plays (Flyvbjerg, 1998a, 1998b, 2001, 2003, 2004a, 2004b, 2005, 2006). Ann Morning has published a multitude of articles that address the importance of racialized marring and how this, most certainly, impacts science, textbook production, education, and research (Morning & Sabbagh, 2005; Morning, 2005a; 2005b; 2008a; 2008b; 2009, 2011). Likewise, as quantitative methods allows for a better understanding of potential issues in the field of education, specifically, -- traditional research practices must be revisited and reconciled with.

Of all the concerns related to the significance of this study, this is the one that will be addressed amongst this scholarly overture, although there are other concerns such as a need to attempt to address the types of damage that early quantitative work has allowed, especially
so with Indigenous and marginalized populations due to political agendas associated with colonization and maintenance of those practices.

As a researcher who possesses a mixed genetic heritage, Indigenous and European, this is particularly important for me, as I am a product, genetically and culturally, of both the Indigenous world and that of the European. Moreover, I believe that it is possible to address and deal with the inequities that have come to be in education, as I see education as a vital part of the solution to the type of diversity issues that exist in and outside of education. Because I am not only a researcher, but an educator as well; both of these facts are a consequence and product of education itself. I came to understand things because of what I did not understand. Ironically, my lifelong pursuit of knowledge was ignited by the same structures that I am still dealing with, the Western worldview. I have no doubt that the interchanging of diverse views in education can only enrich humanity, but it is something that must be done with caution, care, and deep respect for that same diversity.

As discussed previously, arguments for use of the DRM paradigm are grounded in a decolonization paradigm which is embedded in feminist theory and Critical Race Theory (CRT) as it questions traditionalist research methodologies and empiricist practices and their views on epistemology, ontology, and axiology (Weston, Brooks, Gladman, Senior, Denley, Silove & Files, 2009; White, 2010). As discussed by Steans (1998), the use of a feminist gender lens allows for scholarship that implements a feminist view, or framework, into the analysis relative to the “different dimensions of power and gender inequality “, which challenges “dominant assumptions about what is significant or insignificant, or what is central or marginal concerns in …looking at the world (pg. 4).
Similarly, Flax (1995) points out that "gender is a social relation that enters into and partially constitutes all other social relations and activities" (p. 147; Willett, pg. 1996, 346). On these premises alone, it is clear that research methods, overall, require revisiting and revamping. Moreover, and all aspects of research, from how it is conducted to why it is conducted must be examined and explained by centering it in “power,” which is grounded in politics.

Willett (1996) explains that “To view research as gendered practice is to become enmeshed in gender politics and there is no neutral place from which to explore the notion” (pgs. 344-45). This is what most resonates to me in approaching research from a feminist point-of-view, and in incorporating feminism in all the academic scholarly undertakings that I accept, because feminist theory is based on the reality of life, it considers the genuineness of human interaction that takes place between the masses, as opposed to the life experiences of the few, the privileged, the elite.

There is also the matter of gender, which many times, is a phenomenon repeatedly left out of the research paradigm. As Willett (1996) explains,

Gender is one of the major social relations continually negotiated as we engage in social practices. It is a complex and contradictory system that operates not only on language practices and identities of learners and teachers but also on the practices and identities of researchers-the questions we ask, the methods we use, the interpretations we make of our data, the implications we draw from our research, the controversies we choose to argue and even the identities we construct in the process of conducting our research…. Constructing gender relations in the field is no less political than constructing gender relations in the academy (see Bell, Caplan & Karim, 1993, 3, for analyses of gender relations in the field of anthropology)” (pgs. 344-46; Willet, 1996, pgs. 345-46).
From the language researchers’ use to the actual research efforts that we conduct, Willett (1996) is concerned that gender and the issues that surround it are not addressed in the ways that they need to be.

Another important facet to this suggestion is the need to address the continued use of power in research and education, while addressing the need for the creation of an adapted quantitative approach for research collaboratives with Indigenous and marginalized groups. Such a research instrument is meant to address and level, at least a bit, the damage that has transpired directly into Indigenous communities and marginalized groups, as this is due to the byproducts of power. Consequently, pursuit of this is complicated by the fact that these are aspects of these same structures, including the belief in a scientific method to understand phenomenon.

Morning (2005; Morning & Sabbagh, 2005; 2011) argues that scientists, in general, have agendas and alliances that allow for the practice of influencing ideas about race through teaching and textbooks. As a researcher, I concur with that view and recognize that from a historical worldview, much of what has been published in scientific research journals, especially from the early 20th century forward, is tainted with bias and prejudice. More importantly, this ancient practice has contributed to a Westernized worldview that has separated humans, overall.

The primary distinction for me is this, that there is human diversity but one human race. Culture is not a racial classification but an age-old phenomenon in which geography and group belief practices allow for difference from those of others. What has transpired in the case of many Indigenous and marginalized groups of people is significant because the essence of the group, that which held the group together and allowed for their
comingling, one to the other, was interfered with due to colonization. This is significantly significant; however, it is also something that is not discussed in the research, and in education overall, and needs to be.

What is presented in this exertion is an attempt to address these and many more research issues in education today. This effort is representative of the type of issues I have dealt with my entire life, which centers on belonging to two distinct entities, whether genetically and/or culturally; as well as being a part of the colonizer and the colonized; living as an insider and an outsider; while recognizing, as an individual, what it means to love and hate these same structures.

Accordingly, my intellectual worldview forces me to find a means to harmonize these two incessant dichotomies of which I am surrounded by, and, which are essentially two competing forces. I must reckon with them, however possible, in a way that can accommodate the many. As a consequence of this, what is advocated in this labor, and which is born of that need, is an updated version of traditional quantitative research methods in which the researcher must address and attempt to harmonize these problematic aspects of duality as found in research when collaborating with Indigenous groups. The potentiality of bringing Indigenous epistemological worldviews to education can only serve humanity, as these socio-cultural concepts are rooted in what is natural, and, can serve as a means to normalize and connect non-mainstream ontologies, axiology’s, and non-Western forms of spirituality with others.
1.6 Chapter Summary: Fusing Two Worlds

“The bottom line is this, why should traditional research methods be adapted for work with Indigenous and marginalized communities? Aside of the fact that such communities in all reality outnumber the status quo—why shouldn’t they be changed? Traditional realities never really existed…they were something a small group of privileged White men came up with and we all went along with….”

---E. Vallès

This chapter introduces the reader to research practices, defining the difference between methods and methodology. It has also presented arguments for reconsideration of practices. Perhaps one of the most complicated limitations to the study is the fact that it might seem to the reader that the use of two worldviews is problematic: The Western and the Indigenous, the patriarchal and the matriarchal; the, sometimes, seemingly, enormous divide between our worldviews, axiologically-speaking, epistemologically, ontologically, etc…especially when they have been discussed in the way that they have been in this research proposal.

The use of the term “worldviews” is used to describe the lens in which the individual views the world, which many times is a consequence of individual group connection and understanding; so, it would be more likely that an individual view of the world is grounded from the influences, environment, ideologies, and conceptions most appropriate to the place and time that the individual is living in, and the geographic-space of the place in the world (Henderson, 2000; Little Bear, 2000; Bishop; Higgins; Casella; & Contos, 2002; Gil, 2002; Hart, 2010;). Clearly, this will be different, individual-to-individual; group-to-group; community-to-community; nation-to-nation.

Accordingly, this affects the limitation of a study as it is expected that these will change, even within the Indigenous world; however, I posit that the glue that holds many
Indigenous, marginalized, populations together is the colonial experience—the one in which the group has been the target of, and its detrimental impact on the people, the community, it has left its imprint on.

Returning to limitations of the study, on one hand, quantitative methods is boosted as the means to the end of understanding educational phenomenon for large school populations, and then it is undermined with discussion that questions traditional Western assumptions, including the scientific method. Similarly, DRM has some linear aspects to it that might lead critics to question the use of such an approach. Furthermore, the fact that the model is created by someone who comes from these two worlds might seem problematic as well, for this has been the story of my life, either I am too European and not Indigenous enough, or too Indigenous and not European enough…from these pangs and birthing pains DRM has been given birth. The bottom line is this, why should traditional research methods be adapted for association with Indigenous and marginalized communities? In addition, why would there be resistance to such an approach? I suggest that a possible response to these questions requires an understanding and recognition of what is lost to some groups should these suggestions come in to play.

Contrary to current traditionalist belief systems in research methods, for starters, aside of the fact that such communities combined, in all reality, outnumber the status quo—why shouldn’t traditional quantitative research practices not be changed? After all, traditional realities never really existed…they were something a small group of privileged White men came up with and the rest of the world seems to have gone along with it. In the aftermath, many communities not fitting into this worldview have been “painted” negatively and impacted dangerously due to that fact; therefore, at a very basic level, I think these simple
view-points lend themselves out to important reasons why traditional quantitative methods need to be changed.

In the following section, the literature review, these issues and other issues previously touched upon will be addressed in a more appropriate manner, as they are key to supporting a DRM approach to research collaborations with Indigenous communities. The three paradigms are centrally focused on the *Nine Core Concepts of DRM* (see Appendix F, p. 428) and should adhere to these concepts. To be clear, the *Nine Core Concepts* will be specific to each geographic-located community. The literature review is triangulated around the following paradigms:

Paradigm 1: Traditional Research Methods & the Scientific Method: Western Epistemology as a Cultural Broker


Paradigm 3: The Impact of Colonization: Cultural Trauma & Issues of Power
CHAPTER 2. INDIGENIZING TRADITIONAL RESEARCH METHODS, A REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.0 Problem

“Revising traditional quantitative methods is long overdue...it’s amazing that it is still viewed as ‘scientific’ when it has managed quite well to leave out over more than half of the human population, yes, over half of us, which includes women, Indigenous and marginalized populations, and all of us who are a compilation of everything that is wonderful in the world, but indescribable and unquantifiable within traditionalist terms....”

--E. Vallès

In this chapter, three paradigms will be presented and discussed which are intended to present a “case study” of sorts, discussing why the proposed paradigm, Diachronic Research Methodologies, should be incorporated into research projects with Indigenous and marginalized populations. These three paradigms are not inclusive to other arguments that could be just as easily made; however, my intent is to focus on three specific and crucial areas for consideration in the matter. The three paradigms are as follows:

1.) *Traditional Research Methods & the Scientific Method*;
2.) *Indigenous Research Paradigms*;
3.) *Colonization & Decolonization*

In the first paradigm, *Traditional Research Methods & the Scientific Method*, the literature offered will propose that there is a consensus in academia today that recognizes issues with the ideals generated in post-modernity as a consequence of the strong emphasis on Euro-American-centric value systems that permeate the academy to this day. Further contended will be arguments that support the idea that an Indigenous worldview has been negated in research, the academy, and in education systems because of this.
In this proposal, the use of the term “scientific method” (SM) refers to the standard procedure taught in Western public schools and in university that emphasize a “pre-set” approach to investigating phenomenon. It is the process also used in quantitative research methods and consists of the following steps:

- The formulation of a research question
- The creation of a hypothesis for the phenomenon observed or investigated
- A prediction, relative to the phenomenon observed or under study
- The testing of the hypothesis under “stringent” and controlled environments
- Analysis of the test/hypothesis relative to the test
- Replication, the idea that the test used for the phenomenon can be reproduced and allow for similar results
- Recording of the data results
- Sharing of the research results via publications

Correspondingly, use of the scientific method in research, it is presumed, allows for the use of “inquiry” in order to obtain new knowledge produced as a consequence of a particular phenomenon under study. In the field of research, results that best explain a particular phenomenon then becomes an accepted “scientific theory”, which is shared with other researchers. Acceptance of a scientific theory does not necessarily mean that the theory is 100% accurate or viable, it only means that the phenomena has been tested repeatedly and has reproduced similar results. Although scientific theories can, and are, challenged, some scientific theories do not go away, such as in the case of eugenics. As such, scientific theories are powerful and can allow for bias and negative stereotyping, as experienced in early 20th and 19th Century eugenics, allowing for scientific racism to stain literature, scientific journals, and
education systems. This, then, is a major concern for Indigenous researchers and critical theorists.

Another area of legitimate concern in critical research pertains to pre-existing beliefs and personal bias that the researcher may carry with them when they delve into a research project, again, this is something that was often times committed in the early periods of inquiry, and I think is still committed. Essentially, when researchers cross over to fields of inquiry or exertion in areas where they have little familiarity with, their understanding of the phenomena is one-sided, biased, and even nationalistic, meaning that their ideals are pre-set based on the country of origin that the researcher comes from. There is a subliminal agenda in nationalism that many times goes without notice or discussion in the literature. In general, nationalism lends itself to feelings of superiority over others, especially when the country of origin for the researcher is one that is considered a “Power” nation, such as in the case of the US, Great Britain, and other EU countries. These all carry Euro-Amercicentric undertones that are allowed to manifest in the research process.

In spite of these types of concern, the scientific method, is the process most respected in academia as it is perceived to be reliable and rational due to its rigidity and supposed adherence to this rigidity. Although there is a rich Middle Eastern history to the practice previous to its “founding” in Western culture, it was not until the 17th Century that a Euro-centric historical approach to defining “scientific method” came into play. This has not gone away, this ideal continues still. The system of inquiry took on an empiricist approach during this period of European history and was lauded by the likes of Descartes, and later Kant in the 18th Century.
While it is reasoned that a SM research paradigm does not fully “capture the richness of the individuals and the environments under study”, this fact is something that is especially left out of traditional quantitative research practices (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2009, pg. 50). Moreover, Gay, Mills, & Airasian (2009) acknowledge that measuring instruments used for SM research “always have some degrees of error,” to it (pg. 50). This reality also requires that researchers today address concerns about this fact, and then fine tune research relative to the community that they are collaborating with.

These two issues within the context of research, human reality and scientific approaches to understanding human reality, may seem problematic to some, as seen in early 20th Century discussions in quantitative theory (Rowney & Graham, 1969, discussed the meshing of history with quantitative methods). I propose that there is a way to mesh both of these in research with Indigenous and marginalized populations.

The second point-of-discussion will briefly address Indigenous Research Paradigms and present the scholarly efforts of current Indigenous researchers who propose that quantitative research methods can be a viable way to conduct research with Indigenous populations when it has a transformative aspect to it. Just as important, these researchers and authors will discuss some of the consequences of colonization on Indigenous peoples. I maintain further to this, proposing that the history of colonization needs to be made an important aspect of research collaboratives with Indigenous and marginalized populations.

The third area of literary analysis discusses Colonization & Decolonization and its impact on Indigenous communities and marginalized people and will be featured as an aspect of cultural trauma, an area of required study for any academic working with Indigenous and
marginalized populations. In the following, deeper discussions will suggest that DRM incorporates and addresses these issues.
2.1 Review of Literature

From an historical perspective, Lagemann (1997) explains that “the formal study of education” began in the United States at the turn of the century. At the time, research practices in education emulated research processes being used in the field of psychology and in the social sciences; however, in the field of education the beginnings of educational research is most clearly noted with “the establishment of university schools and departments of education and the institutionalization within them of an aspiration to create a ‘science of education’,” (Lagemann, 1997, pg. 5).

Not surprisingly, 20th century educational research in the US was a beginning field of study dominated by mostly White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestants, and (WASPS) who came from privileged backgrounds. These early educational researchers tended to have a limited circle of friends outside of their personal and professional realms, as well as limited external associations with others not like themselves; therefore, their overall, life experiences, both professional and personal, were limited by their privileged backgrounds and social status. These mostly WASP males “tended to hold faculty appointments at places like Chicago, Harvard, Michigan, Stanford, Teachers College, Wisconsin, or Yale; to publish in journals like School and Society or the Yearbooks of the National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE); and to belong to professional clubs and associations like the Cleveland Conference and AERA,” according to Lagemann (1997, pg. 7).

These early researchers were considered "imported experts", who were “summoned to diagnose and prescribe solutions for local school problems (Judd, 1938, p. 11; Lagemann, 1997, pg. 7). Consequently, their backgrounds and life experiences “were increasingly isolated from both their non-educationist colleagues in the university and their school-based colleagues.
in education”, which created a vacuum of sorts in which their worldview tainted their ability to
dwell outside of that worldview and step outside of their comfort zones, as Lagemann (1997)
explains (pg. 7).

It wasn’t until 1917 that an “extraordinary proliferation of tests, scales, finance
formulas, growth charts, and articles warranted the inclusion of educational research as a
distinct category in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature”, previous to this education
research wasn’t even considered as such (Lagemann, 1997, pg. 7). Viewing this historically,
these early beginnings in education research practices are significant because they lend
themselves easily to a potentially privileged “Westernized” jump in which tainted or skewed,
views are frequently a part of the type of research results one finds in the early literature from
this period. It is a practice that is still in effect and is especially problematic for Indigenous and
marginalized populations (Sandoval, 2000; Mutua & Swadener, 2004; Spring, 2007; Tuhiwai
Smith, 2008; 2012; Nicholls, 2009; Nakamura, 2010; Chilisa, 2012; Kovach, 2012; Lonetree,

So is the case with the American education systems, whose history is first noted
in the 17th Century. Consider the early history of education within the context of culture, socio-
religious status, politics and language. At the time, the early American colonies were forming
and had colonized the Americas as a means of obtaining religious freedom from England.
Divine, Breen, Williams, Gross, & Brands, (2013) explain that colonial families of that time
“did not exist in isolation…” (Pg. 77). Furthermore, they explain that “the early history of
colonial America was an intimate story of families, and not, as some commentators would have
us believe, of individuals…” (Divine & et al, 2013, Pg. 77). As discussed by these authors,
such families believed in the concept of a patriarchally-centered God who ruled over humans
and had “ordained the family” for humanity’s further development and for the benefit of all, that is, Godly and good for humans.

In retrospect, this type of early colonial family served as a means of promoting and maintaining social order and advancing a, seemingly united community in reverence of a Christian God (Divine & et al, 2013, Pg. 78). They practiced their own unique religion, which was the glue that held them together initially. These formerly-English colonizers, quickly became the first American families, as we know them today, and were comprised of what was mainly a mono-cultural community comprised of a White, Anglo Saxon, Protestant group, who spoke the same language, had very similar ideas, and were committed reverently to their faith. These variables made transitioning to their new world a uniformed endeavor which would be continuously challenged by the original peoples of the continent, who, ironically, are now considered the sub-classes of the US.

These exclusive, and at the same time inclusive, aspects of their socio-religious constructs promoted a type of family unit that worked hard and held tight social conventions with the other members of their community. Labor was central to their existence, so much so that only their families and God encompassed their personal and communal view of their worldly reality. They were committed, unambiguously, to creating a new world order for their socio-religious needs, and owning property was key to this model—unbeknownst to the Indigenous people of that time.

As a united community that held the same ideals regarding God, family, work, ownership of property/land, gender roles, and a dedication to their own communal progression for their own prosperity’s sake, they began to build towns, churches, and, eventually, schools. Aside of establishing governing bodies and churches, schools were perhaps the beginning of
Early Colonial American institutionalizing, as we know it to be today. In many ways we have not stepped outside of this paradigm, to the extent that public schools and the academy still hold many of those early ideals today.

Interestingly, the building of schools was prompted by the fact that the early American colonizers began to become successful in their endeavors and in their commitment to creating a distinctive world for themselves. This further attributed to the colonizing of the Americas, although it was not called as such. Initially, children were taught at home, openly, in the ways of the faith. This prompted the need to teach their children to read and write so that children could study and catechize the Bible. As communities developed and grew in numbers, by 1647, legislation was enacted in which towns were required to open-up elementary schools when a community was comprised of, at the least, fifteen families (Divine & Et al, 2013, Pg. 80). In spite of whatever expenses, schools continued to be established from that point on. Eventually taxes for promoting education were established and community members paid them without reservation.

At the outset, the power of the printing press played a vital role in promoting education because it became the means of producing the first education primers to be used by the children of the community, which also provided to a nation state grounded in Christian religious doctrine, although adapted to fit the needs of the early American colonizer. Similar to other faiths that do not separate the State from religion, as in the case of Islam in the Middle East, schooling and textbooks served as reflections of the community’s values. This fact allowed for public education to become a further resource for establishing the faith and creating forthcoming adults who would adhere to the values of the community.
Not surprisingly, literacy rates reflected this detail as most community members could read and write. This is, perhaps, key to why the community was successful. I mention that because it is an element that sometimes lacks in communities that struggle economically, politically, and socio-culturally, in spite of their dedication to creating a new world for themselves. From my perspective as an education historian and researcher, this fact establishes what I have always argued and that is that education is critical to the needs of developing communities, and they are a means of maintaining the community—if schools consider directly the needs of that community and not with the needs of the overall state.

Nevertheless, the success of the early American colonizer initiated the establishment of the first universities, as we know them to be today on this continent. The establishment of Harvard University in the early part of the 17th century, quite similar to public schools of that time, also had a solid religious component to it, as well as to its curriculum. In 1769 precisely, Eleazar Wheelock established what is now known as Dartmouth College, in order to Christianize the Indigenous (Lawson, 2013).

Later in the 19th Century, the American government established Indian boarding schools, which only served to leave a tragic history and dark imprint on the American education system. In this way, early American socio-cultural ideals prompted by firm religious convictions of the time were critical aspects of forming a nation, and it is something that we still do today as educators, researchers, and citizens. It would not be until 1972 that Indigenous populations living in the US would have the ability to choose educational content by means of the Indian Education Act of 1972 (IEA’72) (Lawson, 2013).

Current Native American Demographics

“Data that is collected scientifically, that is, it has followed stringent processes that ensure reliability and validity, is data in pursuit of the truth of a phenomenon. Without it, I suggest,
researchers cannot fully understand the phenomenon; hence, our hands are tied... yet, researchers and academics must understand the epistemological, axiological, ontological views of the community that we work with; otherwise, the truth of the phenomenon continues to evade us... ”

--E. Vallès

Gall, Gall, & Borg (2007) explain that research plays an important role in improving educational practice, however, they recognize that because it is a human practice, “research is prone to errors” (pg. 1). Consequently, as Gall, Gall, & Borg (2007) make clear, the educational researcher “must deal with important, but still unresolved, philosophical issues having to do with the nature of social reality and how to acquire knowledge about it” (pg. 1). So it is the case with quantitative research methods, a research system that has the power to bring forth relevant data about large populations in a pretty much efficient and effective numerical way, while leaving the “human part” out of it and the problematic histories of the “Others”.

To be sure, in spite of their use as “powerful persuaders”, statistics in the field of education for Indigenous populations should be troubling to educators and academics as they continuously indicate that of all racial classifications and categorizations, Indigenous populations are the least represented in American systems of higher education and are the most challenged economically, socio-culturally, and, they are the least institutionally protected (Walter & Andersen, 2013, Pg. 7). The US Census Bureau reports that data is race-centered due to legislative and program requirements:

Data on race are used in the legislative redistricting process carried out by the states and in monitoring local jurisdictions’ compliance with the Voting Rights Act. More broadly, data on race are critical for research that underlies many policy decisions at all levels of government (US Census Bureau, 2012)
According to the *Rural Poverty Portal Website*, a subsidiary of The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD, 2012), “There are about 350 million indigenous peoples in the world. Although they account for less than 5 per cent of the global population, they comprise about 15 per cent of all the poor people in the world”\(^{31}\); “poor”, within this example is strictly applied to economics and in terms of viable food production and inter-community self-sustainment (pg. 1). Furthermore, as explained by the IFAD (2012), “Indigenous peoples make up about one third of the world’s 900 million extremely poor rural people” (pg. 1).

The IFAD was established by the United Nations in order to address the international global food crisis of the 1970’s which directly impacted Indigenous peoples from the Sahelian countries of Africa, a region located between the Sahara Desert and the Sudan. Moreover, the IFAD found that the “causes of food insecurity and famine were not so much failures in food production but structural problems relating to poverty, and to the fact that the majority of the developing world’s poor populations were concentrated in rural areas”, which is a commonality found amongst Indigenous populations globally-speaking. Other statistics offered by the IFAD are as follows:

- Life expectancy for Aboriginal men in Australia is 59 years, compared to 77 for Australian men in general (*Survival International)*

- A recent study indicated that ending the marginalization of indigenous peoples could bring about the expansion of the national economies of Bolivia (by 37%), Brazil (by 13%), Guatemala (by 14%) and Peru (by 5%) (*IFAD, 2012*)

\(^{31}\) Electronic Quote Source: [http://www.ruralpovertyportal.org/topic/home/tags/indigenous_peoples](http://www.ruralpovertyportal.org/topic/home/tags/indigenous_peoples)
• In Guatemala 86.6% of indigenous peoples are poor, and in Mexico 80.6% of them are poor (World Bank)

**Poverty situation and access to land**

• Living conditions on Canadian Indian reserves are at the same level as those in a country with a ranking of 78 on the UNDP Human Development Index (CHOIKE)
• Indigenous peoples suffer higher rates of poverty, landlessness, malnutrition and internal displacement than other members of society, and they have lower levels of literacy and less access to health services (IFAD, 2012)
• The Adivasi, or tribal peoples of India, constitute only 8% of the total population of the country, but 40% of them are internally displaced (IFAD), 2012)
• In Thailand, more than 40% of indigenous girls and women who migrate to cities work in the sex trade. The majority of females trafficked across state borders in south-east Asia are from indigenous communities (IFAD, 2012)
• The Amazon River Basin is home to about 400 different indigenous groups. While it accounts for just 7% of the world’s surface area, it harbors more than half of the world’s biodiversity (IFAD)
• Two centuries ago indigenous people lived in most of the earth’s ecosystems. Today they have the legal right to use only about 6% of the planet’s land and in many cases their rights are partial or qualified (IFAD, 2012)

Animated discourse related to improving education for Native Americans and Indigenous peoples from all over the world continues to be unheard, but necessary. The statistics are troubling and reflective of the type of issues that inundate public school systems today, on and off the Res.
The poverty map shown above is provided by the IFAD, (World Bank, 2009) and serves as an indicator of the type of demographics that come into play geographically with the highest poverty rates located in the sub-Saharan African regions of the world wherein Indigenous peoples are settled. Likewise, Latin America and the lower Asian continent continue to be of concern. Again, these regions consist of Indigenous peoples living in rural areas of the world. As discussed on the IFAD Website, the issues related to these dynamics are complex as they are reflective of geographic location; hence, often times, Indigenous populations remain isolated and, therefore, marginalized especially within consideration of post-modernity political
systems of power. On another more comprehensible level, Indigenous peoples are deliberately kept from land ownership and are intentionally separated from the natural resources that they had once been accustomed to previous to colonization. There is also the matter of gender. Females and children, not surprisingly, continue to live under the poorest of the poorest conditions. Heighten this fact with Indigeneity.

External exploitation continues to be at the root of the type of poverty issues we find oftentimes within Indigenous communities, in spite of the fact that Indigenous people—pre-colonization—lived, naturally, off the land and freely partook of the region’s resources for millennia. It was only when such areas were infiltrated by Europeans, then later other colonizers, that Indigenous communities continued to spin downwardly economically, and on terms of self-sustainment. How can people self-sustain when there are deliberate attempts to monopolize and control the resources that were once readily and freely available to the community? Nevertheless, Indigenous statistics continue to be of great concern worldwide. As discussed by Walter & Andersen (2013), these numbers do much more than “summarize reality in numbers….they also interpret reality and influence the way we understand society” (pg. 7). What’s more, they leave their mark (Walter & Andersen, 2013, pg. 7). Yet, as researchers we need them to understand important phenomenon, and as educators, we rely on them in order to address issues in education.

Returning to earlier conversations in this dissertation in which quantitative data has been discussed as a means of denigrating Native Americans, conversely, I have argued throughout the thesis that quantitative data allows for the pin-pointing of significant problems in education today whether for Indigenous and/or marginalized populations, or mainstream
populations. The task at hand was to seek-out a means for conducting research with Indigenous/marginalized populations that did not denigrate or add to the stereotypes that are already out there.

The DRM paradigm attempts to facilitate that process; however, the success of the endeavor is dependent on the research-advocate; therefore, it is crucial to present the dynamics behind the numbers, especially so for research collaboratives with colonized populations, as I have argued repeatedly that colonization is key to understanding phenomenon for Indigenous populations and marginalized people. Statistics for Indigenous peoples can only be fully understood when this is done, otherwise, researchers are only “getting” part of the story. The research-advocate should recognize that Indigenous communities differ in one way or another. Furthermore, the matter of genetic-mixing has impacted the demographics of genetic-identity. The other important matter that will be discussed further is the movement of younger tribal generations moving to cities due to economic motivations, as well as other reasons.

*Developing a Global World within a Nation-State Mentality*

“One of the values invented by the bourgeoisie in former times and launched throughout the world was man - and we have seen what has become of that. The other was the nation. It is a fact: the nation is a bourgeois phenomenon.”

--Césaire, (1972, Pg. 22)

What is problematic, on many levels, relative to this is the fact that the formation of the nation state was never mono-cultural in spite of the many attempts to make it seem as if it was. Although the early American system of privilege and power may have been established for early colonizers, as we see it was during this early period of American development; subsequently, this gave birth to the American race tragedy and saga. As education researchers
and academics, we are quite familiar with the tragedies and complex histories that education has enacted on the “Other”.

As ethical academic historians, educators, and researchers, we must acknowledge the often times negative qualities that are embedded in the systems that we partake in, which are a consequence of subversive ideals promoted by early American socio-cultural practices. No doubt, early American colonizers have been instrumental in creating and maintaining our social, religious, political, and cultural social structures, all aspects of nationhood, but let us consider this away from that socio-cultural lens, and let us impart a global lens to history by making room for Césaire (1972) in the following:

Exactly; but if I turn my attention from man to nations, I note that here too there is great danger; that colonial enterprise is to the modern world what Roman imperialism was to the ancient world: the prelude to Disaster and the forerunner of Catastrophe. Come, now! The Indians massacred, the Moslem world drained of itself, the Chinese world defiled and perverted for a good century; the Negro world disqualified; mighty voices stilled forever; homes scattered to the wind; all this wreckage, all this waste, humanity reduced to a monologue, and you think that all that does not have its price? The truth is that this policy cannot but bring about the ruin of Europe itself, and that Europe, if it is not careful, will perish from the void it has created around itself. They thought they were only slaughtering Indians, or Hindus, or South Sea islanders, or Africans. They have in fact overthrown, one after another, the ramparts behind which European civilization could have developed freely.

-- Césaire, (1972, Pg. 22)

A vital aspect of those types of the mono-socio-cultural structures embedded in Euro-Americentric practices should be addressed in education and research because this type of socio-cultural legacy goes side-by-side with racism, prejudice, and inequality, which, subsequently, has contributed inaccurately to the type of stereotypes we find in Western society regarding other groups of people.
Louis (2007) explains that false representations of Indigenous groups “create ‘artificial contexts’ that further disconnect [them] Indigenous groups from their natural contexts (Absolon and Willet, 2004, pgs. 9-10, in Louis, 2007, pg. 132). This arouses the need for a social transformation, not just of the institutions themselves but of the content that derives from Western structures and social society (West, 1998; Alexie, 1998, 2005). Within such a context, transformation should be a required attribute of all education systems, and it should be an essential aspect of research, when collaborating with marginalized and Indigenous populations, unless the intent is to step-aside from history and just “do the work”.

Many times, as a consequence of what is seen in the type of legacy produced in psychology and the social sciences of the early 20th century, “scientific research” centered and became a vehicle for promoting eugenics, which eventually reached its pinnacle through Nazism. It is not uncommon, still, to pick up a book, research report, or journal article from this period of time in which researchers and academics of that period promoted a commitment to the “scientific method”, wherein this type of bias and prejudice is clearly a part of the research results, or is found as an underpinning, or innuendo, within the researcher’s analysis of the research results, book thesis, or journal article discussion. This is, and has been, the root of the problem when conducting research with participants who are considered to be the “Other”, as in the case of collaborating with an Indigenous community, or with research undertaken involving a marginalized population. In both instances, such groups have become powerless within the researcher-participant relationship.

As a reminder, an Indigenous population is defined as a group of individuals, or members of a collective, that have lived and maintained their geographic place in specific regions of the world for millennia. In having done so, such communities have established
distinctive language systems, cultural values, ethnic practices, and communal understandings, morals and/or ethics. In general, such populations have close relationships to the Earth, its life forms, and the Universe and encompass their life around this.

A marginalized population consists of groups of people who have been defined by the mainstream population as racially and culturally different from themselves. Per se, marginalized populations sit on the margins of mainstream communities, and are, in general, politically and economically disenfranchised because of that fact. A marginalized population, at that moment, is comprised of ‘minority” populations, i.e... Hispanics/Latinos; Blacks/African Americans, etc…. When partnering with Indigenous groups and marginalized populations, it is important to consider the enormity of their history as a community, specifically one that has undergone tremendous changes due to colonization.

Indigenous and marginalized groups continue to be further challenged by the Western colonial legacy in direct relation to research, precisely, in the field of education (Matsumoto, 2001; Kovach, 2005). What is more, the colonial experience continues to impact Indigenous populations everywhere on an economic, political, and educational basis as well, therefore, this fact requires a reanalysis and reconsideration connected to current quantitative research methods in academia and in the field of educational studies, specifically in terms of Indigenous studies undertaken in the field of education (James, Street, & Jedlicka, 1980; Santos, 2002; Walker, 2003; Hodge & Lester, 2005; Kovach, 2005; Gibson, 2006; Louis, 2007; McDonald & McCarthy, 2007; Nabobo-Baba, 2008; Grace, 2010).

Revising traditional quantitative methods is long overdue…it’s amazing that it is still viewed as ‘scientific’ when it has managed quite well to leave out over more than half of the human population, yes, over half of us, which includes women, Indigenous and marginalized
populations, and all of us who are a compilation of everything that is wonderful in the world, but indescribable and unquantifiable in traditionalist terms. We are prompted to come to terms with this in education research and academia.

A dynamic part of this reconsideration is research and academia. We must consider how research, especially the type of research conducted early in education history, has stimulated and contributed to racial disputations and negative perceptions of the “Others.” Although Gay, Mills, & Airasian (2009) contend that “educational research findings significantly contribute to both educational theory and educational practice”; at the same time, the authors reason that there are limitations to the scientific method (SM) such as that SM research cannot answer all the questions (pg. 4).

Likewise, the “scientific method” is one that has been set-up by privileged Westerners who made it a point to separate themselves, much as early American colonizers did, form all “Others”. Similarly, throughout the lower American continents and what is now known as the American Southwest, Spanish Catholic colonizers played a vital role in colonizing the “Other” by creating mission schools created for catechizing the Indigenous of the Americas, these too were intended to ground the ideologies of the colonizer into the hearts and minds of the colonized, the Indigenous. As discussed previously, this has not been fully accomplished even after centuries of colonization. There has always been resistance to the letting go of the ancient ways, the sacred, in short, of our Indigenous ways…
2.2 Paradigm 1: Western Epistemology as a Cultural Broker

“A cultural broker in research? Yeah, it’s long overdue—but not too late.”
--E. Vallès

In this dissertation, quantitative data has been defined as numerical data ethically and accurately gathered on specific populations in order to assess phenomenon. For itself, research phenomenon becomes somewhat identifiable for large school populations and allows for research to be undertaken on what should be to the benefit of the students. Equally maintained throughout this proposal is the counter argument that traditional quantitative research practices and data collection, which are centered on a Euro-centric, Westernized value system, have been instrumental in creating negative stereotypes incorporated into society in order to promote institutional privileging. Moreover, these practices have contributed further to the division between the mainstream population, who are a part of the Western power structures, and all Others. In so doing, these practices have contributed to nativist philosophies because many times there are personal or corporate agendas attached to research overall. In short, research practices, and education structures that cater to a Euro-centric, Westernized world-view, have been at the root of misrepresenting, disparaging and oppressing Indigenous and minority communities in journals, literature, and education systems (Lagemann, 2000).

My greatest concerns relative to the method’s structural foundation is that traditional methods in education focuses on applying statistics to measure phenomenon, which includes human phenomenon. As mentioned earlier, this is beyond problematic when it is applied to people, specifically to those who are NOT members of the status quo with those who are. Afterall, that is one of the main purposes of a colonial legacy, to divide and conquer, even in education.
When applied to the American education system, which is rooted in Eurocentrism, educators must appreciate the fact that even US, state-mandated exams are rooted in one-sided, Ameri-European concepts, i.e., mastery of first language, vocabulary, writing, cultural ideologies, etc. that promote an “I” micro-level perspective, as opposed to a “We.” How, then, is it possible to have students of non-White, non-European ancestry and culture, compare/rank to those who are members of the status quo group? Aside of the racial implications attached to this are the historical ones in which researchers and academics should be cognizant of.

In essence, these are concepts rooted in human phenomenon that are culturally-irrelevant to Indigenous/marginalized population members, such as those fed to Indigenous peoples by the colonizer, even after the ashes of history have begun to settle down (Oyate Omniciyé, Oglala Lakota Plan, Draft 3, 2012; Rossatto, Vallès & et al, 2019). Moreover, when findings are produced by applying traditional research methods to work with Indigenous/marginalized populations based on the latter mentioned, is it ethical to work with these types of evaluation tools without addressing the serious discrepancies at large? Herein is where the gist of the DRM paradigm rests upon.

The DRM premise argues that to participate in any type of ethical and responsible research concerning any Indigenous/marginalized community, non-traditional methods are not, only, required but relevant to the adherence to the fundamentals of research. Without this central acknowledgement, researchers should not go into such communities without recognizing that these societies are recovering, still, from the trauma of American history, and the legacy of the power of colonization wherein colonizers continue to keep these populations in the margins.
It is beyond challenging to assume that such statistical results are “fair,” and, yet, this is at the very core of American, high-stakes, state-mandated testing systems, were even the exams are designed by the colonizers. Likewise, Ameri-Euro traditional research methods center on a form of hierarchy that is conducive to elites because it is based on Ameri-Euro ideals and cultural, linguistic, historical, fundamentals, as opposed to Indigenous and marginalized group member ones. Because of this, as well as other relevant ethical considerations, traditional research methods has been an accomplice in creating negative labels on Indigenous and marginalized population members, which educators/administrators/education board members, etc…, too often, fail to appreciate; therefore, it is necessary to emphasize that the traditional structure, itself, promotes a very White, Ameri-European, cultural-relevant platform which benefits the status quo. It is a research system in which competition is central to it, both in its use to define people, as well as in its use to divide and rank people, and, it does so by negating the historical-traumatic aspects of colonization, which are, conveniently, pushed aside by the American education system and in traditional research methods.

In general, Indigenous group members and marginalized students from low-socio-economic-status (SES) do not do so well when this traditional system of grading work when applied. And, why should they? If the concepts of which they are being tested on are, not, already, fundamentally, conducive to their way-of-being, why should they even try? Furthermore, high-stakes testing is charged with nativist ideologies embedded in a colonial history.

Although this type of testing can serve as a financial motivator for some teachers, for parents and their children, this is not the case. As Supovitz (2009) discusses, “…Research
shows that high-stakes assessments can and do motivate change in instructional practice. But critics charge that these changes tend to be superficial adjustments, focused on the content covered and test preparation rather than deep improvements to instructional practice” (Supovitz, 2009)

Furthermore, state-mandated, high-stakes testing has become a big business, stepping away from focusing on students and teaching. As Supovitz (2009) explains “that test-based accountability systems — the use of tests to hold individuals or institutions responsible for performance and to reward achievement — have become the cornerstone of U.S. federal education policy, and the past decade has witnessed a widespread adoption of test-based accountability systems in the U.S. Consider just one material manifestation of this burgeoning trend: test sales have grown from approximately $260 million annually in 1997 to approximately $700 million today — nearly a threefold increase” (Supovitz, 2019, pgs. 211-227; Rossatto, Vallès & et al, 2019 ). As such, high-stakes, state-mandated testing systems have made states rich at the expense of the children we are supposed to be teaching. Furthermore, and more important, they have become the means of alienating and harming students who do not do well on them.

Supovitz (2009) explains that “Researchers documented how poor and minority students performed worse on standardized tests than their wealthier, culturally dominant counterparts (Garcia and Pearson 1994; Mullis and Jenkins 1990). Girls tended to perform worse than boys on many standardized tests (Jovanovic et al. 1994; Moore 1989). Efforts to control for ethnic/racial and gender disparities in standardized test performance did not eliminate them altogether, suggesting something inherent in the tests themselves (Pennock-Roman 1992; Rodriguez 1992; Supovitz, 2009, pg. 216). The research on this traditional form
of assessment is vast with leading, progressive, researchers arguing that testing has become unhealthy for students and teachers, while serving as a lucrative enterprise for test publishers. Research results from the two-year study sponsored by the Council of the Great City Schools, provided by long-time education professor education professor and researcher from New York University, Diane Ravitch indicate that:

* Testing pursuant to NCLB in grades three through eight and once in high school in reading and mathematics is universal across all cities. Science testing is also universal according to the grade bands specified in NCLB.

* Testing in grades PK-2 is less prevalent than in other grades, but survey results indicate that testing in these grades is common as well. These tests are required more by districts than by states, and they vary considerably across districts even within the same state.

* Middle school students are more likely than elementary school students to take tests in science, writing, technology, and end-of-course (EOC) exams.

* The average amount of testing time devoted to mandated tests among eighth-grade students in the 2014-15 school year was approximately 4.22 days or 2.34 percent of school time. (Eighth grade was the grade in which testing time was the highest.) (This only counted time spent on tests that were required for all students in the eighth grade and does not include time to administer or prepare for testing, nor does it include sample, optional, and special-population testing.)

* Testing time in districts is determined as much by the number of times assessments are given during the school year as it is by the number of assessments.

* There is no correlation between the amount of mandated testing time and the reading and math scores in grades four and eight on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

---

32 Data Source: Diane Ravitch’s Blog: @dianeravitch.com. Diane Ravitch’s Blog by Diane Ravitch is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License. Based on a work at dianeravitch.net.
In a *PBS News Hour, Politics* article titled, “Study: Kids take 100-plus required tests through 12th grade,” Kerr & Lederman (2015) explain that “According to a comprehensive study of 66 of the nation's big-city school districts by the Council of the Great City Schools, students spend between 20-25 hours taking standardized tests each year” (pg. 1). Likewise, the 2015 longitudinal study found that “a typical student took 112 mandated standardized tests between pre-kindergarten and 12th grade,” in so doing, American education has clearly developed an education systems centered on testing instead of educating. As Freire would have said, a “banking culture,” wherein students are like banks with teachers “depositing” information into the student, who will only retain the information up until the test is given, then forget it, or store it, never to use it again.

A healthier and more viable education system must be developed that steps away from a testing culture. School administrators reinforce this new system of “teaching for the test/state,” and not for the student. Administrators will make state-mandated testing days competitive, hosting “test-rallies,” a post-modern version of a pep-rally. Much as Freire advocates, a banking method in education in which students just focus on memorization and testing is an unhealthy and an ineffective educational system. It prevents critical analysis and creativity from taking off. In short, it is not a viable system, long-term, and contributes to a reduction, or the removal of, important human courses such as band/orchestra, art, physical education. Moreover, it is debilitating to marginalized and Indigenous youth, as Ritt (2016) explains in the following:

National indicators states that students in at-risk subgroups underperformed when compared to students not in at-risk subgroups. The term at-risk is defined in the Glossary of Education (2014) as, “students who are considered to have a higher probability of failing academically or dropping out of school” (Hidden Curriculum, 2014).
At-risk students also refer to individuals facing circumstances that could harm student’s educational ability, such as; homelessness, health issues, violence at home, incarcerated parents, students with learning disabilities, low test scores, disciplinary problems, grade retentions, or other learning-related factors that can poorly affect student’s educational performance (Hidden Curriculum, 2014). Educators use the term to define and categorize students that are a concern, these are the students that will work closely with school’s social workers and need a lot of guidance and help. At-risk students are struggling in school due to outside risk factors that are out of their control such as poverty, being a minority, homelessness, etc. (Ritt, 2016 pg. 11)

Although this dissertation is not about “testing” research, it is necessary to point out that traditional approaches to testing are representative of traditional research/assessment/evaluative strategies embedded in White, Euro-centric ideologies consequential of what has been referred to an “Enlightenment period” in European history. It is not Native, nor is it a system conducive to Natives; to the contrary, it is harmful to Natives and members of marginalized populations as Ritt, (2016), documents below, specific to high-stakes, state-mandated testing:

Schools with larger populations of minorities and low-income students are less likely to pass high-stakes standardized tests (Krieg, 2011). One study reported that students in low poverty schools, are 22 times more likely to reach high academic achievement, when compared to students that are in high poverty schools. Schools measure students living in poverty by how many students are registered for free and reduce lunch (Segool; Carlson; Goforth; Von Der Embse; Barterian, 2013).

Schools with high poverty rates and minorities students tend to have fewer resources already and are struggling to find ways to improve student learning. At-risk students are struggling to meet proficiency on high-stakes standardized tests. This is leading to funding cuts by the government, which in return is leaving students to continue to fail and not succeed.
in school due to not meeting proficiency on high-stakes tests (Au, 2013) (Ritt, 2016, pg. 11)

The fact of the matter is that this approach, referred to as the neo-colonizing mentality by Rossatto, Vallès, & et al, (2020), is so entrenched in Euro-American institutional systems, starting off in public schooling. Neo-colonizing mentalization has become a subconscious way of viewing the external world through the eyes of any one taught in Christian, Euro-American educational systems (Rossatto, Vallès & et al, 2019).

I’d like to offer a real-life, semester-after-semester, student happening that I think exemplifies some of the concerns discussed in the above. As a critical researcher, I have taken the traditional grading system and adapted it for better use, and fairer play, with my students who cover the gamut of marginalized population members who reside in a community that self-identifies as 81.4% Hispanic or Latino; 12.6% White, non-Hispanic; and, 3.4% Black/African American.33

At my particular campus, which is located near the second largest American military base, once in a while I may have a few, federally recognized, Natives, as well as a rewarding number of students who are of mixed ancestry or are members of the European Union (EU) currently residing in this particular community. This fact helps me to span my scope of understanding regarding how students from outside of the US, as well as the community we are residing in, view the highly marginalized community in which we are currently residing in.

Returning to the discussion of high-stakes, state-mandated systems of testing presently practiced in the US, the American traditional system of grading rests on the following

concepts: to achieve an “A,” students’ work must fall into the category of 90-100. (e.g., for testing purposes this is based on the number of correct answers submitted). For a grade of a “B,” 80-89; for a grade of “C,” 70-79; for a grade of a “D,” 60-69. Anything below a “60/D” is a non-passing grade. With this traditional approach to evaluating students’ work, when assessed by highly-trained educators, the system is overall efficient and effective, especially so when applied to simplistic testing practices, such as using multiple choice; true/false/; multiple answer, etc… exams, which rely on traditional testing practices wherein answers are either correct or incorrect. This same evaluative/assessment example becomes problematic when evaluation/assessment can be, potentially, idiosyncratic, i.e., when teachers grade students’ work based on the instructor’s subjectivity, but that’s research for another time.

In my adaptation of the traditional grading system, I have offered students the following: a “90” and above is a flat “A,” meaning for example, that to earn an “A” on an exam, they just need to answer 45 questions correctly, with each correct answer being worth “2” points. Similarly, anything from 80-89 is a flat “B”; anything from 70-79 is a flat “C”; anything from 60-69 is a flat “D”; and, anything below a “60” is a non-passing grade. From the beginning of the semester, I stress to my students that all I want from them is a “90”. In the past, I have offered them weekly assignments, group work, as well as weekly exams, etc., in order to entice non-traditional students into achieving a “90/A”. I also offer them lots of extra-credit opportunities, on and off campus, which can easily assist them in pushing their grades up. This works rather well as I am a political science instructor who is attempting to have students recognize their important role in democracy; consequently, I am attempting to not only teach the text, connect the text to real-life political events, but more importantly, to have students engage in civics/voting/political events, etc.
As students’ work is completed, the student grade for an assignment/exam is converted to the appropriate number (based on how many exams and assignments offered) and broken down to a decimal value rooted in the score of “90/A”. Meaning, if there are fifteen chapters to carry during a semester, then each student exam that has earned a “90”, and/or above, is worth “6” points, e.g., 6 pts. x 15 chapters = “90”. The purpose of this grading system is multifold. For one, it allows all students to believe that they can achieve the “90/A” much easier than a “100/A”, which, ultimately, is still an “A”. Also, the breaking down of the grades allows for students who achieve lower grades to believe that they can still reach a “90” more easily than a “100,” if they undertake extra credit work, and in so doing, work towards an “A.” Also, the paradigm has a stabilizing factor when the grades have been “flattened,” so to speak. Based on the calculations, if students’ have earned a majority of “60’s”, they could, potentially, fail a class. With this formula, and 1 or 2 extra credit assignments, they could pass the class with a “60/D”.

Possible implications dealing with the use of this formula? Students become more motivated in turning in assignments; participating in class; undertaking extra-credit work, in and off campus, thus, connecting outside of our classroom and textbook; students’ becoming more consistent in paying attention to their school grades, and, of course, ultimately, passing the course. Moreover, it allows for non-traditional and/or struggling students to feel empowered because they are offered non-traditional options for assessment. I can share a number of success stories directly related to this practice; however, this work is attempting to focus on research paradigms.

As a current college instructor having worked in the field of education for decades, it is amazing to me the extent to which traditional grading methods has “sunken” into students’
attitudes about schooling which manifests itself in a variety of ways, from the sub-conscious to the mundane. Specific to high achievers— even after I have explained the latter mentioned grading system to them, (which I do the first week of class, and then, again, when I update grades)— it is not uncommon to have students’ shoot for grade point averages as high as “100+”. Too often, such students will approach me and ask about the extra points they have earned passing the “90.” Thus centered on traditional ideals that such students have adapted the Ameri-Euro, mainstream, system of competition, which Natives often perceive to be unhealthy to the individual, and the community.

It’s not just students who participate in this practice of competitive unhealthiness and communal disconnection. I am reminded of a faculty session I attended several semesters ago in which a White, PhD was attempting to bring a “-/+” extension to our college’s grading system. He presented a proposal in which instructors/professors would be prompted to use this system of assessment as a standard method of evaluation. I felt his proposal to be offensive because, ultimately, an “+A” -vs- an “A-“, is still an “A”. Not only did I see his presentation as time-consuming, but also representative of what I have been arguing against since I began focusing on educational evaluation/research methods.

Ultimately, this is a matter of dominant cultural relativity slanted towards the status quo. Besides, aside of stable grading systems such as the ones in which scoring is based on a solid correct-vs-incorrect answer, evaluation would be subjective, even with use of an assessment template. American educators and administrators can look at more progressive countries for guidance in these matters. For example, ironically, the best school systems are located in the Northern European countries. I am forced to point out that these countries are
highly homogenized, demographically-speaking, and do not have a colonial history to burden them with.

Similarly, because of this need to adhere to that which is of a European, or Ancient Greek antiquated ideological values system, wherein, an unspoken, and, at a subliminal level, people are viewed hierarchically beginning with the race/color of the individual. Most assuredly, such practices have been at the foundation of creating bias and distorted representations for many non-mainstream populations, especially so for those who do not look “White.” Please note that this is a necessary, abstract, tool of colonization. In the case of collected data in colonized countries, such as in the US, the use of racial categories is a long-standing practice that continues to go unnoted or addressed, as already there is an unspoken, socio-economic inequality formed since the beginning of its colonial domination. In general, “White” students, who are members of the mainstream population, come from less challenged economic homes than that of minority populations. Additionally, in the case of the US, American culture stems from this particular demographic.

Overall consequences of traditional ways of viewing groups of people contribute to practices of “Othering”, or “Otherizing”, which is an inauthentic way of viewing people from outside our race, ethnicity, gender, socio-cultural background, or economic status (Rossatto, Vallès & et al, 2019). This practice of “Othering” has even impacted the Indigenous “self” in ways that are not fully understood, even by Indigenous groups themselves. Media has a devastatingly subliminal effect on our psychological view of self. Cultural imagery, especially one that is representative of mainstream standards has the potential to play havoc on the “self” for groups of people outside of that world. When our concept of self is positive, we are in
general, more positive about life events and find relationships with people from outside our community to be fulfilling and a means of individual growth and self-awareness.

When we “buy into” the stereotypes, bias, and misinformed categorizations represented in media, literature, and research, then we are troubled by our histories, our gender, our people, and our place in the world. This is prompted by subliminal messaging that we, as people, pick-up on from our environment. An environment that is one-sided will always contribute negatively to our self-imagery, especially so when it is a bias and uninformed accounting of someone else. What is required in traditional research methods today is a viable means to provide a cross-cultural opportunity for mutual understanding. A cultural broker of sorts. A cultural broker in research? Yeah, it’s long overdue—but not too late.

Counter-Literature Response to the Colonial Legacy

Matsumoto’s (2001) scholarship prompts discourses specific to the benefits and potentially powerful impact of implementing cross-cultural viewpoints and considerations in all research studies. He (2001) claims that such studies are changing the face of psychology, science, and traditional scientific theory. Matsumoto (2001) explains that the findings are resulting in the creation of “new boundaries and states of knowledge about people and human functioning that ensues” (pg. xii). Matsumoto (2001) sees this as something exciting “because of the uncertainty of what the future holds not only for cross-cultural studies, but also for mainstream practices. The extent is worth deliberate and in-depth analysis and discussion as traditional positivists, scientists, and theorists deal with already extremely complex issues in understanding human behavior across increasingly diverse realms, as well as in their attempts to cross over “hard science” with human thought, emotion, motivation, and all other aspects of psychology (pg. xii).
Matsumoto (2001) postulates about a renewed approach to understanding human phenomenon and sees “a vision of the future as a continued evolution of cross-cultural psychology, particularly as it aids in the creation of a universal psychology that is applicable to all people of the world regardless of cultural background” (pg. viii). Of course, this idealist vision of the future is questionable, in spite of its good intentions as there are many abstract concepts situated in racist ideologies that impede such a possibility. To create “a universal psychology that is applicable to all people of the world regardless of cultural background,” requires that history texts, research studies on marginalized groups, and academic undertakings in these areas address the legacy of colonialism, and more importantly, dive into the complex ways in which such a history impacted various groups to the extent that issues that plague their communities are issues that tie into that legacy still (Matsumoto, 2001; Kovach, 2005; Gobo, 2011).

Because of this, it is required that current quantitative research practices address and rectify the inequities that have been a long part of traditional research practices. Educational research that uses a quantitative methodology requires a new research paradigm and appropriate analysis tools that adhere to the stringent standards of accountability expected in quantitative research methods; however, such efforts should incorporate an ethical, caring approach to study participants that is respectful of group ideologies and their ways of viewing the world. Moreover, such research should acknowledge the role of colonialism and the aftereffects of post-colonialism on the research group (Nicholls, 2009; Weston & et al, 2009; Nakamura, 2010). Finally, any research endeavors undertaken with Indigenous/marginalized populations requires an understanding of five distinct features relative to Indigenous worldviews not fully understood in mainstream populations in such work. They are as follows:
1.) Indigenous populations worldviews are unlike Western/mainstream worldviews: These include distinct epistemologies, ontologies, axiological, linguistic, socio-cultural phenomenon, and economic concepts, etc…

2.) Every Indigenous community holds a different worldview; therefore, no presumptions should be made: This signifies that no two cultures should be expected to be the same

3.) Commonalities found within Indigenous communities are rooted in a relationship with the Earth/planet/universe unlike other peoples: This is a distinctive aspect found amongst Indigenous communities worldwide

4.) Impact of Colonial Histories: Which will differ with each community

5.) Native language (first language) matters, not only in testing, but in addressing the needs of keeping it and enhancing it. This must be done, while learning the language of the country in which Indigenous/marginalized populations reside; specifically, those which have been colonized; for example, in the US “ELL students are especially being hard hit by high-stakes testing and the fast-paced instructions,” according to Katz, (2013).

Accordingly, study participants noted that “ELL students are tested even more because they take extras tests to see where they stand as English speakers” (Katz, 2013; Ritt, 2016, pg. 42). Indigenous and marginalized students must learn the language of the colonizer so that they may test and challenge the same structures that marginalize them. At the same time, it is necessary to address how the language of the colonizer is used as a means of maintaining the margins, specific to disregarded population members (Rossatto, Vallès & et al, 2019).

As Ritt (2016) discusses regarding evaluation and assessment of marginalized population members, “Testing dominates the ELL student experience. Schools accept students with language barriers with the hope that they will be able to teach them how to read and write in English, but testing them in reading, writing, listening, and math causes them to miss out on class time due to extra time required for testing (Ritt, 2016, pg. 42). Furthermore, it stigmatizes disenfranchised students when they are forced to test against mainstream population members, whose first language is that of the colonizer.
As such, Ritt (2016) argues that, “Educators are being forced to teach students that there is only one right answer (Au, 2013), which was consistent with the literature that suggests that the loss of subjects other than math and reading is slowly disappearing from the daily curriculum in public schools (Ritt, 2016, pg. 42). This fact is beyond problematic when applied to First Nations peoples whose language is/was almost decimated by the colonial history (Rossatto, Vallès & et al, 2019).

In regard to the above listed items, #1-5, it is worth noting that attempts to apply the itemized suggestions in countries that have been colonized will be a challenging feat, indeed. At the same time, the nature of acquiring knowledge outside of the mainstream seems to have been altered by younger generations of students who have experienced a life dominated by technology, they have garnered the ability to connect with others outside of their micro-levels.

For students of Native ancestry not only are they challenged by this phenomenon; such students battle against the loss of their language, culture and customs, as well as their traditional familial structure, i.e., kinship (Rossatto, Vallès & et al, 2019). Research in this field of education is amassing. Still, it is worth noting that many Indigenous communities, in and outside of the US, are working to reinvigorate Native language, culture, and Indigenous practices, as well as reunite families by means of inter-generational cultural/linguistic exchanges, as well as by promoting Native spirituality.

The Politics of Education & the Research Agenda, Literature Review

“This is the nature of politics in education. Politics, I am told, is solely about power—who has it and the means in which it is preserved for those same people.”

–E. Vallès

In addressing the idea that creating a “straw man” caricature of objectivity/perfection that needs to be dismantled; for example, it also needs to be noted that there have been many
attempts to bring more nuance to this and to incorporate matters of diversity and subjectivity into quantitative methods, as demonstrated in the argument that:

….information provided by large scale assessments is primarily useful to measure school and system progress, but of more limited utility for instructional guidance.

Most problematic is that the high stakes testing system in America has been repeatedly promoted as a substantive reform in itself.

However, high stakes testing is a relatively weak intervention because, while it reveals shortcomings, it does not contain the guidance and expertise to inform response…

(Supovitz, 2009, Abstract).

As Supovitz (2009) explains, the extent of traditional assessment/evaluative practices has even entered day-to-day considerations, discussions, and debate over how these practices have been institutionalized and used against “Others,” which is best demonstrated in the simple recognition that day-to-day American schooling has managed to negate this aspect of educational practices, as demeaning as it is to marginalized population members (Rossatto, Vallès & et al, 2020).

As Delpit (1988) argues, issues of power are enacted every day in the public c-school classroom. Accordingly, Delpit (1988) explains that these issues include: “the power of the teacher over the students; the power of the publishers of textbooks and of the developers of the curriculum to determine the view of the world presented; the power of the state in enforcing compulsory schooling; and the power of an individual or group to determine another’s intelligence or ‘normalcy’” (pg. 286).

As a final point, Delpit (1988) argues that if schooling prepares people for jobs, and the kind of job a person has determines her or his economic status, then it makes sense to recognize that schools and the schools’ curriculum are “intimately related to that power”
In this same regard, traditional approaches to teaching, learning, and evaluating; clearly, must be adapted to fit the needs of a changing diverse student population, as discussed previously.

Lesser (2014), a social justice advocate and mathematics/statistics professor, explains that, “educators increasingly seek to maximize student motivation or engagement by using supplements or alternatives to physical textbooks and face-to-face classroom instruction. These endeavors of organizations and individual instructors can be served well by leveraging opportunities to connect statistical concepts to the world beyond classroom walls,” such an approach attempts to fuse the traditional with the progressive, in terms of making education work for all.

As a pro-active example of creating a conducive teaching and learning environment for students who are emerging from the margins, Lesser begins work with traditional statistical methods by promoting it to his students on a personalized level. For example, he intermingles probability questions with cultural games such as “La Lotería” or “Toma Todo” (Lesser, 2013c; Lesser, 2010a). In this way, the intent would allow for “cultural know-how” at the micro-level that meshes with traditional White, Euro-American approaches to statistical mathematics.

Lesser, (2007a), whose work promotes implementing social justice themes and activities into the process of learning statistics does so as a means to “provide personally meaningful and potentially transformative opportunities to learn the importance and power of statistics for assessing, understanding, and changing inequities persisting in society at large, and thus learn statistics not just as a producer or consumer, but as an engaged citizen…” (2007a). I have had the pleasure of sitting in on Dr. Lesser’s undergraduate statistic course and
was impressed with the use of this strategy. Teaching at a highly marginalized university, Dr. Lesser created a space in which undergraduates interacted directly with statistics by applying class projects to content that had now become important, as it was personalized.

In considering Bourdieu’s (1977, 1986) view that education attainment allows for socio-economic mobility, for many of us this may seem true; however, it is applicable only to an extent. Critical theorists and progressive researchers argue that the reality of the matter is that Western public institutions are situated and deeply embedded in colonial practices which are entrenched in racism, prejudice, and one-sided privilege for some. The 2001 United Nations World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance Report emphasized “that poverty, underdevelopment, marginalization, social exclusion and economic disparities are closely associated with racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, and contribute to the persistence of racist attitudes and practices which in turn generate more poverty (UN Report, 2001, Pg. 12).

These invisible structures are an ugly part of Western institutions which has had long-term lingering effects on society, much like a disease that might have overtaken an individual, but then began to normalize (hooks, 1994; Mead, 1994; Apple, 1999; Demas & Saavedra, 2004; Mutua & Swadener, 2004; Tuhiwai Smith, 2008). Although education attainment should be more than just a means to socio-economic mobility; critical theorists and many progressive researchers argue that the Western education system limits non-mainstream populations because the system is a one-sided political one.

To be sure, it can be argued that public education systems are meant to keep non-mainstream populations in continued marginalized positions and power holders seated (hooks,
1994; Mead, 1994; Apple, 1999; Demas & Saavedra, 2004; Mutua & Swadener, 2004; Tuhiwai Smith, 2008). This view is carried out and practiced throughout other countries as well and is deemed as aspects of violence because the structures alienate marginalized groups further (Prokhorova, 2007; Schimmel, 2007; Postiglione, 2009; Langton & Rhea, 2009; Cheng, 2010).

“Any situation in which some men prevent others from engaging in the process of inquiry is one of violence…, to alienate humans from their own decision making is to change them into objects” (Freire, 1993, Ch. 2). This is the nature of politics in education. Politics, I am told is solely about power—who has it and the means in which it is preserved for those same people.

Young (2012) maintains “what the postcolonial eye can see more clearly now are the ways in which, like the conflictual meanings of Cameron’s poppy, postcolonial remains operate in a dialectic of invisibility and visibility” (pg. 23). Young’s (2012) reference to David Cameron’s poppy reflects aspects of how colonialism is continued to this day. Likewise, Rhea & Anderson (2011) reason that the “ideals of progressive education avoid addressing the impact of colonization and other structural inequalities that exist within education systems such as occur in Australia and other former colonies and have been widely theorized by, for example, Delpit (1993, 1995), Bishop and Glynn (1999), and Hall (1980),” (pg. 27).

Rhea & Anderson (2011) further claim that “this ‘benefit’ eludes many Indigenous students at all levels of the Australian education system” (pg. 27). I contend that Rhea & Anderson’s (2011) view on this is one that can be easily applied to all public institutions that have been influenced and modeled on Western imperialism (whether influenced by Eastern or Western underlying forces) or capitalism.
Tuhiiwai Smith (2008) expounds on this, “the collective memory of imperialism has been perpetuated through the ways in which knowledge about indigenous peoples was collected, classified and then presented in various ways back to the West, and then, through the eyes of the West, back to those who have been colonized (Pgs. 1-2). Similarly, Williams (2008) explains that “there is a need to examine how an Indigenous research paradigm can lead to a better understanding of, and provision for, the needs of Indigenous people” pg. 20). By appreciating the ontological differences between FPL’s, which are varied and specific to the geography of the group, or, learning specific and deliberate epistemological and axiological views of the participant group. Such discussions can lead to a more robust and authentic research experience and methodology. As Williams explains, “It is one that is more fully integrated with an Indigenous worldview” (William, 2008, Pgs. 20-21). This point seems to be overlooked, even by the most dedicated social activist.

Apple, (1999), urges academics to critically reconsider what we believe the purpose of education is supposed to be about. Instead, he suggests that we should focus on what it should be, and what it can be. As Apple (1999) explains, “education participates in maintaining these differences or may be employed to alter them…,” calling for more research in this regard (1999, pg. 10).

Approximating Lesser & Blake (2006), Apple (1999) sees the development of both quantitative and qualitative data analysis as an important potential counter approach to oppressive policy, focusing on those who direct such policy in order to maintain the status quo. To be clear, the position taken by this work recognizes the effectiveness and efficiency of the quantitative aspects of research, which is, by far, the closest attempt to accuracy in research when undertaken by the stringent methods established in this same field.
What is argued is the fact that the approach is a consequence of White, European colonization of which the tenants resting silently behind traditional research methods are problematic for those who are not a part of the White, Euro-American worldview; therefore, a more appropriate paradigm is required which incorporates quantitative data use. The other problematic pertains to subjectivity in research design, which in traditional methods is a highly, White, Euro-American one (Rossatto, Vallès & et al, 2019).

A Constructive Criticism of Qualitative Research Methodologies and Mixed Methods Methodologies within Educational Settings

“Why not just use qualitative methods? --Because there is much potential in understanding the meaning behind the numbers in quantitative research, but this can only be done if you get to know the people behind the numbers.”

--E. Vallès

Flyvbjerg (2006) describes five common misunderstandings about case-study research that I believe are central to some of the issues regarding the use of qualitative methods. They are as follows:

(a) Theoretical knowledge is more valuable than practical knowledge

(b) One cannot generalize from a single case; therefore, the single-case study cannot contribute to scientific development

(c) The case study is most useful for generating hypotheses, whereas other methods are more suitable for hypotheses testing and theory building

(d) The case study contains a bias toward verification, and

(e) It is often difficult to summarize specific case studies

Although Flyvbjerg’s (2006) attempt to address and, in many ways, reconcile these confusions, from the view of working with large participant groups quantitatively, it is important to
recognize that case studies and qualitative research, in general, contribute significantly to research in ways that quantitative research does not. More important, without such research the field of education would never fully understand phenomena, especially in a field of work that is intricately involved with humans.

Flyvbjerg (2006) substantiates this view by applying *Kuhnian insight* into his argument regarding the use of case-studies by stating that, “a scientific discipline without a large number of thoroughly executed case studies is a discipline without systematic production of exemplars, and a discipline without exemplars is an ineffective one” (pg. 219). Furthermore, he argues that a “social science may be strengthened by the execution of a greater number of good case studies” (Flyvbjerg, 2006, pg. 219).

Why not just use qualitative methods? Because there is much potential in understanding the meaning behind the numbers in quantitative research, but this can only be done if you get to know the people behind the numbers. It is critical to recognize that qualitative research methodologies and mixed methods are an especially important method of measure and of conducting research in the field of education. The process is necessary in order to delve into phenomena that cannot be easily or accurately represented by the use of numerical data, unless adhering to stringent survey approaches that allow the researcher some insight into the phenomena; however, there still exist issues in using this approach.

Evidently, a major distinction between quantitative and qualitative research methodologies is that qualitative methods requires more time in relation to the study and incorporates smaller groups of study participants, and/or singular studies. Additionally, the use of qualitative methods in general touches upon one individual or small group studies versus potential larger studies. The nature of the process demands caution, much invested time, and,
the researcher must commit to a long-term relationship (10 months to 2 years) of sorts with the community or the individual that they are collaborating with.

Issues in education today are so vast that to use a qualitative approach to studying the phenomena is something that would be quite difficult to do, yet, to an extent it is something that is done, and in general, it is done quite well; however, the research conducted is a reflection of smaller-sized populations, which is an ineffective means of understanding phenomena when collaborating with large-sized populations. In this respect, there are still too many unresolved issues in the field of education that await further research studies because the research is still underway. Nevertheless, as already discussed, such a research approach requires that participant sizes be smaller and that the data gathered, generally, touches upon a smaller specific aspect, or an individual case history or a limited number of case studies, which can be problematic when attempting to deal with large population studies, as in the case of Westernized education systems.

Most researchers cannot afford to spend more than 1-2 years on a research project, presuming that we are talking about a thorough, well thought-out project. A thorough qualitative approach to research methods, whether an ethnography or (a) case study/ies in the field of education will require that the researcher gather an in-depth understanding of the sociological, economic, culturally religious, as well as the political aspects of human behavior for that particular community. And, of course this will be vastly reliant on the geography of the place, the politics and economics of the time, and the circumstances in which the study is situated in. Moreover, the qualitative researcher must attempt to seek-out, then analyze the reasons that govern such behavior. This will require a historical overview of the community, from their perspective.
In many ways, qualitative research methods allows the researcher the ability to investigate why something might be happening, and then to attempt to recognize and understand how this has impacted A or B, perhaps even C, D, E, for this reason qualitative research processes are generally smaller studies that are, over-all, specifically focused on a particular phenomenon, consequently sample sizes are often much more smaller than those we find in quantitative methods, which are, in general, comprised of larger sample sizes. In both examples, the researcher attempts to reach informed conclusions that are reliant on many factors; however, it is easy to recognize how differences in sample size might affect the outcome of the study.

In a mixed method approach, and even in some qualitative research approaches, it is at this point in the study that we bring in the tools generally used in quantitative research methods. In general, qualitative research methods do not offer a hypothesis at the beginning of a study, as does quantitative methods. However, there are now valid arguments being made that posit that qualitative methods and case study research can be used effectively both for hypotheses-testing; however, they will not be addressed in this dissertation (Flyvbjerg, 2004).

Critical pedagogues and Indigenous researchers in the field of education argue that those structures can and, in many ways, continue to disenfranchise and alienate Indigenous and marginalized populations (Tuhiwai-Smith, 2008, pg. 124; hooks, 1994; Mead, 1994; Apple, 1999; Demas & Saavedra, 2004; Mutua & Swadener, 2004). Likewise, Tuhiwai Smith (2008) explains that “research has not been neutral in its objectification of the Other (Pg. 39) (Cohn, 1996; Sandoval, 2000; Mutua & Swadener, 2004; Spring, 2007; Tuhiwai Smith 2008, 2012; Denizen, Lincoln, & Tuhiwai Smith, 2008; Chilisa, 2012; Kovach, 2012; Lonetree,
2012; Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2012; Walter & Andersen, 2013). These are legitimate concerns that must be addressed in education today, and in research methods.
2.3 Paradigm 2: Discourse on Indigenous Research Methods

“The use of traditional research approaches in work with Indigenous and marginalized populations, as they currently stand, allows for the continuation of inequality in research design and promotes the power of the elite, reminding us that power creates its own research results and reality.”

– E. Vallès

An Indigenous Research Paradigm (IRP) is one that is “made up of an Indigenous ontology, epistemology, axiology and methodology” (Wilson, 2002, pg. 13) More important, an IRP steps away from dominant Western research paradigms. In fact, an IRP requires that “Indigenous people themselves decide exactly what areas are to be studied” (Wilson, 2002, pg. 13). Wilson (2002) explicates that Indigenous research “is inclusive of all first peoples—unique in our own cultures—but common in our experiences of colonialism and our understanding of the world” (Wilson, 2002, pg. 16). To be clear, as Wilson (2001) explains, an Indigenous paradigm comes from the fundamental belief that knowledge is relational, is shared with all creation, and therefore cannot be owned or discovered. Indigenous research methods should reflect these beliefs and the obligations they imply (pgs. 175-79).

Walter & Andersen (2013) propose that there are three premises regarding the cultural agenda of Indigenous statistics. They are as follows:

1.) Quantitative methodologies “reflect and constitute, in ways largely invisible to their producers and users, the dominant cultural framework of the nation-state within which they operate (Pg. 9)

2.) Differentiation between methods and methodologies, with methodologies “shaping the picture that statistics produce, rather than the research method of statistical analysis itself” (Pg. 9). Methods, according to the authors, is a “technique for gathering and analyzing information, such as a survey or content analysis” (Pg. 41)

3.) The need to be more cognizant of the “translative processes which through which non-academic knowledge is translated to the academy”, with the understanding that academic research is situated activity (Pg. 9)
Morgensen (2012) contends that “Indigenous methodologies present what Dylan Rodríguez (referencing João Costas Vargas) calls an “urgency imperative,” which answers “the academy’s long historical complicities in racial/colonial genocide” by endeavoring “to denaturalize and ultimately dismantle the conditions in which these systems of massive violence are reproduced.” As Morgensen (2012) explains, such theories seek to fundamentally transform the institutional and epistemic conditions of life and thought for Indigenous and non-Indigenous people on lands where all live relationally, in ways that settler societies and their governance cannot contain” (pg. 805).

In recognizing and acknowledging that empiricism places a deep emphasis on categories and a hierarchical order of systems and institutions centered on European/Western presumptions; Indigenous researchers argue that such an approach cannot help but to place Europeans at the top of the heap of such categories.

The truth is that I have said something very different: to wit, that the great historical tragedy of Africa has been not so much that it was too late in making contact with the rest of the world, as the manner in which that contact was brought about; that Europe began to "propagate" at a time when it had fallen into the hands of the most unscrupulous financiers and captains of industry; that it was our misfortune to encounter that particular Europe on our path, and that Europe is responsible before the human community for the highest heap of corpses in history. (Césaire, 1972, Pg. 7).

In all ways possible--this factor alone debilitates the effectiveness of ethical research endeavors in general; however, it is especially troubling in quantitative research because the colonial history of the group is not addressed in the research project.

Conversely, Lesser & Blake’s (2006) view that the use of a Statistical Mathematic (SM) approach to understanding phenomenon serves as a powerful form of countering
controversial “knowledge” and is one worth noting in the pro-quantitative argument. Referring to Gutstein’s (2003b, 45) scholarship as influenced by Freire; Lesser & Blake (2006) make clear that “reading the world through mathematics means to use mathematics to understand relations of power, resource inequities, and disparate opportunities between social groups and to understand explicit discrimination based on race, class, gender, language, and other differences (pg. 161). As such, Lesser & Blake (2006) contend that mathematics/statistics “is actually one of the most powerful, yet underutilized, venues for working towards the goals of critical pedagogy—social, political, and economic justice for all (pg. 159).

As discussed earlier, in a non-IRP, the researcher and the research paradigms consistently place an obstructive Eurocentric worldview on others and “sees” only through the rose-colored lenses of mono-culturalism without recognizing that fact about itself. In its stead, an ethical research paradigm will encompass a cross-cultural view of culture, history, and other relevant group dynamics, which is what should have always been and is what is required (Matsumoto, 2001; Setiadi, 2004; Hodge & Lester, 2006). Does that mean that such a paradigm side-steps the “scientific? Absolutely not, instead it allows science to become real, the center of recognizing issues that, more than likely, can be negotiated. A valid research paradigm should involve an authentic view of the participant/s of which the effort is centered on; acceptance of that reality, even when it is different from the reality of the researcher or consumer of the research paper; and respect towards those who may not be, or think, like the researcher or the reader (consumer) of the research.

Instead, as Walter & Andersen (2013) contend, traditional quantitative research practices have “objectified” Indigenous peoples as they have been used, historically, as a means to frame them “as objects of inquiry”. Consequently, the authors created an IRM
paradigm for collaborations with Indigenous populations called *nayri kati*, meaning “good numbers” in the Tasmanian Aboriginal language *palawa kani*, which is an axiologically centered framework which allows for an Indigenous standpoint to take place. The author’s center it on Bordieu’s (1984) concept of *habitus* as a means of incorporating race capital, social, economic, and cultural capital (Water, 2010 c; Walter & Andersen, 2013, Pg. 83).

The basis of, *nayri kati*, seeks to provide a theoretical platform for understanding power at the micro and macro social levels by incorporating a race perspective to the paradigm. The core of the concepts for the framework are similar to those of DRM, i.e., a focus on Indigenous worldviews axiologically, epistemologically, ontologically, etc…except that DRM uses two additional approaches not found in *nayri kati*. Power relations in both these Indigenous research models is an important aspect to both of these paradigms.

There is an important distinction made by Walters & Andersen (2013) that I found especially attractive related to the use of a quantitative approach to research. The authors explain that the issue with the use of this approach is not so much so about the methods, but the methodology used. Instead, they argue that “the strength of statistical analysis and techniques can and should be retained and positioned within an Indigenous quantitative methodology” and that to “reject work on the basis of the bad methodological company it has traditionally kept is as pointless and at worst…harmful” (Walter & Andersen, 2013, pg.133).

Similar to Lesser & Blake’s (2006) earlier stand that statistical analysis allows for the “widening of the circle of anti-oppression education,” these authors encourage Indigenous people to come to terms with and know how to understand and challenge statistics while becoming comfortable with the data and the practice of applying it to areas that can experience
transformation. In this way they can, and will learn, to control how it is further used. In a sense, “becoming stewards” of their own data collection (Kovach, 2009).

Likewise, Sandoval’s (2000) scholarship in IRM sees research as a means of providing and inspiring social activism from within the tribe. Sandoval (2000), a critical and cultural theorist, encourages Indigenous academics and scholars from within such a context to make use of research methods because it has the potential to become a mouthpiece for the people. Accordingly, Indigenous scholars are allowed the opportunity to link research findings to their emerging work as a means of social advocacy and activism for the communities in which they participate in, which is something that is much needed and an approach that I fully embrace.

Kovach (2009) also emphasizes the need to understand how methods dictate in research. Kovach (2009) explains that “researchers have the task of applying conceptual frameworks that demonstrate the theoretical and practical underpinnings of their research, and, if successful, these paradigms illustrate the ‘thinking’ behind ‘the doing’ (pg. 39). Furthermore, the author explains that “Indigenous inquiry asks researchers to demonstrate how research gives back to individual collective good”, which is something that DRM requires from the research-advocate as well (pg. 174).

Traditional quantitative methods have not stepped outside of its privileged ancestry in spite of its potentiality. DRM is an approach designed to incorporate quantitative research methods into a research framework that can address the inequities that traditional methods has left upon Indigenous and marginalized populations while setting a deliberate agenda for communal transformation.
Research as a Transformative Phenomenon

*It is not the consciousness of men that determines their social being, but, on the contrary, their social being determines their consciousness."

--Marx *(Hammer & McLaren, 1991)*

Chilisa’s (2012) work is a cornucopia of resources specifically for Indigenous researchers and scholars. The use of a post-colonial CRT approach to research is key to the author’s premise. As such, the author is one of the first IRM advocates to place a global emphasis on research exposure for Indigenous peoples by incorporating a cultural-historic, globalized emphasis on understanding research and at the same time handing over the tools for researchers to do so, as Chilisa (2012) views research as a means of transformation. The idea of research as an opportunity is an intriguing and exciting one and an idea first discussed in the literature by Freire (1970; 1973; 1989; 1993) relative to research efforts with the marginalized, which is an idea that I have always shared with these authors and researchers.

Critical theory argues that transformation is about resistance against cultural alienation, the status quo, the structures they have created and sustained, and, ultimately, liberation. Within the field of education, “being transformative” implies a serious pedagogical view that gives students a practical learning experience that allows them to see themselves in very positive ways. It empowers the individual by establishing, through self-recognition, the unlimited opportunities and possibilities that are open to them.

Emphasis on transformation is placed on work with Indigenous groups from throughout the world, which is an approach that offers renewed opportunities for countering colonization throughout the world. In recalling Césaire’s (1972) solace, “*My only consolation is that periods of colonization pass, that nations sleep only for a time, and that peoples*
remain;” within such a context, Indigenous research has the ability to become a decolonization tool by moving theory into practice (Pg. 7). This is an exciting aside of quantitative methods, and one long over-due for many. Aside of its transformative potentiality, research has the means to impact the project participants and community members positively.

What is more, Chilisa (2012) presents guidance on how to integrate IRM into the global knowledge economy by prompting the building of partnerships as a means of the research relationship, which is something that DRM also does and in fact requires of the research-advocate, as will be discussed in more detail in Chapter three. This is encouraged as a post-colonization Indigenous method technique, which is something that has the potential to be of economic benefit to Indigenous peoples worldwide. Overall, an IRM approach promotes social activism and the opportunity for community transformation via research. These are ideals that are also embraced within the DRM paradigm.

In spite of quantitative methods transformational potentiality, there are still areas of contention that need to be addressed when using this method, and in some ways when considering how education and curriculum, explicitly, deal with power and the epistemology of power. For instance, consider the type of changes that should be made in relation to power; how does it affect research results, education, and academia when working with Indigenous and marginalized populations.

In the next section, what will be discussed briefly are some of the issues related to these systems of oppression. Although they are pointed out negatively, the initial intent of the systems have served the nation well. As such, I will argue that they can serve the people just as well.
“The settler makes history and is conscious of making it. And because he constantly refers to the history of his mother country, he clearly indicates that he himself is the extension of that mother-country. Thus the history which he writes is not the history of the country which he plunders but the history of his own nation in regard to all that she skims off, all that she violates and starves.”

― Frantz Fanon, (1961)

*The Wretched of the Earth*

Cohn (1996) addresses how colonialism established forms of Western knowledge systems and the creation of necessary institutions to maintain colonial rule over the colonized. In this particular case, India is the case history discussed during the time of its early British colonization period which began in the mid-19th Century and lasted up until India’s independence from Great Britain in 1947. By applying a post-colonial, anthropological lens to history, the author’s academic endeavor serves as an excellent example of how colonization is maintained. The author presents several excellent specific examples as to how this is done. One of the most important and powerful ways in which this is accomplished is by means of impacting the colonized culture and language, which then lends itself to establishing institutions of control and allows for the changing of law, to the benefit of the colonizer.

Conversely, relative to research design, the theoretical framework underlying a DRM approach presumes that there are vital cultural aspects of the participant group that must be used as a fundamental basis within the research paradigm. These cultural and unique worldviews are, generally, worldviews that are not shared with that of mainstream populations, as in the case of Cohn’s (1996) India. As Swartz (2009) and others have explained, literature in this area allows educators and researchers to recognize “that it is not possible to effectively teach children we do not know (Urbanski, 2004; Prokhorova, 2007; Dean, 2008; Swartz, 2009, pg. 1067). As such, a DRM discourse, will specifically speak to the authentic and unique
attributes that each group is grounded in. As discussed, “if we have not studied the histories
and cultures of the students we teach and have little or no experience with the cultures and
groups they represent…,” then, this is unethical and problematical (Howard, 1999; Swartz,
2009. pg. 1067).

As a result, DRM is ontologically sound, because it allows for the “reality” of the
group to be discussed within the research effort, which consists of a shared but unique
colonized history among the study participants. Aside of this, DRM allows for unique views of
time and space that do not concur with that of the mainstream population. It is just as
important to acknowledge that DRM allows for a unique view of history that imparts from that
of the mainstream. How could it be otherwise when we consider the imprints left by the
colonial legacy? Therefore, DRM adheres to and values unique epistemologies which are
different from that of the mainstream population, and in fact, views these epistemologies as
valuable resources to humanity and necessary apparatuses for immediate and future knowledge
uses.

The increasingly popular idea espoused by many contemporary Indigenous researchers
today advocates that Indigenous research be undertaken only by Indigenous people (Taxiway
Smith, 2008; Wilson, 2008). The promotion of such an approach to research studies is
extremely problematic on many levels. For starters, paradoxically, it mimics the approach to
research that was once advocated by mainstream White academic elitist in the field of
academia wherein academics deemed that only empiricists could be rational and objective,
meaning that only White folks “did” research (Walker, 2003; Gobo, 2011).

Additionally, this view smacks of a type of privilege that is historically rooted in
empiricist dogma, from both a gender and racial perspective. Recall that empiricist beginnings
are situated in White patriarchy with males from families of means benefitting from their already privileged beginnings and perpetuating the social structures that were supported by the very same socialization practices of the time that “they” created and sustained. These are the same structures that kept all the “Others” out of these sacred realms because they determined who could do what and why; so it goes with the viewpoint that only Indigenous peoples can do Indigenous research work.

Thirdly, current world demographics continue to change and reflect our human diversity with people of mixed ancestry taking hold of the realms of demography, as there are more people of mixed ancestry, then of mono-genetic peoples worldwide! Even on reservations, communities all over the globe are “mixing”, and I would suggest that we have always been “mixing” it up… There is no doubt that this will continue and perhaps ignorant, antiquated ideas about race, and just who is what. The Indigenous community does an injustice to those of us who are not fully Indigenous, although it is not difficult to understand why this has transpired in Indigenous communities, especially in the US.

Finally, it should be acknowledged that there are powerful and extremely knowledgeable non, or not fully Indigenous advocates who are an energetic force participating in a group endeavor to change the ways of the empiricist as we continue to seek positive changes for Indigenous peoples, women and children, and men of color. These groups of people are comprised of the enlightened, progressives I have brought up in this paper alone. Their experience and knowledge should not be over-looked or displaced because they are not Indigenous, or because they are only “half” Indigenous, whatever that means.

Because I come from two distinct worlds, the Indigenous and the Other, and because I am, or have been at one time or another, an administrator, a teacher, and a researcher, my
response to Tuhiwai Smith’s lament was primarily prompted with what I thought was a simple enough question, “is it fair to apply research practices to work with Indigenous and marginalized populations in order to understand education phenomenon today, especially so, because I have always appreciated the directness and brevity of quantitative methods?”

Regarding Cultural Capital

What is missing is “Away with racism! Away with colonialism! They smack too much of barbarism...”

(Césaire, 1972, Pg. 14).

The effects of cultural capital have been swept aside in research and in academia. As Cohn (1996) makes clear, colonialism is made possible not so much by guns and continuous battles, but by what transpires after the mayhem and conflicts. Too often, these subversive happenings go unnoticed as colonized peoples acclimate themselves to a new world order, which is one in which they, the colonized, generally, become second-hand citizens of what was once their own country.

N.B. Dirk’s “Forward,” in Cohn (1996), recognized that “the cultural effects of colonialism have too often been ignored or displaced into the inevitable logic of modernization and world capitalism; but more than this, it has not been sufficiently recognized that colonialism was itself a cultural project of control” (Pg. 1). Furthermore, Cohn (1996) argues, and I think makes a valid point, that the colonizer’s greatest accomplishments lay in the fact that the colonizer changes the population, socio-culturally, linguistically, and economically, in the way that it does, and then, it changes the Native population by inter-mixing. Within such a context, the colonizer’s tools incorporate brutality, unethical and unjust institutionalization leading to racial/sexist/economic inequality and forced-upon divisions amongst the Natives. In so doing, these barbaric tactics strengthen the colonizers pursuit of subalternity, forced
compliance, and permanent acquiesce, leading to a Master/Slave perpetuity within the Native population. It is at this point that the colonized have stepped into the diachronic.

In the case of India’s early colonial period, colonizers recognized the importance of learning and getting to know the Indian language; Indian customs; and Indian culture, as this served as a means to eventual control of the country and its people. This makes sense if one considers how language and cultural underpinnings are critical to human relationships. In the case of Indigenous communities, this is one area that still remains untouched for many tribes; however, this too is changing as Indigenous communities attempt to preserve their languages via Westernized approaches, such as creating dictionaries and writing it down in one form or another, many times using English as a means to establish its meaning, for the sake of their future prosperity.

Interestingly, Michael Coe (1993) shared how Diego de Landa, under Cortes and on his own, preserved the Mayan sounds in writing as he thought it was something significant to do during the early colonizing periods of Mexico. He used Spanish as a means to note the languages phonetic sounds. Although Mexico’s early colonization under the Spanish almost obliterated the culture, people, and almost the language, the truly ironical part about this is the fact that the Mayan language in contemporary times could not be fully solved, or verified, until de Landa’s work was incorporated.

This historical incident serves as a reminder of how colonization sometimes shows itself to be a double-edged sword. Allow me to be clear, in positing this discussion I am referring precisely to colonization and not total genocide of a people, their culture, and language, as in the case of Nazism during the mid-20th Century. In spite of the momentous and horrendous happenings that take place when colonizers attempt to take over a region that does
not belong to them, and its people, in one way or another, a paradoxical and puzzling transformation of society takes place. This is not to say that the price is high for the transformation.

Today’s Indigenous communities are encountering numerous issues as a consequence of colonization, including the loss of the Indigenous language. As Césaire (1972) explained, colonial periods “are periods of natural disruption and the breaking of natural economies “I am talking about natural economies that have been disrupted - harmonious and viable economies adapted to the indigenous population - about food crops destroyed, malnutrition permanently introduced, agricultural development oriented solely toward the benefit of the metropolitan countries, about the looting of products, the looting of raw materials” (Pg. 7). It is worth noting that consequences of colonization continue today. This fact should never be far from our consciousness.

In spite of time’s passing, undoubtedly, colonization remains still. It’s multitude of maladies continue in many ways, but always as a consequence of the power of the institutions, media, and nationalism as a whole. The fact of the matter is that even in Indigenous communities, tribal youth and “Other” youth, have stepped away from learning the language of their ancestors, and their customs. This is something that is especially significant to note on reservations and in what is known as in the world of “urban Native Americans”, which are Native Americans living in large-sized cities. Ironically, this has laid down further the need for creating Indigenous dictionaries. The loss of a native language is only second to the loss of native peoples and their land.

Language is the essence of a culture and its people. The really troubling aspect of all this is the fact that, in this case, there is no one holding reins over colonized peoples. In its
stead, Indigenous youth have succumbed to negative Western ideals, consumerism, and really bad habits. Another interesting paradox about language and culture rests on this fact, as the colonized lose them, the Western colonizer, many times, preserves them.

Stuart & Stuart’s (1977) early effort for the *National Geographic Society*, serves as an excellent example of this paradox. Their beautifully photographed book titled *The Mysterious Maya* is a legacy of sorts on just a pictorial level wherein they have managed to preserve early Maya glyphs, artwork, and artifacts via photography. They address this paradox in the following in relation to de Landa’s labor during the early colonization period of Mexico:

> As third Bishop of Yucatan, Landa knew the country well. As the first to write in detail of its people from the outsider’s viewpoint, he stands as the ultimate stranger to the place; he embodies the confrontation of two worlds totally alien to each other. Yet, even as Landa wrote, the Maya had already known six centuries of strangers and invaders…. (pg. 89)

No doubt that conquest is even older and more complex than is readily acknowledged, not only by the colonizer, but the colonized as well. Knowledge of the colonized’s language, customs, and culture allows for the colonizer to change it, and to change the laws of the community—if it is not already preserved in one way or another by the Indigenous. This is a crucial and vital aspect of colonization, a Cohn (1996), Coe (1993), and Stuart & Stuart (1977), have shown in their work of rediscovering lost languages, cultures, and customs. As is widely acknowledged by Indigenous researchers, academics, and revolutionists; preservation, many times, leads to misrepresentation (Lonetree, 2012).

Access to Indigenous language allows for the traditional names of objects to be changed, as Cohn (1996) shows in his analysis of the transformation of objects into artifacts via Western concepts of (pg. 76). This particular fact was special interest as it is a paradox of sorts when it is recognized that, in general, stewardship of antiquities, such as in cataloging,
preserving, and displaying in museums in a purely Westernized concept in practice, one in which much value is placed. This practice is applicable also to language, and dead languages.

In the instances that museums have been pilfered of valuable Indigenous artifacts, many of which were originally stolen by the colonizer (another paradox), we have seen in contemporary times that it has been the colonized or radical groups from the population or from the nearby population that have been involved in such activities. Most recently, radical religious groups have deliberately destroyed and trashed such artifacts and archeological sites. Nevertheless, the academic and researcher must delve into these types of phenomenon as they are of urgent attention within the contexts just described.

Lonetree (2012) attempts to deal with this aspect of colonization and calls for the decolonization of museums, although Tuhiwai Smith (1999; 2012) argues that decolonization can never fully take place as one can never return to what has been inevitably changed of its essence. There is some truth in this; however, the fact of the matter is that Western ideals have permanently changed not just the Indigenous world, but the world as a whole. Returning to Lonetree’s (2012) scholarship, the author proposes a collaborative approach to decolonizing museums and proposes the creation of a “hybrid tribal museum,” which is based on an actual collaborative project between the Minnesota Historical Society with the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe nation (pg. 29).

This approach to decolonizing museums is similar to those proposed in many of the IRM scholarly books and articles presented throughout this proposal. In fact, it seems that this is an ideal approach to meshing the Western with the Indigenous, as I will argue continuously, the diachronic history of Indigenous peoples leaves no other option but to do so, in my opinion. The emphasis should be, though, in creating an instrument or means to do so in
order to “catch-up”, so to speak, on the vast historical inequities that have been inherited by the colonized.

Lonetree (2012), unlike Tuhiwai Smith (1999; 2012) explains that decolonization is a means to “tell the truth” about what happened, how it happened, and to stop it by doing this in order to address unresolved grief which many of us have inherited as a consequence of innumerable tragic historical events, many of which have not gone away despite time’s passing (Lonetree, Pg. 123). Overall, Lifetree’s (2012) approaches allow, and call for, transformation, as well.

Perhaps one of the most significant aspects for transformation is acknowledgement and respect for epistemologies we all hold, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous. This has been a vigorous and vibrant issue in IRM, as most IRM approaches acknowledge the need to present Indigenous epistemologies to the research. From a westernized perspective, this is deemed as something problematic because it is argued that “Other” epistemologies are not “scientific” enough, meaning, “they are not ours”.

On what grounds this assumption is made is still not clear to many of us; yet, one can easily surmise that this is a continued attempt to preserve the colonizers control over the literature, thus, the individual, which is a phenomenon manifested by means of institutions and the productions of such institutions. We see this in traditional research practices and in the academy. To not challenge them is a form of accepting them. To accept them is to participate in colonization, although we may not perceive it as such. Within this context, silence is compliance and adherence to the practices of the colonizer.

Western Epistemologies

“His doctrine? It has the virtue of simplicity. That the West invented science. That the West alone knows how to think; that at the borders of the Western world there begins the shadowy
realm of primitive thinking, which, dominated by the notion of participation, incapable of logic, is the very model of faulty thinking.”

--Césaire, (1972, Pg. 19)

Bender & Schorske (1997) place the role of academia into this consideration. Although these authors argue that much has changed in academia in the past fifty years, the idea of transformation as understood by IRM advocates and Indigenous researchers is not enough, and it is only in its early stages. Much of what these editors present in their work is related to transformation that has impacted mostly non-Indigenous peoples in matters that are specifically related to them as this is centered on four specific areas of study, economics, English, philosophy and political science. Although it is recognized that the academy requires transformation, which is a salient and palpable one as there is much truth in this, especially form an Indigenous perspective; the matter rests on the fact that, again, the undertaking of this book rests on White man’s knowledge, which seems pretty much to be a case in point.

Hardin (1995) serves as a better example regarding the intricate nature of Western epistemology and how the world has played into the use of such an epistemology, which, clearly, is one that no longer is efficient due to globalization. In fact, western epistemological understandings of the world are now considered quite problematic and have laid the groundwork for resistance and revolution.

Hardin (1995) urges thought and discussion in the area of knowledge and the use of coordinated knowledge systems as a means to power by asking “whose choices and whose theories”; as well as in describing the structures of social interaction within this context. The author argues that the practice is consequence of exchanges, coordination and power embedded in self-interest and group conflict. The author elaborates on the idea of a cultural broker,
“which is essentially what an anthropologist, who describes or explains one society to another, is” (pg. 10).

From an Indigenous perspective, Native history and epistemologies have been ignored, bullied about, and shoo-shooed away from the knowledge systems of the West. Stanley (2007) harkens to “journal editors and reviewers to examine their roles as disciplinary gatekeepers and to break the cycle of master narratives in educational research and the editorial-review process” (pg. 14); as such, the power to control the history of humanity, at a meso, macro, and global level, must be challenged.

Hardin (1995) explains that rational choice may be for theorists, but it is not for people” (pg. 11). In the following, the author elucidates that “this is a strange criticism because it is, in fact, not specific to rational choice theory” Further elaboration is required in relation to this argument and is presented in the following:

…for example, contemporary anthropologists speak a language virtually no one else speaks—certainly not the peoples they study do not speak it. Many sociologists cannot even understand their own vocabulary—the people who are their subjects have no chance. Psychology is almost entirely about understood influences on the self and unperceived motivations. Economists also speak a rarefied language. The subjects of their inquiry often can understand and do even use much of the economist’s vocabulary, especially in advanced industrial states in which economists have played large roles in setting the public agenda but it would be egregious to claim that ordinary people regularly, consciously use economic reasoning for matters outside the money market realm. And, maybe they do not even use it much in that realm (Hardin, 1995, Pg. 11).

Again, similar to Bender & Schorske (1997), the areas discussed in the above are fields that are important to academia, and to the mainstream population. Hardin (1995) explains that there are a “multiplicity of motivations” relative to group identity and identification (pg.4). The use of group power over another group is a part of the structures of
social interaction. In many ways, group identification is a consequence of self-interest, according to Hardin (1995). He explains that “one of the most important ways information affects groups is in giving group members an understanding of *their* common interest”, which he claims is appropriately attributed to half of Marx’s early theory of revolution. Self-interest and rational thought are argued as concepts that are always present “overwhelmingly”, and at the same time, futuristic (Hardin, 1995, pg. 21). Subsequently, this lays down the space for group conflict.

Another aspect of group conflict is gender. This is an important area of study, discussion, and research. However, for the arguments promoted by means of this proposal, gender has not been addressed in the ways it needs to be, because any study, discussion, and research that involves gender analysis will require a specific lens that centers itself only on gender. Having acknowledged the importance of bringing gender studies into an analysis or research design, this particular DRM paradigm *does not* make gender the center of the analysis, study, or research.

To be clear, this version of DRM is intended as a decolonization paradigm, specifically for collaborations with Indigenous and marginalized populations. Although there is a DRM paradigm for research specific to gender studies coined DRM-Gender Specific, it has been a deliberate choice to not address gender power issues in this particular proposal as it would “take away” from the effort of decolonizing within Indigenous and marginalized populations. Instead, I repeat, issues specific to gender are not supposed to be a part of the collaborative work, unless, specifically, requested on behalf of the collaborating community.
Group Conflict in Research: Differentiation & the Defining of Community

“Gobineau said: ‘The only history is white.’ Caillois, in turn, observes: "The only ethnography is white." It is the West that studies the ethnography of the others, not the others who study the ethnography of the West.”

-- Césaire, (1972, P. 20)

Group conflict is ever present, and I argue that traditional research methods, academia, and the American education system have played into this, as traditional research publications, especially those from early 19th Century work, and American education systems and curriculum, often times, made way for racial divisions amongst humans. There is an “historical trail” related to this that can be followed in textbooks, journal articles, education systems, media, movies, and in research, amongst many other similar venues. In many ways, the practice allowed and encouraged an “Us” over “them” situation.

Hardin (1995) explains that the socio-cultural concepts hidden behind group conflict permit for a better approach for understanding “communal norms,” which is referred to as “norms of difference and universalistic norms”, which allow us the means to analyze how bias and stereotypes come into being within a communal collective (pgs. 72-106).

A “norm”, within a social context, refers to an unspoken but understood behavior, or way of doing something, and even extends itself to even individual and group systems of understanding. For example, a “really” religious person is perceived to be someone who goes to church every Sunday. How is it that this idea has come to transpire? Who set the

---

35 Joseph Arthur, the Comte de Gobineau (14 July 1816 – 13 October 1882) was a French aristocrat, author, and “academic” credited as the originator of the theory of the “Aryan Master Race”, a radical racist concept that grew extremely popular in the early 20th Century, fueling racism and Nazism. He authored An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races during the periods of 1853–1855, leading the way to the practice of publishing articles on eugenics, clearly, a form of scientific racism, in academic literature. This is a practice that continues to this day. Gobineau is also credited as being the father of “racial demography”, another racially-motivated, socio-economic Westernized cultural practice used to this day in the US and other Euro-centric countries in which humans are classified under the socio-cultural concepts of “race” and data is respective to races, many times unfairly. I argue that these concepts have led to intentional divisions amongst varying groups of people and are practices that must be challenged, especially in the field of education, academia, and research.
unspoken rule on this, and who determined what it means to be “really” religious? This is an especially fascinating area of study for social scientists, psychologists, anthropologists and the like. However, it is important to note that “norms” are extremely powerful, unspoken understandings that transpire within and outside of groups. Most significantly, they are invisible structures that exist in and out of groups.

Hardin (1995) contends that “norms of great social interest are those that enforce something that might go otherwise” (pg. 72). I concur, and I am expressly absorbed in how this transpires into Indigenous/Western world-views relative to modern society, comparative research, and focused on how the researcher understands group/individual phenomenon and their translation of that phenomenon.

Returning to research methods, a workable research paradigm must acknowledge the power structures and assess how such structures influence research and the research outcome, this includes discussion on the use of “norms”, conflict, and other invisible social structures that weigh heavily on human action and interaction. Flyvbjerg (2001) contends that in modern science, conflict and power are phenomena constitutive of social and political inquiry (Pg. 3). Moreover, Flyvbjerg (2001) argues that “the social science never has been, and probably will never be, able to develop the type of explanatory and predictive theory that is the ideal and hallmark of natural science (pg. 4).

In my proposed call for a sensible and specific research model in association with marginalized peoples, I will argue for the integration of a “Phronetic Planning Research Paradigm” (PPRP) (Flyvbjerg, 2004a) approach when conducting research with marginalized groups in the field of educational studies. The conception of a PPRP approach is one that was
first inspired by Aristotelian “phronesis” and addressed most recently by Bent Flyvbjerg (1998).  

Flyvbjerg (1998) has incorporated phronesis into what he has coined “Phronetic Planning Research Paradigm” (PPRP). When implementing a PPRP approach into conducting quantitative data collection, I have adapted Flyvbjerg’s scholarship addressing the research paradigm. As such, the approach to the research project should set out to answer four questions in direct relation to power and the values for specific instances of planning, according to Flyvbjerg (2004a).

Flyvbjerg (2004a) argues that in relation to modern science “it can be simply concluded that despite their importance, the concrete, the practical, and the ethical have been neglected by modern science (Pg. 289). Flyvbjerg’s (2004a) ideas on “optimism bias”, which is the tendency to take an overly positive view of planned actions, and his arguments related to the use of “strategic misrepresentation”, which is the intentional and deliberate misrepresenting or falsely stating the expected outcomes of actions when they are not clear yet, has been incorporated into project evaluation techniques around the world. They are terms that are just as necessary in research today as they are reflective of real-life issues that have transpired in both the undertaking of planned projects and in research.

Resurrecting Research: The Best of Two Worlds, Traditional Quantitative Research Methodologies & Indigenous Research Methods

“Everything can be explained to the people, on the single condition that you really want them to understand.”

— Frantz Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth

---

36 Flyvbjerg (2004a) explains that “phronesis” is a Greek concept that means “practical wisdom, practical judgment, common sense, or prudence” (Pg. 284).
When employing a traditional, quantitative research methodology, the research results, generally, address the researcher’s view of the world in direct relation to the research study. I disagree with this approach. By utilizing a quantitative research paradigm, through a historic lens, what is of consequence to the researcher is the outcome of the study in regard to data results. No account is given in the work that addresses the human experience(s) or the lived experience(s) of the participant group, when it should be, especially as directly related to the colonial history of the participant group. This datum allows for traditional research efforts to fail in establishing a communal worldview between the participant group and others from outside the group (Tuhiwai-Smith, 2008; Wilson, 2008). As a result, this plays further into aspects of colonial practices because the research project results have added to the already preconceived stereotypes that have accumulated historically due to the use of traditionalist research methodologies that have ignored this powerful, group-affecting, dynamic.

Data analysis and results may indicate that there might be some type of educational difference between the study participant/s and other students. At this point, a holistic approach to research methods should not only recognize the phenomenon resultant of analysis but address it in the body of the research. The analysis should allow for a fuller and more holistic view of the daily lived experience of the participant group in direct relation to the phenomenon, this is usually a dynamic that outsiders do not know about or understand; therefore, it must be discussed in the body of the research publication.

Analogous to the one-sided view of history found in traditionalist textbooks popular in states like Texas, Arizona, and other conservative nationalistic states that promote xenophobia and problematic traditionalism; nationalistic-promoting research methods, too many times, fails in viewing the world outside of its empiricist lens. To an extent, I agree with
Indigenous researchers who argue that traditional quantitative research methods contribute to an inauthentic, limiting, and bias misrepresentation of marginalized groups. It does this because the research agenda is produced through an ethnocentric point-of-view that has the tendency of, intentionally or unintentionally, disparaging Indigenous populations and/or ethnic populations that are viewed silently in the West as the “Other” (Zinn, 1990, 2005; Loewen, 1995, 2005; Maybury-Lewis, 2002; Spring, 2008; Tuhiwai Smith, 2008). In this regard, traditional research methods require revisiting and revamping. Flyvbjerg’s (1998a, 1998b, 2001, 2003, 2004a, 2004b, 2005, 2006) work proposes a new approach to empiricism, which I have adapted into my research framework.

Repeatedly, Flyvbjerg (1998a, 1998b, 2001, 2003, 2004a, 2004b, 2005, 2006) argues that political scientists should “substitute phronesis for episteme and thereby avoid the trap of emulating natural science” (2006, pg. 1). By doing so, Flyvbjerg (2006) argues that “political scientists may arrive at social science that is strong where natural science is weak: in the reflexive analysis and discussion of values and interests aimed at praxis, which is the prerequisite for an enlightened political, economic, and cultural development in any society” (Flyvbjerg, 2006, Pg. 1). This is some that has been lacking too often and for decades in research, in academia, and in public education.

Lagemann (2000) discusses the extent of this and explains that educational scholarship, traditionally, has been a field on the edge and outside of the layperson’s reality and lived experience. It is a field structured, committed, and dictated by academia and politics; therefore, it requires revisiting and revamping, much as Freire (1970; 1973; 1989; 1993) would demand, as do many of the Indigenous and ethical researchers and academics already discussed (Cohn, 1996; Sandoval, 2000; Mutua & Swadener, 2004; Spring, 2007; Tuhiwai Smith 2008, 219
Lagemann (2000) recognizes the need to provide a critical history related to our history as a country, which should be one different from the one currently found in public and university textbooks, and, in our institutions. Likewise, Loewen (1995; 2010) has argued repeatedly for the need to present the real history of humanity’s continuous struggles and, especially, to discuss American history as it really happened in order to promote the truth and, I contend, a meaningful human understanding of a multi-cultural, diverse global life experience.

More important, as Lagemann (2000) discusses, when we fail to teach the truth we fail in developing humans to their fullest potential, via what should be a lucrative education experience. This practice keeps Americans, and Others, from achieving a strong, united, and enlightened understanding of each other, hence, the world. What a different place this would be if we promoted such a curriculum in and outside of the classroom.

As Lagemann (2000) contends, education attainment should be about excellence and equity, which is something that is seen in some of the best public education systems in the world, and they are not located in Texas, or in the US, for that matter. Instead, American school systems are places of low achievement and status, and, isolation; again, social constructs derived from Western epistemologies. Lagemann (2000) calls on American universities for direction in this area. With that being Semali, both IRM and traditionalists must contend with what is really needed in schools and must come to terms with how that epistemology must be flexible geographically-speaking.
I have borrowed from Flyvbjerg’s repertoire, IRM theory, and traditionalist ideals on research methods and molded them into considerations regarding efforts to collaborate judiciously with Indigenous and marginalized groups precisely related to research methods. By incorporating feminist theory and Critical Race Theory into this, I advocate for this approach to research methods discovery with research projects with Indigenous and marginalized populations because I see specific problems with traditional quantitative methods as they currently stand.

Although qualitative methods address some of my concerns, the process is limiting because qualitative methods cannot cover the amount of data that quantitative methods can cover, in the time that it can cover. To an extent, this too applies to mixed methods. To this end, in the following, specific concerns in relation to the production of ethical and efficient research methods when collaborating with Indigenous and marginalized groups are articulated. Specific consideration is given to research endeavors regarding large-sized population groups within an education setting.
2.4 Paradigm 3: The Impact of Colonization: Cultural Trauma & Issues of Power

“Colonialism hardly ever exploits the whole of a country. It contents itself with bringing to light the natural resources, which it extracts, and exports to meet the needs of the mother country's industries, thereby allowing certain sectors of the colony to become relatively rich. But the rest of the colony follows its path of under-development and poverty, or at all events sinks into it more deeply.”

— Frantz Fanon, (1961)
*The Wretched of the Earth*

As previously suggested, using colonialism as a lens to examine the impact of colonial history on Indigenous populations allows researchers, scholars, and social justice advocates a means to better understand the implications of that history on current events and group phenomenon (Zinn, 1990, 2005; Loewen, 1995, 2005; Spring, 2008; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999; 2012; White, 2010). In the case of dealing with education phenomenon, DRM is especially useful because it allows for a profounder understanding of the type of events that have impacted Indigenous populations, specifically, the generational dynamics associated with culture and group psychology as a consequence of the colonial experience as discussed by Césaire (1972) in the following:

I hear the storm. They talk to me about progress, about "achievements," diseases cured, improved standards of living. I am talking about societies drained of their essence, cultures trampled underfoot, institutions undermined, lands confiscated, religions smashed, magnificent artistic creations destroyed, extraordinary possibilities wiped out. They throw facts at my head, statistics, mileages of roads, canals, and railroad tracks. I am talking about thousands of men sacrificed to the Congo-Ocean. I am talking about those who, as I write this, are digging the harbor of Abidjan by hand. I am talking about millions of men torn from their gods, their land, their habits, their life-from life, from the dance, from wisdom. I am talking about millions of men in whom fear has been cunningly instilled, who have been taught to have an inferiority complex, to tremble, kneel, despair, and behave like flunkeys (Césaire, 1972, Pg. 6).
Adamopoulos & Lonner (2001) address assumptions about culture from a psychological theoretical perspective and explain that, “…whether culture is viewed as antecedent or consequent to human behavior and as enabling or restricting behavior,” such a “viewpoint is useful not only because it allows one to understand the different aspects of culture captured by either the cross-cultural or the psychological movement, but also because it allows students of culture to stand back and see culture in its enormity, understanding that culture serves all these functions and more” (Matsumoto, 2001, Pg. 12; Hodge & Lester, 2006). Within an Indigenous worldview, much of culture is grounded in the history of the community, as told by the recounting of those histories. These are, many times, preserved in the sacred stories of the community, which is something that is shared by the community members.

As Gross (2003) explains, “Because there is so much at stake, as long as the sacred stories of a people remain viable, their religion and culture can remain functional” (pg. 128). For these reasons, the preservation of those stories, as well as the Decolonial aspect of this, prompts the need for a different methodology. Césaire, (1972) reminds us that “… in the scales of knowledge all the museums in the world will never weigh so much as one spark of human sympathy” (pg. 21). Still, there is something to be said in recent efforts in Indigenous museum design, it is, definitely, a potential means to continue the path of decolonization.

**Western Preservation: Practices of Safeguarding at All Costs**

“..that Europe would have done better to tolerate the non-European civilizations at its side, leaving them alive, dynamic' and prosperous, whole and not mutilated; that it would have been better to let them develop and fulfill themselves than to present for our admiration, duly labeled, their dead and scattered parts; that anyway, the museum by itself is nothing; that it means nothing, that it can say nothing, when smug self-satisfaction rots the eyes, when a secret contempt for others withers the heart, when racism, admitted or not, dries up sympathy; that it means nothing if its only purpose is to feed the delights of vanity; that after all, the honest contemporary of Saint Louis, who fought Islam but
respected it, had a better chance of knowing it than do our contemporaries (even if they have a smattering of ethnographic literature), who despise It... --Césaire, (1972, Pg. 21)

Many times these histories, or sacred stories, are not in print as they are revered to the point that they can only be spoken; however, as elders from the community are beginning to leave this world many Indigenous communities are attempting to “write” the histories, sacred stories, and to preserve the native language by means of creating dictionaries, literary tomes, etc.; thus, language and cultural traditions are being preserved by incorporating and expanding on Westernized concepts of preservation such as museums, and by the use of technology, while maintaining Indigenous ways of preservation (generational).

Many Indigenous communities recognize the need for this, not only because of the aftereffects of colonization, but because of the advances in technology, so it is not uncommon to find or read about Indigenous communities contributing to “dictionaries,” or, preserving their cultural histories and sacred stories in print, or writing. This new approach to preserving the Indigenous by means of Western practices might seem ironical to critiques of this because this is a point wherein two worldviews crisscross. This too is a consequence of colonization.

As efforts are undertaken to preserve sacred stories and histories, as well as language, it is not uncommon to find that numerous Indigenous stories necessitate the use of metaphors to explain issues of race, history, and other relevant cultural aspects belonging to each respective community. In this way, it is vital to understand the use of metaphors in the translation of those metaphors, as well as their use in traditional language usage.

Buendia (2003) explores the use of metaphors as used when writing about race. He explains that there are “core units of conceptual systems that underlie writing stories about
race,” specifically, “how metaphors of the self and the social have historically shaped the seeing and the narrative structure of racial stories” (pg. 50). As researchers collaborate with Indigenous communities, it is important to recognize and understand their use, and to allow for these non-Westernized concepts to become a part of our individual epistemology as it will be vital to the progression of the research project, and to our ability to connect with the community, the community representatives, and with the study participants.

The latter example serves as one way in which aspects of Western epistemologies, in this case the use of museums and dictionaries, have crossed over to Indigenous practices. Similarly, I am reminded of the Hopi story of the breakup of Oraibi (Courlander, 1998) in which the “White Men” said to the Hopi, “Things must change here in the villages. You must follow the new ways” (pg. 194). The Hopis countered why do you tell us to live a certain way when we do not do that to you? Upon much consultation, the community reached the consensus that “If the white man has something good for us, let us accept it. If it is something not good, let us refuse it” (pg. 195). These stories are shared in order to supply examples of ways in which Indigenous peoples continue to change. Moreover, the stories represent a willing acceptance, specific to the needs of the community, of other worldviews within the Indigenous world.

Conversely, the White man, as he is referred to in the Hopi accounting, refuses the knowledge of the ancient ones, who by the way, have lived in the colonized regions, mostly in harmony with the Earth and other tribes, for millennia. Academia, and the education systems it supplies with teachers, research, and Western-rooted epistemologies continue to negate the importance of the Indigenous and their worldviews. They do so at all costs in order to preserve an antiquated worldview that can no longer serve them, and they do so at all costs.
It is within this system that Indigenous peoples are placed into paradigms and research projects that have, historically, been one-sided. This must be challenged and changed. Collaborative research projects conducted with Indigenous communities allows for this to be addressed, and I believe, rectified within research paradigms produced specifically for projects with such communities.

*Research that Addresses the Colonial and Post-Colonial Experience*

"...the relationship between consciousness and reality are extremely complex. . . . It is equally necessary to decolonize our minds, our inner life, at the same time that we decolonize society."

-- Aimé Césaire (1977, Pg. 31)

The essence of DRM is intended to present to the academy, and the readers, some of the issues in education today associated with colonization/post-colonization by means of the research endeavor. Just as important, a DRM approach to research produced collaboratively with the participating community allows for other socio-economic and cultural issues that have resulted as a byproduct of the colonial experience to be presented in the research body. Especially, those educational challenges that continue to affect education attainment for Indigenous populations and the marginalized, namely, the socio-cultural disconnect that transpires between mainstream populations and Indigenous ones.

It is reasonable to conclude that by addressing these type of dynamics in the research publication, educational challenges related to issues of power that affect the community and are not presently discussed or allowed into the quantitative research process, enter into the academic arena so that those issues can be wrestled with in healthy and appropriate ways, and not impact, or stain, that community in unfavorable ways, which is what traditional research methods has done for Indigenous and marginalized communities.
Moreover, by presenting a history that is not presently out there in text or in Western knowledge systems, the application of DRM to research endeavors necessitates that those histories be introduced to the research paradigm by incorporating these histories into the research project and in the actual research documents that will be produced, either through the use of metaphors or in actual historical retellings (verbatim). This is facilitated by tribal/community elders and the community participants.

Likewise, these histories and/or sacred stories are presented in the research from the perspective of the communities, who will have the best knowledge about that history—the colonized and the marginalized. In this way research and the academy step-away from the continuing of “Westernization” and step closer to the other side of history, which is something that is presently being concealed. Western history is read and taught as if no humans were involved in that history, and then it tells a slanted history in which the wrong doings of the colonizer are not acknowledged, hence discussed. We have forgotten about the human side of history.

We do not relay the story of an Indigenous world, or of a world before broken treaties. Nor, does Western history tell of the abuses that were committed against the original people of the lands or against Mother Earth. This practice has desensitized Westerners who, many times, view themselves as sophisticated members of a world so advanced that the human struggle is side-stepped or silenced, and Mother Earth is depreciated, abused, and profited from.

All students of history recognize that “historic retellings, whether in print or other forms of media, are only half of the truth, and even then, it is generally a half-slanted one at that—or at least they should know this. It is imperative that history be told to the maximum
point possible, and as accurately as possible, because people deserve the veracity surrounding events, primarily, so that people do not repeat them. The masses must know history so that they do not allow governing entities to repeat them. Such an approach to history can serve as a means to establish a higher consciousness that allows for global connectedness, as opposed to what we currently have. In so doing, humanity can change the mistakes that past civilizations have continuously made, precisely, by not repeating them. Among other reasons for a DRM approach to research efforts with Indigenous and marginalized communities, rests on the fact that it is a research paradigm meant for decolonization.

In today’s US public schooling systems, a form of transformative optimism is missing for students who come from Indigenous or marginalized backgrounds, meaning that marginalized students do not have a viable opportunity to develop, transform, or evolve in ways that are positive, healthy, and necessary for youth in school, especially true for students who come from marginalized communities. This fact serves as a noteworthy reason in recognizing and understanding why Indigenous and marginalized students do not thrive within these structures. In fact, as statistics show, such students have the highest drop-out rates, which is a fact that contributes to the high poverty rates, suicide rates, and consequent problems related to not obtaining, at the least, a high school diploma or GED (Rossatto, Vallès & et al, 2019).

Continued Challenges within Indigenous Communities: Cultural Trauma as a Consequence of Colonization

“It is no measure of health to be well adjusted to a profoundly sick society.”

— Jiddu Krishnamurti

Clearly, public education systems are a viable means of positively impacting Indigenous identity formation in students, as well as preparing them psychologically,
emotionally, and educationally for present and future life endeavors, but this is something that is not currently done (Friedman, 2000). An important factor as to why this isn’t currently done is because current education systems lack an Indigenous worldview. As such, schools have a responsibility to the student and to the community to begin a process of instilling and contributing positively to the Indigenous student’s psycho-social development, specifically, as related to the “identity versus character confusion” stage in which teenagers should develop a positive sense of self-identity during adolescence in order to reach a healthy level of self and independence (Erikson, 1968; 1993; 1997).

According to Erikson, a primary goal of adolescence is the achievement of a healthy, capable, and intelligent self-identity and the prevention of identity confusion (1968; 1993; 1997). Youth that obtain appropriate encouragement and reinforcement in these areas of self-development, it is suggested by Erikson, will develop from this stage with a robust sense-of-self and should be more independent and feel in control of their lives, as opposed to those youths who do not.

Erikson’s seminal work (1968; 1993; 1997) in the identity formation phases of youth, discusses how a child’s environment and lived experiences are crucial to individual and group self-awareness, posits that the promotion of a fit self-esteem allows for positive human growth, beginning in early adolescence. A healthy Indigenous self-identity leads to children who learn to adapt in normative ways and allows for optimism and positive characteristics in the individual that center on a healthy level of self-awareness and self-confidence in individual identity formation (Engler, 2008).

As youth transition into adulthood, according to Hoare (2001), adolescent teens may begin to experience feelings of confusion and/or insecurity on many levels, primarily in
relation to the “self” and relative to the society in which they are developing in. These feelings may persist into adulthood when the “self-identification/group identification” aspect of the individual is not fully developed.

Similarly, Marcia's (1991) thesis on identity status theory, explains that a child’s/adolescent identity achievement levels, involve the breaking away from childhood beliefs during adolescence; followed by a secondary stage in which adolescents commit, or come to terms, with their individual gender and racial identity. Marcia's (1991) diffusion status, suggests that adolescents may become socially isolated and withdrawn in instances wherein there is a lack of supportive parents, teachers, schools, and community leaders. Instead, adolescents should be encouraged to reflect and further develop “the self”, which is a necessary and vital stage of human development as it allows for self-identification and individualism. Consequently, a healthy approach to an Indigenous self-identity is an essential and dynamic aspect of creating healthy adults as higher self-esteem and self-confidence levels in the individual allow for higher developed critical thinking skills and ethically sound human beings.

In the case of Indigenous or marginalized ethnic groups, minority adolescents must reckon with their, and others, individual/group racial and/or cultural development, according to Phinney and Kohatsu (1997). It is at this time that youth will begin to consider issues such as racism, sexism, and their place in society. Phinney and Kohatsu (1997) suggest that in instances where this area is not developed or addressed adequately, adolescent teens may opt to avoid these types of issues through a stage referred to as “foreclosure or diffusion”.

From an education perspective, positive individual identity formation allows for achievement, self-direction, and self-confidence. Additionally, a constructive acceptance of one’s own ethnic identity is associated with better grades and, overall, healthier lifestyle
choices and relationships (Erikson, 1968; 1993; 1997; Marcia, 1991; Phinney and Kohatsu, 1997; Hoare, 2001). Phinney and Kohatsu’s (1997) scholarship indicates that another important consequence of a grounded, positive, self-identity is found in the development of the attainment of an accepting and healthy “bicultural identity”, which allows for healthy relationships and confidence levels, both, in mainstream and bicultural settings.

From an Indigenous and marginalized standpoint, research can serve as a form of historical preservation, as well as a viable means of enriching knowledge systems globally. Presenting Indigenous cultural norms, no doubt, will enrich a worldview understanding of the diversity of Indigenous populations, at the same time, if approached in the correct way, this can also prompt for preservation of Indigenous ways by means of the concerted efforts that are produced as a consequence of the research collaborative, specifically as related to our planet and human relations. Indigenous ways allow for a deeper understanding of a time before modernity, and of a time to come. It is a means of reconnection, human-to-human, human-to-Earth, and human-to-cosmos.

Once again, it serves to add that DRM requires commitment to the community, and to others involved in the work. Accordingly, any and all research undertaken requires that such exertion be done in a manner that allows for outsiders of the group to connect with the participant group through a worldview that promotes historical accuracy of the participant group—which is achieved only by relating it from their point-of-view. Responsibility to the participant group is necessary, as is the delivery of the product from the research-advocate, to the group. The research product should be presented in an accountable way that allows for future society to view the research outcome as an academic effort free of the researcher’s biases and their worldview, versus the world-view of the participant group.
Although scholarship in post-colonial fields attempts to discuss and relate that experience to others, the psycho-socio, cultural damage caused by early quantitative research endeavors conducted by non-culturally sensitive researchers continues to exacerbate the negative stereotypes indirectly imprinted on Indigenous populations. More important, it affects the minds of those who read the publications without authentically understanding the essential aspects of that group’s history.

Demeaning early research endeavors first presented in the 20th Century tended to refer to Indigenous groups as ‘savages” and it promoted a racist, eugenic-laden view of group populations that, again, promoted “Whiteness” via a Eurocentric view of racial and intellectual supremacy (Ventura Santos, 2002; Slater, Martin-McDonald & McCarthy, 2008). Instead of representing Indigenous people in ways that would elucidate readers of the research ethically and intelligently, early 20th Century empirical research methodologies, and the researchers who conducted the studies, left a highly questionable imprint on Indigenous communities which continues to negatively impact, to this day, group histories, but more important, the group psyche (Weston & et al, 2009). Too often, Indigenous people, as well as non-mainstream peoples, were viewed as non-human, or a sub-species that had just crawled out of a cave.

Accordingly, as a vital extension of this, by stepping away from European and American academic research practices, DRM allows for socio-cultural phenomenon to be considered and analyzed in non-traditional ways. Traditional research methods, too often, contributed to a legacy of oppression, stereotyping, and unjust and unequal treatment by way of the development of such efforts, furthering the trauma, disparagement, and disconnecting Indigenous communities and marginalized peoples from the rest of humanity, as Gross reflects on in the following (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999; 2012; Wilson, 2008; White, 2010; Gobo, 2011):
A culture cannot go through this type of trauma and not expect to suffer some type of impact; for example, it took Europe about 100 to 150 years to recover from the bubonic plague (Gross, 2003, pg. 130)

Gross’ (2003) words resonate in my consciousness, as ethical educators taught in feminist theory and CRT, this should be expected; however, this is not the case for all educators, in particular those who are a part of the mainstream and choose to stay within their respective boundaries, which they themselves, alone, create and control. With this in mind, it is important to recognize that in a traditionalist research paradigm, colonial and decolonization histories do not have to be included, in fact, they are avoided; thus, they are negated—denied a voice, a space, and their place in history. In truth, it is in the best interest of empiricism to avoid this area of study. Why? Because it diverts discussion, more important, it does not allow for thought to take place in that regard. In short, we cannot discuss what we don’t know because we do not acknowledge it in our positivist-rooted endeavors or in our Western histories.

In spite of the fact that empiricism claims objectivity and is presumed to be based on a logic-based foundation, it is argued that, a harmful and deliberate side-effect occurs within Indigenous and marginalized communities as a consequence due to this aspect of quantitative research methods. It promotes and contributes to a continued form of sustained cultural instability and continued disempowerment in relation to Indigenous groups and marginalized groups. More important, it maintains the stability of the power holders through the publication of the research outcome. In addition, these practices continue to contribute to a type of research that centers only the phenomenon itself, while avoiding discussion relative to the consequences of cultural and communal trauma, manifested due to colonization.

*Discourse on the Impact of Colonialism in Research*
“The native must realize that colonialism never gives anything away for nothing.”

— Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*

Post-colonial Indigenous researchers and academics view traditional quantitative research methodologies as having historically permitted, and even encouraged, a warped sense of imbalance in the areas of Indigenous research (Spring, 2008; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999; 2012; Wilson, 2008; Gobo, 2011). I harken back to Césaire (1972) who explained only too bluntly, “Between colonizer and colonized there is room only for forced labor, intimidation, pressure, the police, taxation, theft, rape, compulsory crops, contempt, mistrust, arrogance, self-complacency, swinishness, brainless elites, degraded masses” (Césaire, 1972, pg. 6). Bearing that in mind, when conducting research with Indigenous, or marginalized, groups, the argument is made that traditional research methods have minimized the participant groups in ways that are not fully acknowledged.

Furthermore, marginalized Indigenous populations themselves are affected by the use of traditional research methods because such approaches to research tend to lean towards a European, ethno-centrist view of measurement that indoctrinates the view that the apex of civilization and understanding lies in matters that represent elitist Western worldviews, that is, epistemologies centered on Eurocentric histories, experiences, and knowledge systems (Takaki, 1994; Matsumoto, 2001; Kovach, 2005; Spring, 2008; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999; 2012; Wilson, 2008; Grace, 2010; Gobo, 2011).

Such a view fails to consider the life experiences of the “Others”. This is extremely problematic from a very basic premise, as the “Others” outnumber the privileged for starters. In addition, the vast history associated with Westernization and practices thereof, for millennia have impacted civilizations by creating division as a direct consequence of racist
ideologies, and as such, contributed to the dehumanization of specific members of humanity.

Césaire (1972) reflects this in the following”

Significant of what? Of the state of mind of thousands upon thousands of Europeans or, to be very precise, of the state of mind of the Western petty Bourgeoisie. Significant of what? Of this: that at the very time when it most often mouths the word, the West has never been further from being able to live a true humanism—a humanism made to the measure of the world (Pg. 22)

Fanon’s (1952) early seminal work discusses the negative impact associated with the “White” world’s negation of the black psyche, which is something that transpires as a consequence of living in a white world while being “Black”. Fanon (1952; 2008) argues brilliantly that “Black” people, in spite of time’s passing, cannot fit into the socio-cultural norms recognized and established by White society for White society because of the race factor alone; which is a phenomenon, single-handedly, deeply-rooted in the “lived experience” of the Black person which has been intentionally ascribed to the “Blacks” by the “Whites” (pgs. 89-119).

As Fanon (2008) further explains, the “Black” person, on physical appearance by itself, is immediately excluded from doing so: “[t]he proof was there, implacable. My Blackness was there, dense and undeniable… (pg. 96). This type of subversive reality prompts a “neurotic” type of identity-building that will contribute deleteriously to relationships between manmade created divisions of “races,” while destroying the essence and natural ability of the individual defined as the oppressed “Other” (Fanon, 2008, Pgs. 120-184). Fanon refers to this as the psychopathology of the Black man.

Likewise, Indigenous academics and researchers discuss this aspect of colonization as well. Anzaldúa (1987) presents this facet of colonization in the following
excerpt from her poem titled “Don’t Give in Chicanita, Para Missy Anzaldua”, which is a poem about the inherent aspects of colonial domination and the need for endurance under the oppressor(s):

…and yes, they have taken our lands. Not even the cemetery is ours… But they will never take that pride of being [M] mexicana-Chicana—[T] tejana nor our Indian woman’s spirit…Perhaps we’ll be dying of hunger as usual but we’ll be members of a new species skin tone between black and bronze second eyelid under the first with the power to look at the sun through naked eyes….Yes, in a few years or centuries la Raza will rise up, tongue intact carrying the best of all cultures. That sleeping serpent, rebellion-®evolution, will spring up. Like old skin will fall the slave ways of obedience, acceptance, silence. Like serpent lightning we’ll move, little woman. You’ll see (Pgs. 202-203)

American xenophobes, who are historically confused, would quickly argue, “Well, why are you here in the first place? If you don’t like it here, go back to where you come from,” or something like that. I think that is one of many of the great tragedies that comes along with colonization; that is, that it is so powerfully and deliberately confusing and alienating that it allows and promotes confused histories that are pathologically neurotic for all, colonizer and, especially, the colonized—as it must be understood, that Indigenous and Borderlanders, for much of the American continent, were already here, and had not intent on leaving.

Understandably, this practice is dangerous and is a violently damaging worldview that has played upon the psychological subconscious of both the elite and the “Other.” At the same time, it allows for the practice to be emulated globally when it goes unaddressed, which is a matter that must be rectified. Parenthetically, such a view supports the social systems and structures that have, historically, benefited such groups while vigorously keeping the colonized “obedient, accepting, and silent,” much as Anzaldua (1987) describes in

In spite of developing a problematic type of citizenry; which is one that will be comprised of humans who have immense trouble accepting globalization and the type of diversity that comes along with it, externally and internally; the practice encourages a profoundly disturbing brand of nationalism, which is one that is, overall, psychologically and intellectually unhealthy because it is comprised of beings that fear others who are not like themselves. Moreover, from a historical perspective, colonization, in general, eventually leads up to troublesome periods of revolt, chaos, and instability for the colonized because of the misuse and one-sidedness of power which is one of the most perilous aspects of it, because the short-end of it is that colonization is all about tremendous power over others. Even then, the intricate damage that has been interwoven into the community does not go away, as Gross (2003) discusses in the following:

Like all American Indians, the Anishinaabe are living in a post-apocalyptic period. Here, "apocalypse" is defined not as the end of time, but as the end of the world. Also, it needs to be understood from the onset that the end of a world for a people does not necessarily imply the end of the worldview of those people. The argument being made here is that although the traditional world of the Anishinaabe may have come to an end, the worldview that informed that life still survives (pg. 131).

Similarly, in regard to collaborating with others that might be unlike ourselves, Flyvbjerg (1998) makes it clear that all must be viewed within the context of power. Even when planning and doing research. He explains that “there can be no adequate understanding of planning without placing the analysis context of power,” (Flyvbjerg, 1998b, pg. 292). In this regard, when involved in a research projects with Indigenous or marginalized communities addressing colonialism, the researcher should do so by incorporating that history into the
research design, while at the same time considering how this can allow for decolonization which is, understandably, necessary. In other words, it seems more productive and healthier to address colonization by making it an essential aspect of decolonization.

Regarding traditional quantitative research methods, from the point-of-view of the “Other,” the long-term consequences attributed to traditional research practices has indirectly contributed to the immense backlash non-Indigenous researchers and academics are currently experiencing in relation to being allowed to do research exchanges with and within Indigenous communities (Zinn, 1990, 2005; Loewen, 1995, 2005; Spring, 2008; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999; 2012; Wilson, 2008; Gobo, 2011).

Tuhiwai Smith (1999; 2012) and other progressive researchers explain that university curriculums are instrumental in shaping Western epistemological views of the world. Universities reproduce knowledge by assessing it and manipulating it (Grace, 2010; Gobo, 2011). Furthermore, as Lagemann argues, within the field of educational research, there exists an isolationist aspect to it that is problematic as earlier discussion in Chapter one discussed the specifics of this fact, creating the sense that academia is inauthentic, distant, and limited to race and creed.

Medina-Jerez’s (2007, 2008, 2012) research and scholarship advocates for the incorporation of an authentic approach to learning, which is one that prompts the incorporation of “group culture” and allows for a respected understanding to that, which is then further fused into a new curriculum, which is an approach to education that I fully concur with. This type of approach to learning is essential in promoting a democratic and equitable education for all and should be used as an example of how the meshing of two distinct views can work together.
Without a doubt, “the curriculum of a university shapes the way knowledge is reproduced as a curriculum for schools and for society” (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, Pg. 129); (Bordieu, 1977; 1986; Delpit, 1988; Zinn, 1990; Bhabha, 1994; Bender & Schorske, 1997; Rothblatt, 1997; Ruderman, 1997; Becher & Trowler, 2001; Cheng, 2010; Dowding, 2011). An Indigenous view of university and other educational institutions, as well as the view placed on traditional research practices, observes that these Western systems serve as a continued form of “elitisms” and it is a means of long-held power. Historically they too have been oppressive, exclusive, and fatal to Indigenous populations and marginalized groups. Subsequently, the elitists that run these types of institutions are seen by non-mainstream peoples as creators of a Western epistemological reproduction that reinforces the system and keeps privilege in check (Tuhiwai Smith, 2008). Understandably, there is a backlash.

The degree of this type of backlash is seen in the creation of contemporary Indigenous versions of Western “Internal Review Boards” (IRB’s) which have become more reluctant to collaborate with non-Indigenous researchers or institutions that seem “too white,” too academic or mainstream. These types of institutions and their representatives are viewed as entities that will present inaccurate and one-sided views of the participant group (Martin-McDonald & McCarthy, 2008). Additionally, Indigenous advocates, critical thinkers and pedagogues argue that this research imbalance has oozed itself into Western/American history textbooks that have been, traditionally, used to inculcate nationalistic Western ideals. These nationalistic “ideals” are then used as a vital part of public schooling (Zinn, 1990, 2005; Loewen, 1995, 2005; Said, 1996; Spring, 2008; Gobo, 2011). Wane (2009) contends that there is a deliberate strategy to these types of “schooling models” (pg. 161):

One of the strategies of Western European models of schooling was to universalize education. However, what the promoters of this grand idea
did not spell out was that the internationalization of curriculum would be skewed towards a Eurocentric paradigm and, in particular, British and French. There was no consideration of local knowledge or local peoples’ everyday experiences. Such knowledge was seen as either non-existent or of little or no value. As a result, many educational reforms failed

These schooling models are still practiced, and not just in the US but also in schools that emulate Western education practices. Although their tragic history is easily recognized today by academics, scholars, and researchers, we fail in identifying this directly related to how such models are still at work, specifically in Indigenous and marginalized communities. Must we wait another fifty to one hundred years to recognize that fact?

I concur with partisan Indigenous researchers in this regard. There is no doubt that marginalized groups continue to be further challenged by the long-term penalties placed on them for being colonized as it is recognized that such penalties are a consequence of the Western colonial legacy (Matsumoto, 2001; Kovach, 2005). Moreover, the colonial experience continues to impact Indigenous populations everywhere on an economic and educational basis as well, therefore, this fact requires a reanalysis of current quantitative research methods in academia and in the field of educational studies, specifically in terms of Indigenous studies undertaken in the field of education (James, Street, & Jedlicka, 1980; Santos, 2002; Walker, 2003; Hodge & Lester, 2005; Kovach, 2005; Gibson, 2006; Louis, 2007; McDonald & McCarthy, 2007; Nabobo-Baba, 2008; Grace, 2010; ). The extent of this is reflected on in the following:

And sweep out all 'the obscurers, all the inventors of subterfuges, the charlatans and tricksters, the dealers in gobbledygook. And do not seek to know whether personally these gentlemen are in good or bad faith, whether personally they have good or bad intentions. Whether personally-that is, in the private conscience of Peter or Paul - they are or are not colonialists, because the essential thing is that their highly problematical subjective good faith is entirely irrelevant to the objective social implications of the evil work they perform as watchdogs of colonialism (Césaire, 1972,
As Wane (2009) asserts, certainly, there is a political agenda in education, “Eurocentric discourses serve the purpose of justifying the neo-colonial agenda and further inform research and policy that influence our current educational thought” (pgs. 170-71). Clearly, contemporary educational systems and traditional research methods have played an important role in maintaining the status quo; thus, preserving the colonial. This is no longer acceptable. As Indigenous and marginalized community members become elevated within the Western higher education systems of post-modernity, their voices are rising in protest of this fact.
2.5 Buried Treasure: Gender & Race in Research Today

“…Daughters and sons must follow the same curriculum of study, thereby promoting unity of the sexes. When all mankind shall receive the same opportunity of education and the equality of men and women be realized, the foundations of war will be utterly destroyed. Without equality this will be impossible because all differences and distinction are conducive to discord and strife.”

--‘Abdu’l-Bahá, (The Promulgation of Universal Peace, Pg. 175)

In an attempt to reckon with current arguments that Indigenous research is something that only Indigenous researchers should be allowed to do, I challenge that view and offer an intermediate ground via the use of DRM. I would like to propose that the use of non-Indigenous and female researchers into communities that might be resistant to such practices be reconsidered. Instead, such researchers should be seen as potential “treasure” to the community as they can enrich the community in a multitude of ways. An outside researcher has the potential to bring insights to the community specifically because they are viewing that world through “new eyes”. Still, it is necessary to consider why there is resistance to such peoples, especially in the context of research.

Accordingly, it is highly likely that there will be issues in trying to gain access into an Indigenous community that one does not belong to. Although there are significant socio-cultural reasons as to why this might be, it is important that the DRM research-advocate be cognizant of essential participant group dynamics when conducting research on Indigenous or marginalized participant groups relative to this because they will require addressing them while conducting work with the community, or in seeking acceptance into the community. The key to this is in to achieving close and reciprocal relationships between the research-advocate and the participant community and its leaders.
It is critical to evoke the message that when conducting research in direct connection with Indigenous or First Peoples of the Land, (FPL’s), the research-advocate must be aware, respectful, and cognizant of the group’s identity and belief system in order to create lasting bonds with that community, this includes areas of gender dynamics and race. To address these types of issues it is suggested that information be gleaned from the participant group and is a matter that should not be seen as a “personal” issue, or an attack on the person, because it is possible that resistance is a consequence of cultural norms, past negative experiences with outsiders, etc., for that community. Likewise, should the researcher be male and seeks entry into matriarchal communities, the gender/race issue may arise. Even so, the research-advocate is advised to recognize that there could be issues relative to gender and race that will be discussed more deeply in the following.
I suggest that the matter of gender impacts research in many ways, even when it is not a specific aspect of the research agenda, meaning that it is not a part of the research phenomenon being studied. Because there continues to be serious issues relative to gender equality both on and off the res, gender issues will continue to be just that, unaddressed gender issues. It is with these matters in mind that the following paradigm is presented to the reader and research-advocate so that potential issues, both as a researcher and an interviewer during the process of conducting focus group sessions.

*Geo-Gender, Socio-Cultural Feminist Framework—Discussion*

"...power is everywhere;" relations of power are omnipresent, multiple, and dynamic; they are not limited to "centers of power," like government institutions, parliaments, or political parties...”

--Bent Flyvbjerg (1999, Pg. 1)

In research partnerships with Indigenous and Marginalized populations, by incorporating Critical Race Theory (CRT) into a feminist framework and into the actual research paradigm, it is suggested that research with Indigenous and marginalized populations can be better analyzed, understood, and discussed with the community, and in the research, throughout the enquiry process. In doing so, the DRM research-advocate has the means to understand the phenomenon, as well as the community’s reasons behind many of the cultural, linguistic, and, overall, societal norms the research-advocate might encounter.

As guidance for use in the DRM enquiry process, the use of viable comprehensive analysis models are offered to the research-advocate in the expectation that the models can further enable the research-advocate the means to understand socio-cultural phenomenon at a more intrinsic level that will be necessary for the success of the project. The above framework coined the *Geo-Gender, Socio-Cultural Hierarchy Output* (see: Appendix C,
p. 424) is for the use of examining research relative to gender and race analysis, which, I argue, will always be an essential aspect of any research undertaken with mixed gender populations, whether with mainstream or Indigenous/marginalized populaces. It is offered as a tool for the reader in recognizing how I have broken down gender and socio-cultural phenomenon.

This particular paradigm has been especially created for projects with Indigenous/ marginalized communities, who many times, have very traditionalist gender, and many times, racial cultural norms at the meso-level (community-level) that impact community members at the micro-level (individual-level), as Gross (2003) suggested in his publication with the Anishinaabe, and as is suggested throughout Hallowell’s (1926;1934; 19847; 1950; 1951; 1954; 1955; 1957; 1960; 1963; 1965; 1972; 1975) scholarship and research findings with the Ojibway community and other Indigenous communities that he collaborated with throughout his brilliant career.

I suggest that it is necessary to consider how race and gender impact research, and, how they are accommodated in traditional and Indigenous research practices, especially when the researcher (DRM) is not from the respective community in which the research will take place at. Although the DRM Framework is a set paradigm, it is meant to serve the community. As the DRM research-advocate, it is important to note these very fundamental aspects of each community that we might collaborate with will differ accordingly. Our role as the research-advocate, initially, will be impacted by our race, and then our gender.

There is another layer to research at a gender and race level that is not discussed in the literature in greater depth, specifically, for those researchers who collaborate with Indigenous and marginalized populations. For example, Kane & Macaulay (1993) and other
researchers who study the impact of race on research interviewing, specifically in relation to what is coined as “interviewer-gender effects” by these authors, explain the following:

When interviewer race affects survey responses it is generally for race related questions.\textsuperscript{37} For example, Anderson, Silver, and Abramson (1988b) document that black respondents report less warmth of feeling toward whites when interviewed by a black interviewer…Schaeffer (1980) concludes that both black and white respondents interviewed by black interviewers offer more liberal responses on some racial-attitude items.

Schuman and Converse (1971) summarize their findings on race of-interviewer effects by noting that interviewer race is most important when racial issues are being addressed and ‘polite conversation’ between the interviewer and the respondent is thereby threatened.

In addition, there is some evidence that an interviewer's socioeconomic status has an effect on responses to class-related issues (Katz 1942). These findings are generally based on data from face-to-face interviews, in which the race of the interviewer is usually self-evident, and clearly suggest the importance of considering gender-of-interviewer effects for gender-attitude data.\textsuperscript{38} (pgs. 2-3)

As a Critical Researcher, I recognize that race is always an issue, no matter what group we might work with, there is always a division between the interviewer and the interviewee, which is heightened by gender as discussed in the quote above. This is not talked about at graduate school, or in doctoral research courses and it is a vital matter to research studies that should be. When we discuss this in a university environment, then these types of issues are allowed to be considered by those who would not initially consider them. As this is not the case, consequently, there are several key issues that the research-advocate needs to be

---

\textsuperscript{37} According to Kane & Macaulay, (1993): “Race-of-interviewer effects also have been documented for some issues not directly related to race, such as electoral attitudes and sense of civic duty (Anderson, Silver, and Abramson 1988a), but such effects are much more consistently evident for race related items” (Footnote Source: Kane & Macaulay, 1993, pg. 2).

\textsuperscript{38} According to Kane & Macaulay, (1993): “Groves (1989) offers a comprehensive review of the literature on interviewer effects, including an excellent summary of findings regarding demographic characteristics of the interviewer (such as race and gender)” (Footnote Source: Kane & Macaulay, 1993, pg. 3).
aware of. One such issue is the “race” one, even when entering Indigenous spaces or marginalized spaces. The more traditional the community, the more likely this is to be the case. The other issue is that of “gender”, i.e., being a female researcher and attempting to enter or partner-up with Indigenous communities, or traditionalist communities, which are communities that adhere to patriarchal ideals, specifically about gender; and vice-versa for male researchers interested in conducting research studies in their endeavors with females.

As a long-time feminist scholar and academic, I understand the issues that fall under the “gender” umbrella, which, too often, feminists will need to side-step because it is understood that the ideas behind this is that many times, as we step-outside of our comfort levels, or our individual “worlds,” we sometimes need to let the “gender thing” go…especially when trying to collaborate with people who have traditionalist gender ideals. Moreover, I have often argued that women who “make it” into the patriarchal worlds of power do so by, initially, fitting into a culture that is resistant to them. It is only when women are “insiders” in such cultures that feminism will set forth… Moreover, within traditional tribal communities, cultural norms are already fragile, and research-advocates have no business, whatsoever, undermining that fragility. What feminist research-advocates can do, when asked by the community, is to share culturally sensitive approaches to gender equity in conjunction with the community’s input.

From a global perspective, the rationale behind this stems from the understanding that although many of us would like to think that the world is gender-neutral, too many times it is not. All one needs to do is read the “world” section of a newspaper, or watch world news, etc…, the point being, when stepping outside of our proverbial space, there is need to recognize that there is an entirely different world outside of our own that might not
be as “gender-friendly” as others. Although some progressives might want to think that this is specific to radical groups, or groups who hold a fundamentalist religious ideology, this is not entirely the case. Overall, I am referring to communities in general, Indigenous, marginalized, and/or mainstream that are comprised of males and females who hold “traditional values”, or rigid ideals about sex roles, race, which many times, like racism, cannot be easily avoided.

From the point-of-view of communities that the researcher might not belong to, often times there will be a layer of resistance towards researchers who are not from that community, and then there’s the “gender thing”, which is specifically aimed at females whom might be required to have a male escort, or guide (in case we get lost, I imagine…). Nabobo-Baba’s work as a researcher, at one point required the use of a male escort (Nabobo-Baba, 2006; 2008). As a feminist, I recall feeling greatly disappointed in finding this out, initially. As the designer of this framework, I now appreciate its importance because it is really representative of authentic Indigenous research practices. Issues circumventing sex/gender, I argue, will always be an essential aspect of any research undertaken with mixed gender populations, whether with mainstream or Indigenous/marginalized populaces, noting that Indigenous communities do not subscribe, necessarily, into feminist ideologies. Ultimately, tribal/marginalized communities’ cultural norms must be respected at all costs.

This particular paradigm has been, specifically, created for projects with Indigenous/ marginalized communities, serving as a reminder of the types of issues that continue to remain in research that must be explored further. Differing perspectives, specifically, dealing with the role of gender and race and its’ impact on researchers trying to enter a community that they do not belong to, centers on the recognition that the research-advocate must be respective and non-judgmental, culturally.
Cultural relativism contributes to what might seem as patriarchal practices for feminist research-advocates working with tribal/marginalized communities, which is something they must step-away from, according to the DRM model. The research collaborative is NOT about the cultural belief systems of the researcher, or what they might perceive to cultural norms. The work is about the community, and recognition that their epistemologies, axiology, and ontologies are non-Western.

For these reasons, and more, gender is something that should be considered when we are conducting research, but from the perspective of the research-advocate who must make it a point to keep their personal beliefs out of the research. Whereas, Schwedler (2006) claims that gender has not been an issue in her research conducted in the Middle East, while working with fundamentalist groups that she covered for four years as a reporter. Other researchers counter this aspect of research practices (McKeganey & Bloor, 1991; Kane & Macaulay, 1993; Deutsch, 2007).

Researchers, such as Delgado Gaitán and Delgado Bernal, claim that the researcher is always an outsider, in spite of our sex and race. No doubt, for feminist researchers, there are important issues tied to the practice of “side-stepping” gender issues, whether due to cultural relativism, the enforcement of religious and cultural dogma that places more importance over males as opposed to females, etc. I suggest that this leads to emphasis on the idea that male/female community members both need to participate, and assist, in changing these types of cultural practices and advocate for gender equality; however, that is something the tribe/community must do of their own volition. Unless the research work is specifically centered on addressing such issues, and, at the tribe/communities’ request, DRM research advocates must step-away from this. Mills & Newman (2002) emphasize that “If only women
advocate for gender equality, it will most likely fail because men still hold the balance of administrative and political power” (pg. 25). A good way to approach this is by reframing gender.

Deutsch (2007) argues that we need to reframe the questions to ask how we can undo gender,” although I do not think that gender can be “undone,” especially so, when working with Indigenous/marginalized communities. However, Deutsch’s (2007) suggestions are healthy first-steps to the issue. She suggests that we start by promoting research by focusing on the following:

(1) when and how social interactions become less gendered,
(2) whether gender can be irrelevant in interaction,
(3) whether gendered interactions always underwrite inequality,
(4) how the institutional and interactional levels work together to produce change, and
(5) interaction as the site of change” (Pg. 106-127).

Correspondingly, Glasser & Smith (2008), explain, “…researchers have not seriously taken on the task of defining gender (or sex) in their analyses and have not operationalized the term in their research…” nor do we discuss it in research courses or in the literature adequately (pg. 344). These matters concern me as they are issues that I have encountered as a researcher myself, consequently, I have chosen to address this in this proposal because of resistance I have come across personally, first for being a Mestiza, that is, a person of mixed ancestry, Indigenous and European, and secondly, because of my sex.

Furthermore, there are additional issues in research that continue to be overlooked relative to gender and research, especially so within an Indigenous realm. We can start by, specifically, recognizing that there are, indeed, gender differences at the communal
level. As researchers, many times, we overlook these and fail to include them in our projects or our reports, unless we are focusing on gender specifically. As Glasser & Smith (2008) explain, “the theoretical language that researchers use to formulate questions and make sense of data is also part of gender politics.

Selecting a less explicitly political language (e.g., ethnography of communication or interactional sociolinguistics) positions a researcher in these political debates as much as selecting a more explicitly political language (e.g., critical theory or feminist poststructuralism) (pg. 345). As an academic whose work is, generally, focused on gender, I find that in research “gender issues”, which is, discussion relative to gender equality/inequality within a phenomenon, are avoided either because the researcher is unaware of them, or because the researcher recognizes that if they address them, well, that complicates matters significantly and will probably add additional time and effort to the project. Expertise in the area is required as well.

**Gender Issues in Conducting Interviews**

“Allow me to be clear about this, we cannot experience gender equality in the field of research until we experience it within society. Indeed, therein lays the patriarchal-feminist struggle, a seemingly endless challenge to humanity’s greater good.”

—E. Vallès

One area in which gender is especially relevant is in interviewing project participants. Arendell (1997) argues that in qualitative research that involves the use of in-depth interviews, “the researcher is the primary research tool, since it is up to the researcher to build rapport with subjects, coax answers from them, and guide and control the interview,” which, of course, makes perfect sense until we start to really look closed at this fact (Pg. 340-41). As Arendell (1997) explains, “While contextually situated, the relationships which evolve
during the research process are influenced by the identities and histories of those involved, including those of gender”; consequently, who the researcher is, in terms of race, class, and gender, must necessarily be important to the dynamics involved in face-to-face interviews, as well as in research undertaken in tribal or traditionalist communities (pg. 341).

Likewise, McKeganey & Bloor (1991) find three themes relative to gender and research, in the first theme there is the “tendency to employ gender as an explanatory catch-all in accounting for processes which may, in fact, occur as the result of cross-cutting influences like age and social class”. Secondly, in their analysis, gender is viewed as a vital aspect of the “structural grounds upon which negotiation takes place”, meaning that the “fieldworker role may be only intermittently gendered but nevertheless subject to certain normative constraints related to the fieldworker's gender,” furthermore, as they explain:

This suggests that the fieldworker's gender may be only occasionally thematically relevant in many participant observations studies, but that there may be boundaries to the negotiability of the fieldworker's role, limits which may only be overcome by the modification of subjects’ gender-related expectations. The third theme of particular relevance to our own work has to do with the limited visibility and the taken-for-grantedness of gender influences. Warren has cogently illustrated the selective attention to gender relations to which even the most reflective fieldworker may be prey (pgs. 197-98).

I suggest that there are two specific themes that must absolutely be reckoned with when dealing with gender, the first is very simple to understand, that gender issues are complex and when the researcher fails to recognize this fact, then they are setting themselves up for failure and issues, especially so within the context of research, unless the research project is centered on gender.

The second theme that I repeatedly find is that gender issues are everywhere; however, as already mentioned, people choose to avoid them, and in so doing so they lessen the
effort and other potential issues that come with the acceptance of additional labor. The third theme, as already mentioned as well, is that too often people are unaware of them and therefore do not encounter them until they are forced to collide into them. This is why I have created the following paradigm titled the “Geo-Gender Socio-Cultural Hierarchical Analysis Feminist Framework” (see: Vallès Geo-Gender, Race & Socio-Cultural, Hierarchy Output Mechanism) for the use of examining research relative to gender and race analysis.

Relative to this discussion, as seen in the analysis model below, the user of the framework should note that race, or racial classification of the individual or community, is the starting point of the agenda, which then feeds into the central component of the structure as geographic/social location of the community or individual. This centrifuge is key to understanding the other dynamics involved in the paradigm as it is a “filter” of sorts in that without this one component, all other aspects of the proposal do not function properly because it is expected to greatly impact the other variables located in the paradigm.

In reference to the “Geo-Gender Socio-Cultural Hierarchical Analysis Feminist Framework (HAFF) Output,” figure, the geo-gender exploration tool is, specifically, for the use of the research-advocate. The form can be used at the micro-level or within a group activity and should be pre-approved by the community before use. Any IRB guidelines must be followed as required. The paradigm works best with the understanding that the cultural norms communities inherit are rooted in gender and race, but become specific when layered with individual/group socio-geographic locations, then further layered with economic status, socio-cultural and ethnic norms, all of which are relevant, pre-set societal concepts, which are, often times, fiercely protected ideals or expectations pre-set for males and females, especially within Indigenous/marginalized populations.
Analysis of local socio-cultural, religious and political context is therefore a crucial pre-requisite, there is no doubt that culture and tradition are used to maintain the status quo, both in and out of the res; therefore, it will be challenging to attempt to change these, even as feminist CRT researchers. The research should never be about this, unless it is the primary reason for the research project. So, there is need to be cautious in this regard.

Until recently, the intersection of gender and racial discrimination and its consequences had not been subject to detailed consideration in education studies, and they still are not in the area of research design. The problems linked with incorporating a gender lens into this work, at all levels, was perceived or categorized as manifestations belonging to either one form of discrimination or the other, sexism or racism, but not both. Ultimately, this allowed for the full scope of the problem to escape analysis, which then lead to ineffective or inadequate remedies, or approaches, if you like. However, allow me to be clear about this, we cannot experience gender equality in the field of research until we experience it within society. Indeed, therein lays the patriarchal-feminist struggle, a seemingly endless challenge to humanity’s greater good.

This is finally changing because as I have argued in this particular section, both of these variables impact research, especially when the researcher is not from the respective community in which the research is being conducted. The big difference is that this fact has gone unaddressed in the research produced, and in the academy, somewhat like Indigenous epistemology. Through its "gender mainstreaming" policy, the United Nations, for example, is acknowledging the different ways in which gender roles and gender relations shape women's and men's access to rights, resources, and opportunities, with the ultimate goal being the
achievement of equality, and not just in Lesser Developed Countries (LDC) but in the West as well.

Although gender issues circumvent research, I am troubled by the fact that they are not discussed inside the research classroom at the university level, an area where it is most needed. Gender dynamics in research must be addressed and in education systems as well. Stepping outside of the researcher’s role, I think it is important to recognize that gender equality cannot and will not take place unless men join in the process of change. Without them it will continue to be an upward battle, precisely, because this is something that should never stop from being challenged, still there is a religious-centered, geo-political element to this that does not go away with the changing of borders, again, both on and off the res. As argued previously, it is up to men to unlearn patriarchy. Moreover, it is argued, that pedagogically-speaking, this is best done by men working with men in this regard, although the point is emphasized that it must be taught by whichever means necessary.

Nevertheless, the researcher has need to understand the importance of these types of socio-cultural dynamics, and how they are a vital aspect of research undertakings with research participants in relation to identity, and identity formation. Therefore, a fundamental aspect of research with any community requires that the researcher understand, at the least, some of the basis for identity formation and requires an analytical paradigm for efforts in this area.

Applying the framework above, within the use of such an analytical paradigm, a Native American socio-cultural norm would differ from that of an African female from South Africa, or a Latina from the US, or that of a White, Anglo Saxon, Protestant (WASP) male from Appalachia, etc. These examples are meant to emphasize the distinctiveness of the model,
specifically in relation to the geographic location component of the framework, which should not be difficult to comprehend, especially when we place it into context with an example of a “Latina” from the US, as opposed to a “Latina” from Peru, which then continues to be layered in distinct ways as a consequence of the other model components, all filtering back as a consequence of geographic location.

This tool is a part of the DRM package and is included for use with participant groups. It is important to use the outline as a method to understand identity formation and should not be something that is presented to the participant community. The tool is a means for the researcher to understand socio-cultural norms from a feminist/CRT perspective and should be used within that model. It is expected that the research-advocate can use it to analyze gender dynamics as found within the community and connect it to the education phenomenon, when necessary.

Differing role allocation means different power relations are present at all times within human society. As such, socio-culturally, differing members of society are assigned differing amounts of power, authority and control over other people, resources and decision-making positions within most communities. Often times, this is something that comes into place based on one’s sex alone. Therefore, gender relations not only impact the behavior between males and females but also the actions, attitudes, and cultural practices between men and men. One example from the Indian sub-continent is that of the bride's father and family. Within this context, the bride-to-be's father and family are considered inferior to that of the groom’s family, even under the circumstances that they might be “better-off” socio-economically.

Culturally, male children are already preferred over females based on sex alone, then this is highlighted by the economics of the matter, so to an extent from a culturally, socio-
economically perspective it is not difficult to recognize how economics influences and value males over the female. We see this also in the use of dowries, not only in India but in other communities that that incorporated it into their ideologies. Gender relations are therefore relations of dominance and subordination with elements of cooperation, force and violence sustaining them. Of course, the model can be used for specific work related to gender within an Indigenous community, in which case the framework should be shared with the community.

As to whether the analysis output should be incorporated into the research publication, of which must be approved by the community, I stand by my earlier analysis that it is necessary to do so but will, inevitably, complicate matters and, quite possibly, allow for additional tensions in the project as gender issues, or potential gender issues, seem to always have a way of doing that. I would like to suggest that a vital reason for this is because gender inequality exists at all levels and to address this, either in the literature or in the community (which I would highly suggest the research-advocate never do) is to “close doors” because many times the community will not be prepared for such a dynamic, and who could blame them? After all, the research-advocate is supposed to be there to understand an education phenomenon, and not to create one.

This example serves as a worthy demonstration of why gender issues continue to go unaddressed and why gender inequality continues to exist and will continue to exist. Until males and females can be willing to give something up for the other, I dare say that this will be the state of the matter, still I attempted to address it within the context of this paradigm. To be clear, use of DRM in research does not invite such a level of analysis at this point—unless it is the area of study/research to be undertaken by the research advocate at the request of the participant community. For this reason, this DRM framework is not gender-specific, which
means that the gender aspect of research is not addressed; however, there is another DRM research proposal that has been created for work, specifically with Indigenous and marginalized women, which is not to be confused with this one as it would make this endeavor, the proposal, twice as long and would redirect the essence of this version of DRM. DRM, gender specific is a framework for use in research work specific to gender-relations at the tribal level, which will not be presented in this work.
2.6 Chapter Summary

In this chapter, three paradigms are discussed which are intended to present a “case study” of sorts, as to why the proposed paradigm, Diachronic Research Methodologies should be incorporated into research collaborative with Indigenous and marginalized populations. The three paradigms are as follows:

1.) *Traditional Research Methods & the Scientific Method*;
2.) *Indigenous Research Paradigms*;
3.) *Colonization & Decolonization*

In addressing the first of these, Traditional Research Methods & the Scientific Method, as presented into the discourse was background information on traditional research methods in the field of education. I argue that a preferred method of doing research in large education settings is through the use of quantitative methods. At the same time, there are problems with its use in work with Indigenous and marginalized populations. Literature used reflected this fact. I also discussed the need to develop a global worldview, which I refer to as a *Universalist Reality* and encouraged the use of DMIS in education today.

Added to the discussion were issues surrounding Native American demographics which I find necessary, but problematic at the same time as they have been a consequence of the colonial experience. Furthermore, I presented arguments surrounding the “*Scientific Method*”, a favored Western epistemology, calling it a “cultural broker”, meaning that we cannot seem to go anywhere without it as a globalized world. I question this and point out that Indigenous epistemologies have been negated, downplayed, and avoided when, in fact, there is much power and profound understanding within these epistemological worldviews. Moreover, I suggest that we are living in a time wherein their use within post-modernity is necessary.
Incorporating Flyvbjerg’s (1998b; 2003;2004a; 2005, 2006, 2008, 2009) large arsenal surrounding power plays in research projects and in the field of research, I also presented arguments relative to the politics behind education and the research agenda.

Acknowledging the importance of qualitative and mixed methods, I still argued that within large education settings, quantitative methods was a preferred method, as long as it was adapted to the needs of the community and allowed for that history to be a part of the research, which leads to the presentation of the DRM paradigm and the need to make research a transformative experience for the participant community. I shared the issues that surround traditional methods as it has been a research method that went after the data in order to understand phenomenon without considering the people centered on the research. Consequently, I address the ideas behind cultural capital rooted in Western epistemologies.

It was necessary to also discuss issues surrounding group conflict in research endeavors. Also presented is discussion over Indigenous research methodologies, brining into the discussion work by notable Indigenous researchers who also argue that research can and should be transformative, and it can also be a way to address issues that have resulted because of research itself. Research was also presented as a way of empowering the community, when it was undertaken under the right conditions. I offered a meeting point between Indigenous research and traditional methods, coining it Diachronic Research Methods.

The third paradigm addressed the impact of colonization and the cultural trauma it has left on countless Indigenous and marginalized communities. As such, I proposed that the colonial experience should be a significant aspect of research and argued that a paradigm is required that allows for discussion over its legacy, as directed towards the education phenomenon being studied.
Finally, gender issues in research were discussed as an added necessary element to the discussion. Although, it is not a part of this particular DRM paradigm, I explained that there is a need to bring gender into research at all levels, from teaching and preparing researchers in the university classroom, to discussing resistance in research to individuals because of their sex, which is something that is done both on and off the research. I also suggested that it behooved society to teach gender equality within public school systems. I highlighted the need to do so while at the same time clarified that for this particular DRM paradigm, discussion regarding gender should be avoided, unless it was a part of the research subject being studied.

I referred to the DRM-Gender Specific Paradigm which I have designed for research projects, specifically, with Indigenous and marginalized women; however, I clarified that the two paradigms, were distinct and were to be used under the specific guidelines for each paradigm, which meant that in this particular proposal, Indigenous and marginalized populations within the context of colonialism were the focus of the research endeavor and referred to the DRM Framework specific to research associations with Indigenous communities. This particular DRM paradigm, as already described repeatedly, steps away from all phenomenon except the three aspects of DRM already mentioned, which all center of the “Nine Core Components” of DRM, unlike the DRM Gender-Specific Framework, which focuses primarily on gender issues in research.

Use of the DRM paradigm requires only three considerations, the first, collection/acceptance/analysis of the data in conjunction with the participant community. Secondly, the addressing of the colonial/post-colonial analysis, again in conjunction with the participant community. Thirdly, the agreed upon incorporation of the grant or partnership with
the participant community, which is also achieved through collaborative effort with the host community. More than this steps outside of the DRM paradigm boundaries. The idea is to keep the research efforts confined to these three main objectives, while adhering to the “Nine Core Components”. In so doing, the research endeavor will continue to focus on what is most important for the community, which is something that the research-advocate should always strive for.

In the following chapter, the DRM paradigm will be discussed in its entirety so that the research advocate can become familiar with it and understand its basic focus on the three facets of the model. This chapter will also offer background information on the research proposal that is expected to be undertaken for completion of this academic endeavor in order to complete this dissertation. At this point the DRM paradigm has not been applied in the “real world”, although this is expected to transpire during spring of 2016, with the culmination of the research project taking place during the summer of 2016. Nevertheless, the proposal at this point offers valid arguments as to why DRM is necessary and how it can be used to address the stalemate that currently exists in traditional research methods.
CHAPTER 3. A PROPOSED METHODOLOGY FOR DECOLONIZING TRDITIONAL RESEARCH WORK WITHIN INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES

“Is it possible to quantify ethically? Yes! Let me measure and collect data, but let the research be about the needs of the people, under their direction, and not numbers.”

--E. Vallès

3.0 Indigenizing Traditional Quantitative Methods in Educational Research

After having read Tuhiwai Smith’s Decolonizing Methodologies shortly after its release in 1999, research for me was never the same. Her heated words reminded me that in research, power plays and struggles impact the use of a traditional quantitative research processes, whether they are a consequence of the academy, racial motivated, situated in sexism, gender, politics, socio-economic status, etc. Moreover, her work pressed the matter of ethics in research, ideals of justice into the use of traditional methods, as well as the matter of how traditional research methods had been used in research and other Western traditions rooted in empiricism.

Just as it does not make sense to try to apply a fully Indigenous research paradigm to work with mainstream populations; clearly, it does not make sense to apply a traditional quantitative research paradigm on Indigenous or marginalized peoples. Still, we have been doing so for decades. Consequently, I was pushed into considering why this is the case. In view of these matters, I came to understand that research was, really, supposed to be about people, and not just numbers, although the numbers are important, no doubt. Ideas stemming from reading Tuhiwai Smith left me thoughtful and contemplating with a newfound awareness, although aspects of her arguments had already been on my mind. Although I had come to recognize the power of quantitative research via my graduate and doctoral statistic courses and had viewed quantitative research methods as a necessary means of understanding phenomenon; Tuhiwai
Smith’s book prompted me to recognize that research had to be more than that. Furthermore, in order for quantitative methods to become an equitable tool, it required that the method renew itself by becoming a system that addressed the history behind the statistics. In particular, research needed to become a tool for positive transformation and a means of renewal specific to the matters centering equity and justice. In other words, quantitative methods had to be about the people behind the numbers, and not the numbers in front of people.

As Tuhiwai Smith (1999) stated so clearly--and who could blame her? -- “‘Research’ is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world’s vocabulary” (pg. 1). At the time, I found myself in a quandary-of sorts because I have always perceived that research, when done with care and caution, is a viable, somewhat, ethical means of establishing some sort of necessary understanding, or, at the least, it allowed for a relative consideration of phenomenon which could be addressed, worked upon, or improved by means of reassessment and modification, specifically, because of the data collected. At the same time, I recognized that there were issues with traditional methods that I argued about in most of my research courses, even before I read her book (p.1).

Such issues had to do with unequal access and power, and a one-sided history that always inflamed my intellectual sensibilities, as well as my personal sensibilities, as I am of two worlds, the Indigenous and the European. In fact, by the time I was in middle school, I perceived that there were all sorts of deliberate and offensive practices that American and European culture intentionally committed towards “the Others” that was, and still is, meant to alienate, negate, and damage the “Other.” I now viewed traditional methods from this lens.

In retrospect, it took me awhile to get over the type of resentment that I had first experienced in elementary and middle school as a consequence of this type of educational
practice. Consequently, I “get it” when Indigenous and marginalized students don’t do well in school. It took maturity and, ironically, more education to develop my own critical consciousness in order to adapt to a *Universalist Reality*. The framework I have designed is precisely for the benefit of research; however, I am proposing a new and better approach to research that bravely steps-away from the traditional; hence, the Ameri-Eurocentric, and re-focuses, positively, on non-Euro-Western centrist paradigms.

**Argument #1: Developing Critical Consciousness through use of a Universalist Reality**

“Ye are the fruits of one tree, and the leaves of one branch. Deal ye one with another with the utmost love and harmony, with friendliness and fellowship...”

--Baha’u’llah

Just turn on the computer or television and you can see for yourself the types of racial and sexist “darts” being thrown at differing people. After Trump’s presidency, this has heightened. News channels and talk shows are some of the worst ones to practice this, and that should be troubling because media has been one of the most powerful instigators in this. The reader should be made aware of the fact that I began this work pre-2015, so my early observations have heightened as a Consequence of the political divisions that have been escalated as a consequence of political and racial divisions in this country. Empires like Disney, Fox Television, etc. have been quite successful in playing havoc on youth and teens by creating a version of “I want to be like them,” when, in reality, they are not. Moreover, I suggest that this practice is so commonplace that we don’t even bother to respond to it. That’s really dangerous, and on many levels; however, it is especially troubling for Indigenous and marginalized peoples who often times are not portrayed positively in media of all types.

Some additional thoughts relative to this are that when conducting research, the research-advocate should consider the goal of interpretation when working with others. As
Maroudi (2008) discussed, the goal of interpretation should be one that encourages us to learn how things, people and histories are connected, although separate in our direct experience within our individual cultural and linguistic distinctiveness. In understanding that we are all members of different cultures, different peoples, different places, and that we have been affected by differing historical experiences throughout historical periods; then, I suggest, that it is at this point that we are truly sharing historical truth. That being said, it is instrumental to re-note that the research-advocate should understand that there is an even greater truth to this reality and that is founded in our “Universalist Reality” (Vallès, 2013).

An UR is an understanding on an individual level that all humans are a part of one humanity. There are no races but one, the human race. Additionally, an UR understanding recognizes that in spite of our oneness, our histories are, and should be expected to be different. Finally, an UR requires the implementation of a critical consciousness which is something that can, and should be, developed in our public education systems for starters.

Methodologically-speaking, it is further offered that there are several distinct and major differences between pragmatist research methodologies and that of DRM. Aside of the human/communal ethical distinctions, primarily, DRM necessitates that first-steps to a solution to the phenomenon studied be addressed regarding the participant community, which is an exclusive requirement in the field of research (Weston & et al, 2009). In general, a traditionalist approach to research simply allows for the indication of the problem to be presented to the reader of the study, with no resolution or potential recourse addressed by the researcher.

Secondly, and just as important as the latter, when collaborating with Indigenous communities and marginalized populations, too often traditionalist researchers fail to address
the colonial history that has obviously contributed to the current challenges found within FPL populations (Matsumoto, 2001; Kovach, 2005). As Tuhiwai Smith (2008) explains, “the problem is that constant efforts by governments, states, societies and institutions to deny the historical formations of such conditions have simultaneously denied our claims to humanity, to having a history, and to all sense of hope” (pg. 4). Clearly, DRM has the potential to be that venue, a space in which Indigenous voices are finally heard at an academic level, which I have no doubt will trickle down to the masses.

Furthermore, DRM attempts to rectify and introduce a much needed updated, potentially revitalizing, reconsideration of traditional research methodologies by respectfully recognizing the non-mainstream aspects of individual group ontology, epistemology, axiology, and incorporating those worldviews and applying them into a collaborative and scholarly research agenda that empowers the participant group (Parrado-Rosselli, 2007; Wilson, 2008, pg. 21). Education-wise, this is particularly important matter because of all the damage that has already been out there against native peoples everywhere from the initial phases of colonization. To recapitulate, DRM:

1.) Requires permitted access to data by the tribe/community,

2.) Addresses pre and post-colonial community histories, reflective of “the *diachronization,*” from the perspective of the community; this includes, potentially, addressing the implications of the data in context of colonization, and/or, addressing the Euro-centrist/Western implications of colonization on the community, following the communities requirements relative to the research they have requested

3.) The DRM approach requires the research-advocate bring some type of project, grant, initiative, etc. as requested by the community, to the community, following the
communities’ requirements relative to the research they have requested

"Euro-centric" Knowledge Systems, which are rooted in Ancient Greek Knowledge Systems

"Euro-Ameri-centric" Knowledge Systems, which are rooted in European World Views but have been adapted to American Ideologies Rooted in Capitalism and Ego-centric Group Dynamics

"Indigenous Knowledge Systems", which are NOT included in education textbooks, research approaches, or education curriculum. Such a system is rooted on preservation and connection to the planet/cosmos, as well as to the human collective.

Figure 3.1: Euro-Ameri-centric Pyramid

Euro-Ameri-centric Pyramid

“It is not for him to pride himself who loveth his own country, but rather for him who loveth the whole world. The earth is but one country, and mankind its citizens.”

Tablets of Bahá’u’lláh, Lawh-i-Maqsúd

As it is recognized that traditional research methods is part of that worldview and that it has played a role in creating a negative and demeaning character for people other than the mainstream. What it has done to all Indigenous or marginalized groups found throughout the world is a consequence of its early beginnings in which White mainstream males called the
shots, so to speak. Accordingly, research has negated and alienated the Indigenous and the marginalized, from the mainstream. As an academic, researcher, teacher, and education scholar, I recognized that I needed to address this dichotomy of sorts. This commanded reflection and thoughtful consideration of the matter, which in due time gave birth to this paradigm.

Initial questions soon evolved into other important questions that I felt required answers. Hence, there are four specific questions that started off this project that are worthy of reconsideration as we enter into the methodology section of this dissertation. They are as follows:

1.) Why are traditional quantitative methods problematic for use in research with Indigenous and marginalized communities?

2.) In what ways do research methods accommodate Indigenous and marginalized community’s collective histories, epistemologies, axiological and ontological considerations?

3.) How has published research about Indigenous and marginalized communities, globally, effect and impact the local community?

4.) How do racial and gender dynamics influence the research process?

There is another important aspect to this all that I do not address in the questions above but requires attention in all research methods, which is central to the idea that research can have a transformative aspect to it. This proposal is burrowed in the initial four questions above and puts forward the idea that the use of quantitative research methods in the field of education is a potentially effective means of understanding phenomenon within large group settings, i.e., via the use of assessment scores, important numerical data specific to education such as Grade Point Averages (GPAs), absence rates, data collected at the district, local, state, or federal levels, etc., while allowing for group empowerment when they have a vital role in the research process. This can allow for transformation under the appropriate conditions.
The use of these types of data collections, when done ethically and following the stringent parameters required as a part of an ethical worldview of which many of us are aiming for, can bear fruit. Quantitative research methods, in spite of its racist and sexist beginnings, allows for quick attention to potential problems within large-sized education systems. These are issues in education today that require consideration and renovation. I reemphasize that all data collected and used in any research methodology requires that the data used be precise, valid, and reliable.

In attempting to deal with the research questions above, I concluded that it was imperative to apply a feminist and critical race lens to research practices, specifically to quantitative methods. There does not seem to be another way because both paradigms speak of what must be addressed in research work with Indigenous/marginalized populations, specifically, a need for analysis relative to colonization and an urgency for a standpoint theoretical approach unlike that of the traditional patriarchal type—although, there will be aspects of patriarchy in all communities, I will argue that feminism is located at the end of this particular spectrum.

As briefly discussed previously in the above, in some ways, a type of dilemma-of-sorts came to be as regards the use of traditional quantitative research practices to its application to research work with Indigenous and marginalized communities. Essentially, I found myself sparring intellectually with two differing continua, two opposites, i.e., the natural, and the unnatural; an Indigenous worldview Vis-à-vis Empiricism. I wrestled with the profoundness of the damaging historical legacy and collective trauma that empiricism had delegated to the “Other”, whether because of our race or our sex. The matter transpired and would not go away.
As an academic, I considered the question “Why should researchers have the right to measure and collect data in general about Indigenous populations that later damages perceptions of that community, internally and externally?” As Tuhiwai Smith (1999; 2012) and other Indigenous scholars have shared, history warns us to be careful here (Hardin, 1995; Cohn, 1996; Bender & Schorske, 1997; Lagemann, 2000; Sandoval, 2000; Mutua & Swadener, 2004; Spring, 2007; Chilisa, 2012; Kovach, 2012; Lonetree, 2012; Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2012; Walter & Andersen, 2013).

As the question is specific to work with Indigenous and marginalized populations, as explained, these are communities that do not hold the same worldviews or epistemologies that Westerners do; therefore, as researchers, we should be even more so cautious because we are now playing with potential fire and it is something that might not be easy to fan out. What this means is that when we publish or share Indigenous research collaboratives with external entities, it is to the behooves all interested parties to consider deeply potential backlash opportunities that might transpire not only in the present, but in the future, as a consequence of our work.

Reflecting on what some earlier Indigenous researchers have stated, research about Indigenous populations, historically, has served to undermine the community and the individual (Hardin, 1995; Cohn, 1996; Bender & Schorske, 1997; Lagemann, 2000; Sandoval, 2000; Mutua & Swadener, 2004; Spring, 2007; Tuhiwai Smith 2008, 2012; Chilisa, 2012; Kovach, 2012; Lonetree, 2012; Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2012; Walter & Andersen, 2013). Taking this fact into account and recognizing the potential power of quantification in research processes in large education systems today, I concluded that I needed to find a way to address this dilemma because it was comprised of many attributes of which I felt I belonged to,
academically and on a personal level. To do so required for me to consider how researchers can accomplish this equitably and ethically, that is if we are going to attempt to do this at all?

Is it possible to quantify ethically? I think so. Yes! Let me measure and collect data, but let it be about people and not numbers. Key to this, as I came to establish accordingly, is the imperative that the researcher put the community’s needs above the needs of the researcher and any institutions that the researcher might be tied to, as well as any financial backers or grant funders. I reasoned that such an approach allows, and advocates for, the needs of the communities to be attended to judiciously, and, for the students’ needs to be analyzed and studied.

Clearly, this is what the research project should come back to, Indigenous ways, which center the research project on the community and the needs of the community. Ultimately, returning to the use of the metaphor of “Indigenous ways”--within a variety of means, Indigenous research methods are about the acquisition of fire and tools. To be used as a means of protection, sustainment, and transformation. As such, we can build resilient communities with these, fire and tools.

No doubt, there is a strong need to change traditional research practices, especially in work with populations who are marginalized or historically misrepresented, just as there is a need to modify current education systems in the US. Consider then the suggestion that although all children are expected to be educated within a healthy and intellectually prosperous educational environment that services all equally and equitably—we have failed to do this in the case of Indigenous and marginalized populations. We failed and continue to fail these students as it is a matter that must be accomplished in a way that is appropriate for the students as related to what the student has been taught in their community, their geographic
space. This means that public education systems that are standardized are problematic for Indigenous and marginalized populations because they are based on an epistemology that does not account for many Indigenous peoples as they are epistemologies rooted in the Euro-centric, or Ameri-centric.

Public schooling can no longer be a standardized “one size fits all” model of endeavor loosely set-up by politicians who know nothing about education in and of itself. That’s a big part of the problem in education today for sure, and that’s not even addressing the intricate and interwoven issues that come along with a “standardized testing” approach for all attending public schools. Often times, these same politicians return to the table placing blame on everything and everyone, except for themselves and their standardized policies. The other troubling aspect found in education today is the need to address important issues specifically about getting education and research to work for post-colonial Indigenous communities everywhere (Prokhorova, 2007). Traditional research methodologies, like mainstream education systems, are at root of the problem.

Returning back to the times in which children were pulled out of the arms of their family members and communities and sent to American boarding schools where they were physically forced to endure a well-executed approach by the American government to malign and do away with their culture, language, and ways of being, it is documented the extent of this, as well as the damage that it caused; today’s education systems are reflective of these types of practices (Spring, 2007; 2008; 2010).

Likewise, a differentiated curriculum wherein Indigenous culture, history, and language are central features of the curriculum has been needed and demanded by Indigenous scholars and social-justice advocates; but then again, this is something that has been negated
and denied; yet, educators today acknowledge that it is required and fair to do so. Furthermore, it is a matter that should be a fundamental consideration and mandatory prerequisite for such communities, just like testing is, because at a very indispensable level, worldviews are considerably different between Westerners and non-Westerners; that is to say, between mainstream populations and non-mainstream populations; or, if you will, those in power and those lacking power. Bottom-line, the colonized and the colonizers of today.

For that reason, research conducted and collected with Indigenous and marginalized populations should reflect the fact that a serious misdistribution of power and resources exists, in all ways. In this regard, gathering data on education from First Peoples of the Land (FPL’s); Indigenous populations/Borderlanders, transnationals, etc. namely, communities that have been geographically long settled in areas that were later challenged by new geographic and political forces at work must be revisited.

It should be noted that this particular categorization includes dysphoric populations who were forcibly taken from their Indigenous ancestral homelands and displaced on new continents, or in new geographic spaces. It is inclusive and applicable, as well, to other traditionally marginalized groups. These considerations are vital and should ignite necessary consultations and deliberations that reflect the integrity and ethical underpinnings of research practices as they were meant to be at some high point in our human history in which the objective was to create a better, more equitable understanding of the world. On a personal level, I was impacted by that experience.

Still, under all circumstances, it is imperative that caution and care be central to the research process, whether we use quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-method approaches to our research, the ethical thing is to do it in a way that behooves the community and does not
alienate or work against the community, which is something Indigenous researchers have
rallied for and are fighting for. Again, in order to ensure that such an equitable apex in
educational research is reached, the history of the group must be addressed from the
perspective of the participant group as the residuals of an oppressive history have impacted the
participant group in ways that should be acknowledged and discussed within the research
paradigm, and in the academy, as well as throughout post-modern public-school systems and
universities. So, it is with these thoughts in mind that I set out to begin efforts in setting-up a
critical research tool that encompassed CRT and feminist theory in order to address the age-old
issues that traditional research methods have placed on Indigenous communities everywhere.

Argument #2: Implications of Deliberate Historical-Alienation and Communal Psycho-Social Damage

The alienation and psycho-social damage that has been enacted against
Indigenous peoples, and marginalized populations, continues, going back to the landing of the
first Europeans on the North American continent. Moreover, it is deliberate. As already
discussed throughout this dissertation, this work hypothesize that it is directed towards the First
Peoples of this continent, not only because of initial attempts to seize their land, but to commit
genocide of people, language, culture, and history. Without a doubt, what has been committed
against Indigenous peoples located throughout this planet has facilitated the process of
colonization, enabling Europeans and their descendants to hold mastery over the colonized
peoples of the world.

These historical implications have been comfortably brushed aside by the
Euro/American status quo, which is an interesting phenomenon when juxtaposed with the ideals
of the West rooted in Christian theology. The repeated attempts at genocide, which continue
still, as well as the “stealing/ forceful taking” of land, the Indigenous “self,” Native culture, language, and epistemologies, etc., in short, all that is considered sacred in Western civilization are beyond troubling. In fact, it is amazing as institutions, governments, religions, and the academy have managed to successfully brush them aside from textbooks and discussion. Additionally, the continued need to keep Indigenous peoples in check, whether through the use of reservations or through an unjust legal system used against Natives, all these approaches have been successful in destabilizing and fracturing Natives. Again, these are age-old, Western, European practices well-versed by the status quo designed to control, negate, and obliterate any linguistic, socio-cultural, spiritual aspects of what it means to be Native, or to acknowledge their history at all stages; past, present, and futuristic. Consequently, American/Western history fails all in addressing true history.

Unquestionably, the teaching of history is a powerful tool for the dominant power-culture, as it is the means of promoting nationalism in others. Indeed, in national and global politics, education, and research Western history is grounded in a Eurocentric ideology, enhanced by American national interests. These knowledge systems, which are rooted in the history produced at the national and global levels, extends itself to the placement of that history and worldview within the Euro-Ameri-centric Pyramid, a term I coin to refer to the type of epistemological power distributions we experience in the West and in nations that follow Western ideologies.

As such, the Euro-Ameri-centric pyramid seen above is simply the continuation of Ancient Greek ideologies rooted in patriarchy. These “Euro-Americentric” worldviews are still alive and doing well, despite times passing, both within European and American socio-cultural systems, which includes our institutions. These types of ideologies are highly valued
and allow for a, somewhat, intellectual collectivity amongst groups of people who work or interact with Western socio-cultural systems. Not surprisingly, in this Euro-Ameri-centric power pyramid, Indigenous epistemologies, or worldviews, are located at the bottom of the pyramid, as such rich and holistic Native knowledge systems are lacking in Western culture, which contributes to an unhealthy, materialistic, self-centered, greed-gobbling society.

Moreover, as Sartre and de Beauvoir (2003) explain, individual practice *mauvaise foi*, “bad faith” when we willingly participate in inauthentic and unhealthy behaviors towards self and *Others*. In short, we intentionally self-deceive self and Others as a consequence of negative socio-cultural pressures having to do with “wrong-doing,” or self-profit, instead of participating in ethical and fair practices. Humans espouse dishonest ideals and principals that are self-benefiting, yet, we are capable of much more when we are conscious/self-conscious and cognizant of Others outside of the self.

The alienation and psycho-social damage that has been enacted against Indigenous peoples, and marginalized populations, continues. It is directed towards the first peoples of this continent, not only because of what has been committed against Indigenous peoples located everywhere on this planet as it allowed for the “taking” of land, the self, culture, language, epistemologies, etc. Additionally, negating/oppressing, or taking advantage of *Others* serves as a means of controlling people and *their* history at all stages, past, present, and futuristically, because it fails in addressing true history. We do harm to Others, and through the practice, ultimately, to the self.

Unquestionably, the teaching of history is a powerful tool for the dominant colonial power culture, as it is the means of promoting nationalism in others—the way *they* want it to be done. Indeed, in national and global politics, education, and research, Western
history is grounded in a Eurocentric ideology, enhanced by American national interests. These knowledge systems, which are rooted in the history produced at the national and global levels, extends itself to the placement of that history and worldview within the *Euro-Ameri-centric Pyramid*, a term I coin to refer to the type of unhealthy, and unjust, epistemological power distributions we experience in the West and in nations that follow Western ideologies.

As such, the Euro-Ameri-centric pyramid located above is simply the continuation of Ancient Greek ideologies rooted in patriarchy. These “Euro-Americentric” worldviews are still alive and doing well, despite times passing, both within European and American socio-cultural systems, which includes our institutions—our academies, places of supposed “knowledge.” These types of corrupt ideologies are highly valued and allow for a, somewhat, intellectual collectivity amongst groups of people who work or interact with, and within, Western socio-cultural systems. Not surprisingly, in this Euro-Ameri-centric power pyramid, Indigenous epistemologies, or worldviews, are located at the bottom of the pyramid, as such knowledge systems are lacking in Western culture and in the academies.

**Argument #3: A Need to Decolonize Research, A Proposal, Diachronic Research Methodology (DRM)**

“The paradox is this, and has been for me, how do I show that quantitative methods is most useful in contemporary education settings, especially with research collaboratives in Indigenous and marginalized communities, in spite of its long racist and sexist history?”

-E. Vallès, *(Dissertation, 2015)*

In this section of this proposal, the quantitative research paradigm coined Diachronic Research Methodology (DRM) will be discussed thoroughly so that the DRM paradigm might be used in research collaboratives with Indigenous and marginalized populations in research projects in the field of education. The framework and the tables,
graphs, and documents to be used for application of DRM is all work I have designed, specifically for use with this framework. In addition, it should be made clear that all package frameworks and documents are optional and have been designed to assist the novice researcher in their research collaboratives with Indigenous/marginalized communities.

For starters, it should be made clear that DRM is community centered as it requires that the research project center on the community’s need/s. Moreover, a DRM-centered project cannot move forward without the consent and full collaboration of the participant community. Although not fully a “race-based methodology” in which race is the central feature of the research project; to the contrary, DRM expands on this and its design is intended to serve as a decolonization paradigm for efforts directly related to research projects specific to Indigenous peoples/communities, and/or marginalized communities due to colonization and the race factor.

Similar to Pillow’s (2003) reference to a methodology “that raises consciousness of, and asks critical questions about, our most fundamental epistemological practices,” DRM is expected to do just that and to bring to traditional quantitative methods an expanded worldview not currently found in quantitative research methods that addresses the colonial histories of Indigenous and marginalized communities globally (pg. 195). DRM can also be incorporated into research as a tool for historical rectification, which is a term I coined that represents the refinement of history by means of updating traditional history with active research and publications that emerge because of that research experience or project.

Reflecting on Pillow’s (2003) reference to Tyson (1998), attributes associated with “race-based epistemology” regarding the “specificity of oppression”; similarly, the essence of DRM is not grounded in the “victimization” of the Indigenous or marginalized
peoples of the world, but their continued “struggle and survival” and the reclaiming of
Indigenous and marginalized history from the mainstream population, specific to
Indigenous/marginalized communities located from throughout the world.

As argued throughout this treatise, such community histories, languages,
cultures, etc… have been negated, and the groups challenged by the same institutions and
abstract concepts instituted by that same hegemony! To be clear, the colonizer; accordingly,
will take charge of the structures, the laws, economic access, even Native rights to healthcare,
water and wildlife, e.g. Indigenous hunting rights, etc. The Colonizer will not stop there, but
will continue to push with invisible structures as well by creating and instituting the “isms,”
such as racism, sexism, classism, etc., in order to ensure full control of marginalized
populations/communities, safeguarding that they are not a part of the status quo, and are, in
fact, recognized as being so out of the trajectory that any God granted rights, as mandated by
the Constitution of the United States, will be out of arms reach for decades.

This will become the internationalized, Western, traditional worldview
promulgated to the Indigenous, and the rest of the world. It will be a successful one as early
1930’s-1950’s American films will portray Natives as insidious and inferior to Whites, to the
point that Natives will become a negative stereotype, a “cardboard” caricature or “straw man”
reference, traceable to the usurping and settling of the American West. This is how colonizers
set, and perpetuate, a one-sided history of cowboys and “Injuns” and/or cowboys and the
Others, wherein “dirty Injuns” are the “bad” guys (Tyson, 1998, pg. 22; Pillow, 2003, pg. 196).
It will take Americans up to the 20th Century to provide an adequate, somewhat positive,
period piece of grand cinematic reinterpretation of Indigenous ways, such as seen in Costner’s
Dances with the Wolves, for many American moviegoers, and Europeans, to, finally begin to
better understand, at least to a minimal degree, what Indigeneity might be about. Even then, there remains much room for work in this area.

Consequently, the issues that circumvent Natives of the “American” continent can be traced back to America’s colonial period and the usurping of Native lands by White Europeans. The price of the American colonial experience for the Indigenous of this continent is beyond financial reparations of any kind. Land that once belonged to Natives will never be returned to them by White European power holders, nor their descendants. To the contrary, these battles will continue, in many instances leaving the *Supreme Court of the United States* (*SCOTUS*) to determine outcomes, which American history demonstrates clearly just how judicious American Justice really is as it centers on White man’s principals surrounding “just-us,” a judicial methodology witnessed, first-hand, by *SCOTUS* rulings such as *Scott-vs-Sanford* (1857). This major racist ruling will prompt the Civil War.

In this ruling, *SCOTUS* establishes, through the application of American law of that time, that former African Americans slaves were not citizens of the US at the time of the ruling. By solidifying the idea that Congress did not have the authority to prohibit slavery in the territories, this *SCOTUS*’ faux pas will seal the fate of the *Missouri Compromise of 1820*, which had, up to this point in early American history, outlawed slavery in newly acquired Maine, while simultaneously protecting slavery in Missouri and other parts of the Louisiana Territories, deeming it unconstitutional (Mauro, 2016, pgs. 15-24).

Other troubling, yet similar rulings are *Korematsu-vs-US* (1944), in which *SCOTUS* will apply the *War Powers Act* against Japanese Americans, allowing the federal government to forcibly remove Japanese American citizens from their homes, businesses, property, etc…and place them in military institutions (Mauro, 2016, pgs. 25-35). Up to the
1954 SCOTUS ruling in *Brown-v-Board of Education*, separate but equal will serve as the standard American platform for “democracy,” permitting *Jim Crow* laws to function freely and racism to continue to be institutionalized, in spite of the passing of the *Fourteenth Amendment*, and, despite the US having undergone the most devastating war the US has ever had—a war in which Southerners will see Northerners to the death as a consequence of the issues surrounding slavery.

Regrettably in 2020, in spite of time’s precious passing, Americas’ racist origins continue to develop as witnessed in Texas, not surprisingly. The reader should recall that the state seceded from the Union in order to join the South during the American Civil War, specifically because of Texas’ refusal to emancipate “their Slaves.” In spite of Texas’ Civil War loss, the state continues to practice institutionalized racism throughout the state as seen in the current controversial case involving DeAndre Arnold.

Arnold is a high school senior who has been prohibited from participating in his graduation with his classmates, also known as, “taking the walk,” because he has refused to cut-off his dreadlocks, which are an important aspect of who he is, and where his ancestors come from. Arnold explains that his hair serves to honor his Trinidadian culture. Although Arnold wears his braids up when he’s in class, the public school he attends stipulates that he is going against the school district's dress code. Consequently, he has been suspended.

Similarly, more than a dozen Catholic schools in New York have been mandating that males must not have braids as of 2019.39 It is worth noting that private schools

---

39 Source: *Business Insider*, McLaughlin, K. (Dec 2, 2019, 10:35 AM). “Catholic schools in New York City are banning braids on black male students, and it's all perfectly legal.”
are protected under the law in such cases, public schools are a different matter. Dependent on the geo-location, the history and demographics of the community, in the end, public school culture will reflect those variables. We should seriously consider what this really means, *black males* must not have braids and will be required to cut them off in order to attend school.

This modern-day, legal battle reminds Natives of what was done to their young, warriors and maidens alike, at the turn of the 19th Century by means of cruel, American, assimilationist practices targeted at the Indigenous people of the continent. This was achieved via mean-spirited, legally-sanctioned, institutionalized, un-democratic educational reforms, to the point that Native friends and family members have shared with me the idea that so much has been rigged against Natives, that even their genetic material, DNA, now carries it, explain that it is a defining aspect of being Indigenous.

Make no mistake, these are full-hearted, hate-driven, racist, “Christian” initiatives in which early Whites in positions of power forcibly attempted to strip Natives, in particular innocent children, of anything representative of their identity. From compulsorily separation of Native children from their parents, to placing them, without any individual choice, into “boarding schools,” also done so without parental consent, state and federal American law carried out this rampage. Tragically, youngsters were stripped of their hair (males), language, culture, spirituality, etc., *and families* in an attempt to “civilize” them.

The basis for this psychologically and emotionally debilitating initiative centered on an attempt to “kill the Indian, and save the man,” according to Pratt (1892). Pratt refers to Union general, Phillip Sheridan, as a “great general” who said that “the only good Indian is a dead one…”. At the same time, White colonizers forcibly placed Natives on reservations with the intent of preventing them from acquiring “the benefits of American life” (Johnson, 2005,
Now, someone—anyone, please explain how this type of rationalization works itself out? America will strip you of your Indigeneity in order to make you American, while preventing you from “acquiring the benefits of American” life? Ironically, this will be the standard of the day practiced and advocated by early American, Christian and political leaders of the time, as well as American/European educators and the military.

It is deeply troubling when we consider these case studies. In spite of what is considered by some as “God-inspired,” almost, “politically-sacred” documents, e.g., the US Declaration of Independence, the American Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, all which clearly mandate that all Americans are endowed with “certain, unalienable rights…, …that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness…” is only applicable to Whites. And yet, there it is, the long, continued battle to keep America White, and, at all costs. Clearly, the expensive lessons America has experienced as a consequence of their early, and continued, racist history continues to be negated and ignored. In the case of the US Supreme Court, clearly, interpretation of the US Constitution is beyond problematic.

Walter Echo-Hawk, a Native American attorney who has served the Native American Rights Funds and has participated in the defense of Natives for over thirty-five years specific to vital legal issues that impact Indigenous communities in ways outsiders are ignorant, and insensitive to, explains that, “the fate of Native Americans has been dependent in large part upon the recognitions and enforcement of their legal, political, property, and cultural rights as indigenous peoples by American courts,” with “most people thinking that the goal of the judiciary, and especially the US Supreme Court, is to achieve universal notions of truth and justice,” and yet, for Native Americans, I dare say, Indigenous peoples located from throughout
the world, have been deeply mangled through American and global-courts located throughout
the planet. They are, repeatedly, cheated, under-served and under-mined, by this same system.

It is, precisely, because of these types of histories and the countless episodes, hopelessly, witnessed through the lens of critical theory, global history, legal and academic
malfeasance specific to research that I have designed DRM. The paradigm’s main intent is to
create a space for Natives and marginalized population members/communities to voice, through
the academy and legal journaling, the incidences of wrong-doing, deceit and deception, the
lying and history of countless broken treaties that have endangered and continue to endanger
Natives everywhere.

Research Collaboratives with Indigenous and Marginalized Communities

“I am reminded of a Native story about how the skunk sacrificed itself to provide medicine for
the Anishinaabe during a time of illness in the community, as told according to Gross (2003). I
cannot help but to think that often times, there is remedy in the unexpected. So it goes with
incorporating Indigenous ways into quantitative methods.”

--E. Vallès (Dissertation, 2015)

In the following section, the Diachronic Research Methodology (DRM)

Framework (Appendix G, p. 429) is offered to the reader for use in visualizing clarity and
comprehension. In designing the DRM paradigm, I am reminded of an Anishinaabe story that
tells about how the skunk sacrificed itself to provide medicine for the Anishinaabe during a
time of illness in the community, as told according to Gross (2003). Reflecting on this, I cannot
help but to think that often times, there is remedy in the unexpected; thus, it goes with
incorporating Indigenous ways into quantitative methods.

As I have suggested throughout this proposal, quantitative research methods can, and should be, implemented into Indigenous research methods. Quantitative research design is
a powerful tool, and therefore, a viable means of understanding phenomenon by the use of data. At the same time, it is necessary to recognize its Euro-American bias. In order to judiciously apply it to Indigenous research methods, the data collection processes remain the same, nothing changes in terms of ethics, reliability and replicability. What changes is the standpoint, allowing for viewpoints to be flipped/reversed.

By acknowledging the empiricist, Western aspects of this dated research approach, *quantitative methods*, and identifying it as such in the collaborative work and in any publications, it is through the use of relevant data that the DRM strategy becomes a space in which traditional thinking espoused in academia, textbooks and in policy is challenged, *vis-à-vis*, with that of the Indigenous, non-White, non-Euro-American experience. As such, defining traditional quantitative practices as a “precise” science then becomes problematic as it is clear that it is cemented in Western thought, history, ideology, etc.; hence, bias. It cannot, and should not, be used in the same traditional manner in work with colonized communities because the histories, the players, the phenomenon being collaborated on belongs to non-Westerners/non-Whites, making it necessary to apply an Indigenous research methodology to traditional quantitative methods.

What is offered via DRM as a teaching/learning tool for educators and Indigenous researchers is a means to step outside of traditional quantitative methods, through the use of data. In applying the *nine components* of DRM to the captured data, (See section 3.3 for specifics), and presenting the pre/post-colonial histories of the differing communities in the published work, the outcome of the collaboration will result in an overview of the “*diachronizational*” experience of the community/tribe.
Adherence to the *nine components* of DRM is crucial for use of the DRM model, as is the establishment of a healthy, research relationship with the participant community. Consequently, every aspect of the research process must be approved by the community, or its representatives, i.e., tribal leaders/elders, district officials, superintendents, tribal, organizations, education officers, etc. To reiterate, the DRM model is centered on the *nine components*, but consists of three specific areas pertinent to the participant community.
3.1 Diachronic Research Methodology, the Framework

Accordingly, Indigeneity is NOT “voiced” in the academy nor in the textbooks that we adopt and use for teaching new generations. As academics, teachers, and employed by these same institutions, I suggest to the reader, that in some ways we have become a vital part of the bias that is required in teaching, only, through a Western lens. Whether as public school teachers, higher-level education instructors/professors, or in research, as such, we neglect history, instead choosing Western traditions, policy and procedure. DRM is about transformation and transcending the colonial history and the negative structures forced upon
Natives by colonizers, and specifically, achieved through hostile educational practices/the academy, film, bias/racist publications that come out of the Western world and are promoted by these same mediums. As academics, we have become stuck on the traditional methods of conducting research and publishing. Even when we are scientist, we stick to the empiricist methods of understanding, even when they are not logical. We do so, I suggest, because we have bought into the “traditional” empiricist teachings as a consequence, and in spite of our schooling, obviously.

Accordingly, Indigeneity is NOT “voiced” in the academy nor in the textbooks that we adopt and use for teaching new generations. As academics, teachers, and employed by these same institutions, I suggest to the reader, that in some ways we have become a vital part of the bias that is required in teaching, only, through a Western lens. As such, we neglect history, instead choosing Western policy and procedure. As educators and researcher, we fail in addressing appropriately how education should incorporate the Indigenous into our world view, because like it or not, that world view is a critical part of Western history, precisely because of the colonial history. As educators and researchers, I argue that at some point we must reckon with that colonial history, and, suggest that teachers and researchers must learn to associated with it, at some point in our intellectual development.

Moreover, Indigeneity, within the context of climatic and socio-cultural/political chaos will require that we do so, as Indigenous wisdom and Native traditionalism tells us of what is to come, while presenting methods to reckon with that coming. I suggest that the main way to move forward is by addressing that history, and, explicitly, addressing the impact it has rooted on the Indigenous and the marginalized. It is in this way that DRM is designed to do so within the context of educational research.
Although there are numerous open-ended issues relative to the deliberate silence of the Indigenous voice in public education, in American education textbooks, academia and research, DRM attempts only to address this aspect as relative to educational research design, and it attempts to do so in a, somewhat, judiciously manner by considering Indigenous and marginalized populations from their perspective, or standpoint.

Most recently, there has been a call directed towards the academy by Indigenous scholars, feminists, and Critical Theorists, and social-justice advocates demanding a much needed change in Western history books, public school curriculum and pedagogy, as well as in research practices, and to the academy. What is being demanded is a change in this one-sided, ethno-centrist, Western worldview, which begins with the arrival of White Europeans to the continents of what are now called the “Americas.” For starters, we are demanding the renewal of traditional Euro-American historical practices, which leave out the “Other” side.

Overview of Diachronic Research Methodology (DRM)

“Appear as you may wish to be...”
— Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*

Let us first begin with this simple but thoughtful consideration, “In addressing the ways in which colonization, race, and power impact the use of a traditional quantitative research methodology within the field of educational research studies, —how does this fact impact the research process and the research results?”. In response to this particular question, I began DRM by grounding it in an authentic view of populations that have, historically, been geographically situated in a particular region of the world for epochs. These types of communities have specific physical, spiritual, and socio-religious bonds that the mainstream population does not have. Moreover, these types of populations were situated in distinct
regions of the planet for thousands of years and had not left those regions, although some tribes may have wandered around the regions for specific reasons, they remained in the general vicinity of their “cosmological” beginning place (Zinn, 1990, 2005; Loewen, 1995, 2005; Spring, 2008; Tuhiwai Smith, 2008; Wilson, 2008).

From this point, a colonial history develops as a consequence of “Other” populations entering these once sacred spaces of old. Clearly, these monumental happenings were “diachronic” points in their history. Consequently, when invaders attempt to conquer either through the carrying of diseases that wipe-out almost entire Indigenous populations, as well as by creating warfare and warmongering, or by instituting violence against the Indigenous, and convoluting ancient civilizations while corrupting much of what they come into contact with, etc. expect havoc and other harmful psycho-socio effects within such populations. This is the history of colonization which is not addressed in the way that it should be in our history textbooks. No doubt, as a consequence of that colonial history, these groups of people, whom are located all over the planet, have been historically, geographically, and politically manipulated by the power holders, or dominant elite, as argued by Indigenous researchers and Critical Race Theory (CRT) proponents.

As many Indigenous researchers today argue, for too long, Native Americans/First People of the Land (FPL’s)/First Nations Peoples, etc. have been under-appreciated, marginalized, and oppressed (Hardin, 1995; Cohn, 1996; Bender & Schorske, 1997; Lagemann, 2000; Sandoval, 2000; Mutua & Swadener, 2004; Spring, 2007; Tuhiwai Smith 2008, 2012; Chilisa, 2012; Kovach, 2012; Lonetree, 2012; Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2012; Walter & Andersen, 2013). Not surprisingly, as a byproduct of colonization, the Indigenous of our world have had limited access to resources, education, and political power
because they are not a part of the “capital D,” Dominant culture; moreover; they have no desire to be a part of that world. To the contrary, traditional Indigenous communities seek an epistemological and ontological existence that does not concur with that of the mainstream populations or cultures (Zinn, 1990, 2005; Loewen, 1995, 2005; Spring, 2008; Tuhiwai Smith, 2008; Wilson, 2008). This particular fact guided me in my academic endeavors with the DRM paradigm.

Methodologically speaking, DRM integrates that deep impact of colonialism and its practices within the body of the research project, which is something traditional quantitative research has failed to do (Archibald, 2006; Raven, 2010). Additionally, DRM requires action, or recourse, from researchers in alliance with the participant group being studied, specifically related to the research undertaken. For this, and other reasons already discussed, it is argued that a DRM approach is a sounder approach to research practices, as it is authentic and attempts to avoid placing any type of value judgment on Indigenous or marginalized groups, which is something traditionalist research has not been able to do (Tuck, 2009; Getty, 2010).

In the following section, a foundational overview regarding Diachronic Research Methodologies (DRM) will be provided, to include a workbook/package, so that interested researchers might better understand how to apply the DRM model to research-collaboratives and other work specific to Indigenous or marginalized communities, should they choose to apply it. For a more specific explanation of the entire DRM research processes, step-by-step, series of “snapshots” are offered in order to allow for a richer understanding of how to apply the research paradigm to potential collaboratives.
3.2 Diachronic Research Methodology, The Three Objectives

Conceptually, the framework is simple to understand as it is comprised of three specific research objectives (ref: page 260) that are framed around the *nine components* of DRM. The nine components serve as the essence of the DRM paradigm (See: Appendix F, p.428) and will be discussed subsequently. The nine components (section 3.3) were designed, specifically, due to my interactions with some tribal communities.

Whether in the Southwest US borderlands or in the mountains of Cuidad Juarez, Chihuahua, Mexico with the Rarámuri; or, in the Yucatan with the warm-hearted and kind Maya peoples located in the Mexican Riviera; or, in my limited interactions with the Mescalero in that beautiful place in New Mexico which I often dream about; or, in consideration of the minimal work and interactions I have encountered with the very-private Pueblo peoples and the fully-accepting Navajo of the Four Corners Southwest regions; or, in meeting and learning from the proud Tigua people of *Ysleta del Sur Pueblo* located in the Southwest borderlands; and finally, with major consideration of my important work with the awesome, brave and honorable, and generous Lakota people, whom I have come to love and see as family. The fruit gathered from all these relationships resulted in the incorporation of the *nine components*, which are consequential and based on those momentous and unforgettable interactions, and what I have learned from interacting with each community.

Recognizing the lack of, and need, for the *nine components* in Indigenous research methods, and, within any educational endeavor undertaken with tribal or marginalized communities, in the following, this treatise will attempt to explain why they are of significance and why they must be adhered to in work with Natives/marginalized population members.

Upon receiving consent from the participant community to enter the community by means of a
research collaborative understanding, one of the most important components of DRM requires that the data be collected. This must be done ethically and, of course, the data must be accurate. Without this aspect of the paradigm all else cannot stand. Therefore, this is the first of three objectives of the paradigm required.

Once the research-advocate receives tribal/communal permission to work with the tribe/community, this is, then, followed-up and allows for the solidification of the collaborative to take effect, substantiated by the fact that the research-advocate has been given access to open, or private, data relative to the phenomenon by the community. As to the data that will be used, this could consist of data collected on behalf of the state; the federal government; or for the school district; or community, etc., whatever is, officially, provided by the community.

Accordingly, it is vital that the research-advocate verify to their fullest capacity that the data is accurate and publishable. This can be achieved in a variety of ways, including revisiting the data from its inception. It also helps if the data is discussed in the “DRM 15 Page Research Report.” Matters such as how the data was collected, and how it came to the research-advocate should be included in the report. These are important staples that will require finesse and collaboration with the representatives who offer the data, or safe keep it. It is also necessary to adhere to any type of Internal Review Board (IRB) requirements and criterion, whenever required. Relative to this, the data should allow for researchers to begin to recognize and commence to explore issues collaborated on for that particular community, as requested by the community. The data must be verifiable and collected ethically, as is expected. Moreover, all Internal Review Board (IRB) mandates must be followed and adhered to.
The second objective of the DRM Framework requires the addressing of the colonial/post-colonial history of the community, which is an effort that is only achievable through direct exertion with the community. It is critical that the history of the community be shared with the research-advocate, and then acknowledged in publications, from the perspective of the participant community, or, the designated representative from the respective community, who will share the impact of colonization with the research-advocate. This is what is referred to as the diachronization of the community, meaning, that this aspect of the research-collaborative serves as a means to bring to recognition how the tribe once was, and how it presently is due to the colonial experience of the community.

The research-advocate should collaborate with the community and its representatives in order to make this history a vital part of the research project report. It is important to remember that this is information that must be discussed in the body of the research, or any publication that comes as a consequence of the research project; therefore, all aspects of it must be cautiously presented and should offer an insider’s view at the participant community’s history pre/post-colonization. This should be presented in a non-detrimental manner, so that readers of any publications better understand the effects of the colonial experience from the perspective of the tribe/community. In short, this section of the paradigm allows external readers the opportunity to better understand more intimately the types of issues and lived experiences that the participating community has undergone and continues to undergo.

When necessary, it is the responsibility of the research advocate to align this history with the education system in which the community is situated in, and to parallel it with the phenomena studied. This is accomplished through close association with the research
project participants and the community leaders and/or representatives. This is perhaps one of the most distinguishing aspects of DRM and is crucial to decolonization and educational transformation for the community, because it creates a point of understanding not currently found in quantitative methods or in traditional, non-Indigenous, research methods.

Accordingly, the research-advocate should establish a work relationship based on trust and confidence that ensures all involved that they are working with the community in positive ways, as opposed to approaching the phenomenon as a negative aspect of the community.

As the DRM model centers on CRT and feminist concepts, it is critical to recognize that these are areas of post-traditionalist research methods and studies that have been, historically, negated or disregarded in traditional research methods, and in the academy. Both are distinguishing aspects of DRM that bring to contemporary education systems, and to research in general, a vital, long-tangled, negated history not currently found in schools, school/university textbooks, and in journal writings; therefore, the healthiness of the collaborative between the research-advocate and the community should become a form of academic critical theory, embedded in feminist methods, that will be key to the research project undertaken with the community.

With the latter in mind, DRM is not about playing the “blaming game” in research. Instead, the collaborative between the community and the research-advocate should serve as an intellectual and ethically-grounded space for reckoning with Native/marginalized community’s history-- that is to say-- that diachronic point of historical change forced upon Natives by Western/Euro-Americans; then, later by the academy, and then, again, continuing in our educational systems. In order to step-out of it, to allow or prompt the beginning process of
healing, acknowledgement of that history is required. Transformation is only achieved through acknowledgement and *historical rectification*, which embodies the refining of history by means of updating traditional White, Euro/Ameri-centrist history with active research and publications that emerge because of that research experience or project.

These types of positive gleanings derived from the *DRM* research project, I suggest, will begin the process of rewriting history as we currently know it—which is something that is long overdue. Furthermore, it is proposed that it is in this way that *DRM* serves as a form of critical race decolonization because it forces the research-advocate to align socio-cultural and economic changes within the community with considerations of that history of colonization not currently addressed both in traditional research methods and in contemporary research methods. Again, these types of “colonial” experiences will be specific to each differing community that we collaborate with. Still, commonalities remain…the irreversible damage that has been brought to tribes located from throughout the planet, and of course, the dulling of our species, our planet, and the creatures of the planet. All this has been spoiled by the White man and his attempt to take, take, and take again…

Returning to the structure of *DRM*, the third objective of the *DRM* paradigm requires that the research-advocate initiate some type of collaborative arrangement, i.e., institutional collaborative, grant project, tutoring program, program design, etc. In short, whatever it is the community wants the research-advocate to undertake on their behalf that addresses the issue or phenomenon studied is what must be done. Clearly, this is a “first-steps” initiative as many of the education/socio-cultural/ economic issues the researcher will encounter will require a multitude of incremental approaches within any context—once more,
this is something that can only be achieved successfully by dealing directly with the community, or community leaders representing the participant community.

The main idea behind this aspect of *DRM* is that the research-advocate not just go into the community and work with the phenomena or issue, as has been done since researchers began entering into foreign places and sacred spaces, and then, failing to recognize that fact. The motivation behind this aspect of *DRM’s third paradigm objective* serves by accommodating the research-advocate, alongside the community, to address the types of educational, or other relevant community issues currently found in post-modern public education systems, or within the community, that might be impacting the tribal/marginalized community. The collaborative also serves as a means of assisting the community long-term, and vice-versa, and, it will be an academic effort that requires the communities’ approval and input, as the community must see merit in the endeavor.

This aspect of *DRM* is also discussed within the *DRM research report*, which will be explained in greater detail in a subsequent section of this chapter (see: Section III). In addition, publications that develop because of the initial research project must be discussed with the participant community that the research-advocate is collaborating with before any type of publication related to that community takes place. Without their approval, it is highly recommended that the research-advocate refrain from advancing any effort to publish, either the research report or any type of article without proper consent/approval.

*DRM* requires that the research-advocate discuss the colonial/post-colonial history of the community, the *“diachronization”* of the tribe/community, as has already been discussed. Nevertheless, this is one of the major criteria of the *DRM* paradigm. This section is vital, as it has the potential to put the education issue/s being studied into the context of
consequences that take place within Indigenous and marginalized communities as a consequence of the colonial/post-colonial circumstances that have transpired due to that history. That experience represents a significant time in the history of the people, hence, the community because of the fact that other people, foreigners, entered into geographic areas that were once First Peoples Nations. This must be pointed out in the work. This section also applies to people or communities that have been forcefully displaced due to territorial/capitalist instigation by other “governing” parties. The point being that the community has been interfered upon, hence, a diachronic moment has been established.

In the article titled “Cultural Sovereignty and Native American Hermeneutics in the Interpretation of the Sacred Stories of the Anishinaabe,” Gross (2003) explains this aspect of the post-colonial period and colonization’s continual impact on the Indigenous individual/group in the following:

…In any case, starting especially with the reservation period but actually going back to the time of first contact with Europeans, American Indians have seen the end of their worlds. In addition to the genocidal practices followed by Euro-Americans, the apocalypse for Indians was brought on by the onslaught of Afro-Eurasian diseases, which may have been responsible for reducing American Indian populations by as much as 90 to 95 percent (Gross, 2003, Pg. 130)

It should be of no doubt that this facet of existence for Indigenous communities and marginalized border peoples, in particular, is something so profoundly damaging to the community and the individual that even after the passing of decades, the colonial legacy still remains silently in the heart and soul of all those it has touched negatively.

Some would argue that the colonizer is a victim of sorts too, an idea that presumes that when they practice, allow, and promote the oppression and subjugation of
“Others,” they are “doing it to themselves” as well, as it is suggested that colonization and those who choose to colonize lose their humanity whenever they do so. Of course, this is of little consequence for those who are actually suffering under the toil and hand of the oppressor. Nevertheless, the point is that colonization is just plain bad, especially for those who suffer under it.

As explained repeatedly throughout this proposal, individuals/communities cannot go through the type of devastatingly damaging type of cultural, emotional, psychological, and physical trauma that develops from that incredibly excruciating experience known as colonization, without serious long-term repercussions following thereafter, which Gross (2003) refers to as a “post-apocalyptic period” and discusses in the following:

Most usually, and as occurred in Europe, a post-apocalyptic period will see an abandonment of productive employment; an increase in substance abuse; an increase in violence, especially domestic violence; an abandonment of established religious practices; the adoption of fanatical forms of religion; a loss of hope; and a sense of despair on the part of the survivors. Together, these elements constitute what I call post-apocalypse stress syndrome, which can be thought of as posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) raised to the level of an entire culture. As with an individual suffering from PTSD, the challenge for a culture is to go through some type of recovery. That process principally entails rebuilding the cultural world. (pgs. 129-130)

In the subsequent sections, several additional psycho-socio, and theoretical conceptual models for understanding phenomena will be offered to the research-advocate that have been created for use, ease and facilitation of the DRM paradigm. These frameworks have been designed by applying feminist concepts with elements from Critical Race Theory (CRT) and take into consideration the “Nine Core Components of DRM” (NCC’s). To apply these to the research project will require familiarity with the NCC’s, which is the essence of DRM.
In connecting the DRM paradigm further, this final objective, external or additional collaborations promotes the research project as an active undertaking, which means that the research-advocate will need to be pro-active in their effort, and in the relationships that are established with the research-advocate attempting to create and provide additional educational opportunities with other institutions, in and off the rez, that promote a richer educational venue for the community. This is achieved through collaborative and fruitful efforts with other institutions to be designed in assisting the respective community with the educational issue being researched, or this can be achieved through the writing of a grant that puts the needs of the participant community to partner with. In short, whatever it is the community requests that the research-advocate bring to the table, specific to the phenomenon being collaborated on, is addressed.

The writing of the grant, in most cases, can be a long-term process; therefore, the research-advocate should be cautious in terms of potential collaborators and what they are asking for in return for any grant monies, potentially, awarded. Under such circumstances, the research-advocate will be responsible for all aspects of the grant project and must see it through to its completion—unless, that is NOT what the community wants-- so it is imperative that the research-advocate recognize this fact and discuss it thoroughly with the respective community.

Perhaps the best way to proceed with this endeavor is to have a project in mind, once the data has been assessed and consultation has gone underway. This allows the research-advocate the means to understand what is acceptable to the community, and what is not. Thereafter, decisions should be made collaboratively which focus on the educational phenomena. Again, as mentioned previously, the point of the collaboration between the
community and the funder serves as another nexus point which rests on the research-advocate, so it is vital that the participants, at all levels, have similar intentions, ethics, and that the relationship allow for a potential long-term endeavor that might remain viable, even after the research-advocate has completed the research project. Once again, it is beneficial to understand that these are first steps in addressing the research/educational phenomena, so it should be understood that the research project can only be achieved incrementally.

This feature of the DRM paradigm has the potential to allow for the community to expand in positive ways, either through the collaborative, or through the grant writing project. For the research-advocate that is ambitious, it is possible to do more than this. The extent of the exertion is dependent on the research-advocate, and, of course, the participant community’s willingness. Nonetheless, should these matters be agreed upon and achieved, this too is addressed in the DRM Research Report and in any publications that emerge as a result of the research project. Again, every step of the DRM way is a reciprocal endeavor with the participant community, its leaders, and/or both. Nothing can be done without their approval or their acknowledgement. To recapitulate, the three DRM objectives are as follows:

1.) Requires permitted access to data by the tribe/community

2.) Addresses pre and post-colonial community histories, reflective of “the diachronization,” from the perspective of the community; this includes, potentially, addressing the implications of the data in context of colonization, and/or, addressing the Euro-centrist/Western implications of colonization on the community, following the communities requirements relative to the research they have requested

3.) The DRM approach requires that the research-advocate bring some type of project, grant, initiative, etc…as requested by the community, to the community, following the communities requirements relative to the research they have requested

In the following section we will begin to discuss more fully DRM’s Nine Core Components (NCC’s), which had been introduced in chapter one of the dissertation. These are the
philosophical/ ethical parameters necessary for equitable standards specific to research with Native/Marginalized communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cosmology:</th>
<th>Axiology:</th>
<th>Epistemological:</th>
<th>Ontologically-Sound:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous concepts regarding human origins; the design &amp; development of the universe/ nature/God, etc... is reflective and specific to each respective Indigenous community and tends to be nature-centered and harmonious.</td>
<td>Is reflective and appropriate to Indigenous/ marginalized community value systems in non-Westernized, Euro-American ways, i.e., Earth is not for sale but is to be shared with ALL, including non-human life forms.</td>
<td>Unique theory of knowledge that reflects the community’s traditions and values based on a naturalistic system of understanding unlike a Western, Judeo-Christian one.</td>
<td>Community’s “truths” dealing with the nature of being/ existence are non-Eurocentrist and grounded in nature.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptualization of Time &amp; Space:</th>
<th>Work is Communal:</th>
<th>Work Serves a Nexus:</th>
<th>Work is Ceremonial:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time is measured cyclically: Non-Western group views centered on time, space, existence.</td>
<td>Collective Approach to project: Comprised of a binding interconnectedness established between researcher &amp; community.</td>
<td>Work must serve as a meeting point between the community, and the research-advocate, and potential third parties.</td>
<td>Approach to work/community is sacred and respected and may consist of sacred ceremonies/ traditional expectations initiated by community and collective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Does Not Objectify:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultures are not trivialized, disrespected, or viewed as inferior; instead, they are valued and recognized as highly-valued Indigenous aspects of humanity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.3: *The Nine Core Components of Diachronic Research Methodology (DRM)*
3.3 The Nine Core Components of Diachronic Research Methodology (DRM)

“In the end, we have the acceptance of a plurality of interpretations interacting with the values and functioning of the community. To the degree this approach is in concert with other Native American traditions, it could be referred to as Native American hermeneutics.”

--Gross, (2003, Pg. 129)

Let us consider a significant matter relative to conducting research within historically colonized communities. How do current, yet, traditional, quantitative research methods take into consideration the respective populations’ unique history, precisely from an epistemological, axiological, and ontological consideration? I would argue that it does not. In fact, that is the crux of the problem with the application of quantitative methods in research design, specifically, when used as a research prescriptive in work with Native communities. It fully omits the colonial aspects of the Indigenous, African Americans, and Mestiza.

In a DRM adaptation of Gross’ Native American hermeneutics, the DRM approach to research demands that Native knowledge dealing with the interpretation of sacred, Indigenous oral history, is something that only Natives can do. Only Indigenous people can interpret their own history, their own belief systems, their inherited, precious legacies carried guardedly and secretively from one generation to another. These are the research mandates circumventing DRM, as described briefly in the DRM chart located below.

Recognizing this fact as necessary, the DRM paradigm advocates for the expansion and unification of traditional quantitative research methods when collaborating in research projects with populations consisting of Indigenous groups and marginalized populations, which includes Bi-nationals; Borderlanders, transnationals; and other historically marginalized groups of people, (please refer to the glossary for specifics on these terms). As Gross (2003) explains, “In the end, we have the acceptance of a plurality of interpretations interacting with the values
and functioning of the community. To the degree this approach is in concert with other Native American traditions, it could be referred to as Native American hermeneutics” (pg. 129).

DRM advocates for this view and its application in the business of quantitative research methods. It is only by doing so that a viable research methodology for partnerships with Indigenous and marginalized communities can be recognized as legitimate and ethical. Furthermore, the DRM paradigm is not a one-way research process, as traditional methods has been. Instead, the paradigm requires an exchange, or that a collaborative nexus be achieved, which is one that, ultimately, will benefit the community, specifically, in relation to the research phenomena.

As explained in Chapter 1 of this dissertation, research design is a method, or, “technique for gathering and analyzing information, e.g., such as a survey or through the application of content analysis…” Contrast this to a methodology, which is “a theoretical lens or worldview through which research is understood, designed, and conducted,” according to Walter & Anderson (2013, pg. 41). These concepts have been incorporated into the following discussion.

Additionally, as Sandra Harding (1987) makes clear, "a research method is a technique for (or way of proceeding in) gathering evidence" while "methodology is a theory and analysis of how research does or should proceed" (pgs. 196-97). As such, the DRM paradigm is a methodology that requires that the nine specific aspects of Indigenous identity formation, as seen in the figure above, mandates the incorporation of group epistemology, ontology, and axiology. It is an essential aspect of the research analysis and will guide the research-advocate on how to do, or proceed, with the research project in collaboration with the community (Renjie
& Hui, 2001; Matsumoto, 2001; Kovach, 2005). In the following, what is offered is a visual for better conception of DRM, which, again, centers on the following:

1.) The three objectives, as previously discussed, and

2.) The Nine Core Components (NCC’s), which will now be discussed

The Nine Core Components of Diachronic Research Methodology (DRM)

The first component of the “Nine Core Components” of the DRM paradigm addresses the axiological aspects of research. What this means is that the research collaborative should be grounded in mutually exclusive moral and ethical considerations specific to the tribe and/or community. Research-advocates should keep in mind the fact that collaboratives require precious time centered on building trust between the community and the research-advocate, and vice-versa. This is successfully achieved by recognizing the moral and ethical distinctions associated with the respective tribe/community. Typically, this investment of time is two-sided with one side expecting one outcome, and the other side expecting another.

Use of the DRM framework promotes the idea that the research outcome/s is mutually desired, agreed upon, and should center on the needs of the community. All work is grounded in truth, tribal/community principles, and seeded in honest interactions between the two. Community/tribal expectations focus on this trust. With this in mind, it only makes sense that the ethics and morals respective to the culture are honored and adhered to.

The ethical and moralistic considerations involved in tribal research-collaboratives require that the research-advocate understand them as related to the tribe/community, and, they should guide the collaborative, meaning that the ultimate outcome should serve the community/tribe above all else; then, oblige others, e.g., the academy and the
research-advocate. As Shawn Wilson explains in *Research is Ceremony, Indigenous Research Methods* (2002), axiology centers on the following considerations

- What part of this reality is worth finding out more about? *and*,
- What is ethical to do in order to gain the knowledge? *and*
- What will this knowledge be used for? (pg. 34).

Adherence to all these considerations are imperative for all involved.

The second component centers on the *cosmological aspects of the tribe*, denoting *how the tribe/community understands the cosmos, the Earth’s relationship to it, in short, their origins related to human existence/planetary life/where it begins and where it ends, as well as planetary evolution and the fate of the universe*. For instance, Mayans and Aztecs are renowned for their understanding of planetary existence, even making references to outer space, the Milky Way, etc. way before Europeans ever did.

As Natives, their cosmological understanding was sophisticated beyond any other civilization of that time. It is obligatory to note that although tribal communities have distinct commonalities, as discussed previously in chapter one and two, it is worth noting that cosmologies are distinctive for each tribe. Each community views, interprets, and processes the world in, essentially, different ways. The research-advocate must be aware of these and articulate them as such in any work produced from the collaborative.

The third component of the DRM paradigm requires that the research-advocate provide a better understanding of the community’s *epistemological* grounding to the research project, its readers, to educators, and to the academy, as well as to any potential publication/s that might emerge as a result of the research partnership. Epistemology, according to Wilson (2002), is the “*study of the nature of thinking or knowing…*,” which encompasses, “how we
come to have knowledge, or how we know that we know something” (pg. 33). It is the research-advocates responsibility, with guidance from the community, to discuss this area in the work.

The *fourth component* of the framework is specific to community *ontology*. What exactly is meant by an Indigenous ontology? Again, I refer back to Wilson’s (2002) early efforts relative to Indigenous research methods in which he contrasts ontology with epistemology by explaining that while epistemology is “the study of the nature of thinking or knowing,” *ontology is tribal/communal understandings of creation, specific to how the world/the cosmos were founded, how they came to exist* (pg. 33).

In the following, Wilson’s (2002) elaboration assists further in threshing out potential ambiguities between some of these concepts relative to defining the concept of an Indigenous epistemology:

… It includes entire systems of thinking or styles of cognitive functioning that are built upon specific ontologies. Epistemology is tied to ontology, in that what I believe to be ‘real’ is going to impact on the way that I think about that ‘reality.’ Choices made about what is ‘real’ will depend upon how your thinking works and how you know the world around you. Epistemology is thus asking, “How do I know what is real?” (pg. 33)

To be clear, from a non-Native perspective, an epistemology is rooted on the concepts associated with Western-perceptions of “knowledge,” that is to say, what we have established in our thinking as reality, e.g., our understanding of that knowledge/knowledge system, as opposed to an *ontology*.

As a means for better appreciating this dissimilarity amongst Natives, in general, and Western-Euro-centric cosmology, I refer to the ideas behind the Judeo-Christian, Biblical accounting of how a “God” figure created Earth in seven days—how everything begins with nothingness, a dark void, which is a retelling both Jews and Christians fiercely embrace in their
understanding of how all is creates. In short, the fourth component, ontology, is the theory of understanding (micro/meso) of how we came to be, e.g., our existence, matters relegated to how we have been “created” and ideas surrounding a “Creator,” or, the concepts surrounding a “God figure” or “Great Spirit,” or “Creator” in relation to the beginnings of existence.

In an ontology, meaning, the dissimilarities in belief-systems amongst all peoples regarding their specific ontology is respective to their geo-location, the history of that place, and, of course, the demographics of that place. Ontologies differ in a substantial multitude of ways. For example, ontological-belief systems are essential to individuals at the micro-level, yet, when they are built-upon at the meso/macro-level they have the ability to unite, or divide, dependent on geo-location, history, and demographics. It is precisely because of this fact that any research collaborative should recognize a community’s ontology and refrain from objectifying it.

For Western-Europeans, and even in the academies housed in these highly populated regions, unless agnostic or atheist, there is a long-standing, tendency to discuss such concepts from a Judeo-Christian perspective. This predisposition is heightened during times of socio-cultural-religious backlash, as witnessed throughout the world, specifically in light of 9/11.

In the 9/11 attacks in 2001, after the deliberate downing of the Twin Towers, there should be no doubt, whatsoever, that religion was central to not only the barbaric act against the Americans, but also as seen in the reactions of the White, Euro-centrist global community, who has gone after Islam and Muslims. With that said, clearly religion and the concepts associated with creation of the universe/our planet, the role of “God/Gods” within religious belief systems are beyond imperative to recognize and understand. Yet, for many
Indigenous communities, differing interpretations that are far beyond those Western traditions, specifically, concerning ontologies.

What should be focused on within the context of the sharing of “sacred” stories is that this sharing is not only an honor, but a trusted exchange with the respective community. Be cautious, don’t compare/contrast, and do not refer to the sacred histories/telling’s as “myths.” They are NOT myths, but protected legacies that must be passed on from one generation to another (Hallowell, 1975).

As a research-advocate and an Indigenous person, I find the use of the term “myth” disrespectful, and it seems to me that it is used as a means of referring to Indigenous ontology as problematic, because it is dissimilar from Judeo-Christian, even Islamic, religious thought. The use of the term “myth” is highly offensive as it infers, often-times, a bias respective to Western, Judeo-Christian world-view that makes it clear to Natives that Indigenous ontologies are, seemingly, nonsensical to non-Natives; that the ontologies might be perceived as make-believe to the outsider, or that they are viewed as a form of entertainment/storytelling centering on ancient, antiquated peoples, when it is not.

People, even Natives, too often forget that the sacred stories are truths of events that came to be in ancient times. Use of the concept of myths, whether Vedic, Greek, Talmudic, or Christian Biblical hermeneutics, are fantastic accountings grounded in real-life experiences that will hold many images and concepts that Westerners, modernists, and scientists, will fail to understand. Still, their worth within our human history is priceless and must be preserved at all costs.

Gross (2003) states, that an essential starting point for religion is what Western epistemologies recognize as “myth” (notwithstanding Gross’ use of the term “myth” which
counters my early argument that Indigenous sacred stories are “myths”). As Gross (2003) explains, “Myths provide the foundation stories for a given culture by giving structure and meaning to the cosmos”, a reference to the cosmological order of the universe, outside of the ontological order of a pantheon of gods, or God/Great Creator. In doing so, this allows for ideals behind cultural sovereignty to connect the community, in spite of the life experiences and challenges that the community might undergo through together (Gross, 2003).

Within the context of colonization, the reader can understand why this is an extremely important area of study, of understanding, and of addressing. Furthermore, Gross (2003) expounds on the importance of this in relation to cultural sovereignty in the following:

Before all the other aspects of a religion can be put into place, the story underlying the belief system must be established. In other words, religion starts with a story. Myths are also used to direct the actions of people, such as in the areas of law and the arts. Because there is so much at stake, as long as the sacred stories of a people remain viable, their religion and culture can remain functional. Since myths direct people's actions, control of the meaning and interpretation of myths can in turn affect the way in which people act. This is why control of sacred stories is such a crucial element in cultural sovereignty (pg. 128).

In this example, it should be clearer by now that there is a distinctive difference between epistemology and ontology, and still it should be noted and understood that they are interconnected on some levels and are integral aspects of tribal or marginalized socio-cultural interactions; therefore, fourth component of the “Nine Components of DRM” requires that the scholarship be ontologically sound, and that the ontology is one best representing the participant community, and that the distinction between epistemology and ontology be distinguished and described within those contexts.

By itself, this is information that the research-advocate can only come to understand by working with the community. The sharing of these ontological understandings
relies on the epistemological exchange between tribal individuals hold positions such as historian, tribal elder/s, etc... with the research-advocate. This too is something that the participant community oversees every step of the way and elaborates on with the research-advocate. The idea behind comprehending the importance of an “ontologically-sound” community worldview is respective and relative to each community, so ontologies should be expected to differ from community to community.

Wilson (2008) describes criteria for developing appropriate Indigenous research paradigms in his book titled Research is ceremony, Indigenous research methods and explains that ontology is “the theory of the nature of existence…the nature of reality” (2008, pg. 33). Other researchers explain this as a distinct attribute, ideal, moral, or understanding of reality that is supported through the sacred stories of that community, and it is something that is best understood within that particular community’s worldview. Its preservation (ontology) is maintained as the essence of that community’s way of life, or religion is recorded by the research-advocate (Hallowell, 1975; Meyer, 2008).

Ontology, then, is essentially “what is real” to and for the individual, which expands within a communal context (Wilson, 2008, pg. 33). Accordingly, whether Ojibwa, Anishinaabe, Mayan, Azteca, Tigua, or Border Mexican…ontologies will differ. The point of this being that the research-advocate must come to learn to apply that ontology within some type of context that allows the research-advocate to apply it to the project, or research project appropriately. It also allows the research-advocate to better understand why, and in what ways, certain matters are discussed or presented in the way that they are.

Understandably, ontologies are sacred and a vital aspect of Native knowledge systems that should be cared for and kept within the community. At some point, should the
need arise to discuss ontologies in publications, once again, the research-advocate must consult and receive permission from the community in order to use that information in publication format, remembering that it is difficult to remove it from that realm once released, so caution is highly recommended within such instances.

Intrinsically connected, the fifth component of the “Nine Core Components” of the DRM paradigm addresses and allows for discussion and elaboration of the community’s views of time and space, which will, more than likely, be constructs not found or perceived to be similar, or correct, in the Western world; therefore, they might be seen as problematic. Still, they must be discussed and presented, with the community’s consent, in the research partnerships being conducted as they are necessary to understand. When collaborating with Indigenous communities and marginalized groups, these types of belief-systems will, in general, take on a form quite different from that of the West, this is precisely why the discussion must take place. To not do so allows for Western structures and epistemologies to maintain the primary voice in the field of research and education. This too must be changed.

The DRM research-advocate must find a way to connect this to the research/education phenomenon, which more than likely will make sense at that point in time when the research-advocate is putting these pieces together. Of course, it helps to conceptualize these distinctions by stepping outside of the “self.” We do so in an attempt to view, understand, articulate these precious sacred knowledge systems; otherwise, it will be an intellectual challenge for some. A DRM-approach to research collaboratives assumes that if the research-advocate establishes the necessary relationships and approaches the research project with care and caution that this phase of the project will proceed successfully.
Accordingly, the *sixth component*, of the Nine, *promotes a communal and interconnected approach to the research project*, thus the participant community. As has been stressed throughout this proposal, this is an area that will make or break the research project. If the research-advocate cannot connect with the community on several levels, then the DRM *framework* will NOT work, so it is critical to be able to do this. The DRM framework suggests the following first steps.

For starters, the research-advocate needs to approach the community leaders in order to gain access into the community, this will not be as easy as some might presume it to sound. To the contrary, this will probably one of the most challenging aspects of the potential research-collaborative. A major reason this is difficult to achieve is because tribes, in general, don’t what outsiders, “Whites/non-Natives,” poking their noses in private matters, and who could blame them. I imagine by the time someone gets to the level of researcher, specializing in Indigenous studies, this should not be difficult to appreciate. At the core of the matter is the recognition, respective of this, that without this first step, no collaborative can be achieved.

Whether the research-advocate can build community, or not, will determine whether the research-advocate will be able to do the work, intellectually, as well as culturally. Recognizing that all is tied to this, e.g., access to the data, and then the storytellers/historians/tribal tipos/war captains, etc., as well as the participant community. So, you can already see how important it will be to establish a reciprocal relationship with all involved. In addition, the relationship should be one in which the research-advocate is constantly “looking-out” for the best interests of the community, not only with the external collaborations they bring to the table, but with the university and other entities that the research-advocate brings to work within the community.
The most advantageous way to remember the importance of all this, and to contextualize it appropriately, is to understand and recognize that throughout all points of the research project the DRM research-advocate must receive approval from the community to move forward in all endeavors it undertakes. In order to do this, the research-advocate must establish a healthy and viable relationship with the community, its leaders, and the community participants. It will behoove the research-advocate to focus on the development and preservation of the communal relationship at all levels. Without it, there really is no point to applying a DRM approach to the research project.

The DRM paradigm serves as a reminder that the research relationship between all involved has the potential to achieve higher levels of connection, therefore, it is ceremonial. This is the seventh component of the framework and consists of the implementation of formalized tribal procedures, as such, it is ceremonial, and is something that is prompted by the community. This means that any traditional ceremonies are to be initiated by the community and kept private.

Additionally, it is important to note that DRM adhere to the traditional rituals of the group. This interactive opportunity between the community and the research-advocate may allow for the incorporation of unique and sacred objects into the study (Nabigon, Hagey, Webster & MacKay, 1999; Wilson, 2008). This process may, or may not, be conducted within formal or informal internal group structures, or it may be undertaken outdoors under very informal conditions, which should not prompt the idea that it is not a significant event. Indigenous epistemologies tie relevant events to outdoor settings, which serves as another example of some of the differences between the Indigenous and non-Indigenous.
The important thing to consider throughout the DRM process is that it is a vital aspect of the research paradigm because it allows for the first steps of creating viable and active relationships with the participant group, and some could say—first steps into a long relationship with the community, even after the research project and collaborative has been completed- (Nabigon, Hagey, Webster & MacKay, 1999; Wilson, 2008). Again, it is something that is prompted by the participant group, and not the researcher.

The eighth component is that the research-advocate ensure that the methodology does not objectify, judge, or make negative assumptions about the community, and/or, the issue being collaborated on, or the process in which the research work has been conducted. This particular component discourages the use of unapproved photographs, sacred/oral histories audio recordings, film, objects, etc. that portray a negative image of the community in any way. Instead, the use of such technology should portray the community only within positive contexts, such as in matters that promote education and portray a unified and well-developed and defined community.

Please note, this aspect of this particular component requires that all images/photos, film, audio recordings, or tapings/visual recordings of any type be approved by the community/collaborators before publication of the report or in potential submissions to journals, peer-reviewed, articles, review essays, or any book publications. Should it be collectively decided that such articles/recordings, etc. can be used, this particular aspect of the DRM protocol serves as a means to keep negative imagery of the community out of the mainstream. Although this does not mean that such items cannot be incorporated into the research project, they will need to be described or situated into the work, with the approval of the community/collaborator in a cautionary manner.
Too many times, I have visited museums, read books or publications, peer-reviewed articles, essays of one type or another in which photography/sacred knowledge pertaining to marginalized populations or Indigenous peoples are portrayed as dirty, backwards humans who, in general, are living in below-poverty conditions. There is also another type of disparaging image of the Indigenous or marginalized peoples that portray them as something bizarre, or abnormal, straight out of a “Ringling Brothers & Barnum Bailey” exhibit. It is clear to me that such images, recordings, or films, are difficult to remove from the minds of those who visit, study, or incorporate them into some publication of one type or another, as much of these types of photos were taken without the approval from the community.

These types of “images” create a snowball effect that is detrimental to Indigenous communities everywhere. The main purpose behind this particular protocol is the preservation of dignity and respect for the community. In doing so, the community remains a private and safe place for all. Viewed long-term, this precaution prevents false or damaging imagery or recordings of the community in which the research-advocate dwells in, because once images are released they can easily go “viral”. Again, all imagery allowed into publications of any type must be approved by the community and must promote only positive images of the community.

The ninth component of the DRM paradigm posits that this is not just research, but a connecting point for all involved—a nexus—a meeting point that is expected to be maintained for as long as possible. This means that the research-advocate will serve as a nexus, an important link of sorts, between the community and external entities. At all times within the collaborative, it is the research-advocates responsibility to ensure the safety of the community, the privacy of the community, and the protection of the community. This means that any
collaborative endeavors will be approached with deep thought and consideration, and that caution serves as our companion. Much of the information required for this part of the paradigm is addressed in the “DRM 15-page Research Report,” which will be discussed in a subsequent section of this dissertation.

Diachronic Research Methodology (DRM): Structural Background Information

“I'm not interested in preserving the status quo; I want to overthrow it.”

— Niccolò Machiavelli, The Prince

A major concern of Indigenous Research Methods (IRM) has been the need to recognize, address, and rectify the types of inequalities that have existed in traditional research methodologies specific to Indigenous peoples, because traditionalist and the academy have failed in advocating for them, and instead, have caused indirect harm, or revealed sacred knowledge to outsiders. It is critical that the research-advocate, and the reader of the data collected, understand and appreciate the human-side of phenomenon, weather in an education-setting or in whatever area of mutual collaboration. This is, especially, important to do when the study takes place in non-mainstream communities as in the case of research collaborations with Indigenous and marginalized communities.

Application of DRM contends that an empiricist approach to data collection can be useful in understanding statistical data for large public-school populations; however, there are serious concerns with just a quantitative analysis, which is especially true for research work with marginalized or minority populations. Consequently, overall, traditional research methods demand revisiting because of the major changes that have taken place demographically in public school spaces since the 20th Century. These incremental changes in demographics are
concentrated on gender, race, socio-cultural and religious diversity as found within postmodern populations.

As discussed throughout this dissertation proposal, traditional quantitative methods should be supplemented, or countered, with an authentic view of human phenomena accurately related to the participant group. Clearly, research methods must be ethically collected, cautiously applied, and respectful of differing socio-cultural and religious demands, while paying caution to the political nature of education (Apple, 1999). Besides, such a research approach should demand that the research-advocate, via their relationship with the participant group, investigate the colonial history of the community in which they are working in. Just as well, the research-advocate must be accountable to the participating community in a manner of ways that will be addressed further along in this academic endeavor.

As previously stated, Freire (1970; 1973; 1989) and other critical theorists argue that institutions and the structures that support them require changing when they do not permit dialogue between the power holders and the masses. In the case of traditional research methods, Tuhiwai Smith (1999; 2012) argues that “from an Indigenous perspective Western research is more than just research that is located in a positivist tradition. It is research which brings to bear, on any study of indigenous people, a cultural orientation, a set of values, a different conceptualization of such things as time, space, and subjectivity, different and competing theories of knowledge, highly specialized forms of language, and structures of power” (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, Pg. 42).

Likewise, as other Indigenous researchers and social justice advocates have argued relative to quantitative methods, this apparatus of measurement (traditional quantitative methods) is often times flawed in that it is a one-sided mechanism concerned with data;
therefore, it lacks the necessary components to fully understand the phenomenon being studied, especially so within the context of Indigenous studies as there exists a number of significant distinctions within such communities, which are not to be found in mainstream populations (Bernstein, 1971; Nandy, 1989; Zinn, 1990, 2005; Brennan, 1991; Hall, 1992; Goldberg, 1993; Gidley, 1994; Loewen, 1995, 2005; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, 2012; Spring, 2008; White, 2010).

Incorporating Hall’s (1992) work, Tuhiwai Smith (2008) explains that the procedures used to code Indigenous peoples and their societies into the Western system of knowledge, is embedded in power, unambiguously, that of the dominant group. All the same, the dominant group’s knowledge base is entrenched in a different epistemology and relies heavily on variant reference points that fail to recognize an Indigenous worldview; hence, as such, there exists a lack of Western understanding and appreciation of the actual phenomenon studied (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, pg. 43). For this primary reason, I have suggested throughout this proposal that a feminist approach is required for use in understanding a world seemingly incomprehensible to the powerholders.

Although “most feminist theory started out from the conditions of women’s lives,” according to Steans (1998); making sense of the world through the experiences of women has widened to a more accepted view of feminist scholarship, which promotes the idea that we are all trying to understand, or make sense of the world, males and females alike; which makes us “theorists” of sorts (pg. 4). Conversely, although “it is the nature of academic inquiry, to make explicit our assumptions about the nature of the world—what can be said to exist ontologically —and about what is significant or insignificant or enduring rather than ephemeral,” still requires an Indigenous expansion (pg.4).
DRM, in many ways, forces traditional academic ideologies to clash with non-linear, non-Western ideologies, *but not crash*, meaning that they are two points of contention that force the user of the paradigms to reckon with these two Western-viewed “linear” opposites, while creating a space for this to transpire in.

Steans (1998) advocates for a “mapping-out” of knowledge-building, which she describes as the involvement of empirical research and theoretical debate within the academic community, which is driven by a desire to establish a degree of consensus about these matters (pg. 5). Again, DRM is a research paradigm, specifically, for application within non-Western communities that brings to the academic table, non-Western conceptions, ideologies, epistemologies; hence, axiological foundations, allowing a voice to transpire not currently heard within mainstream academia. Within this context, the need to establish social conventions for a specific community is required, but it must be an endeavor that is initiated by the community, and not the academy.

Still, it could be argued that a feminist framework is rooted in conventions, albeit, they are distinct from those established via a patriarchal view of the world (Flax, 1993). As such, gender roles can and should be analyzed explicitly, from the lens of sex/gender. By implementing a patriarchal perspective to this lens, it is suggested that pre-conceived and socio-culturally-set gender expectations contribute to the different life experiences we undergo as humans, which are unambiguously, a consequence of our sex, i.e., male gender roles and expectations – *Vis a’ Vis* -- female gender roles and expectations.

These socio-cultural concepts are comprised of detailed cultural and ethnic dogmas that have been pre-assigned to individuals at birth because of our sex. These later contribute to what we do as an individual as a result of societal expectations, which are ideals
embedded in socio-cultural norms as discussed in chapter one of this work. When we do not follow these conventions it becomes problematic for the group, and especially so for the individual, even in Indigenous and marginalized communities. If we take this a step further, to understand gender and race dynamics, the researcher can then incorporate this hypothesis of sorts to issues of race, as in the case of White (mainstream) populations-- Vis-à-Vis --with non-mainstream populations, i.e., Indigenous and marginalized populations, or gender, i.e. males-- Vis-à-Vis--females.

Relative to the use of DRM, it is crucial to understand these types of basic socio-cultural conceptions are instrumental in the study of human phenomenon, and the ability to apply them to issues found in education today can only behoove the research-advocate; however, much caution must be undertaken. This is why the frameworks have been made available to the research practitioner. With that said, as a critical aspect of DRM, in the following sections, the conceptual paradigms will be discussed, as well as the “DRM 15 Page Research Report”. Adherence to them is highly recommended because they facilitate the research process as they address some of the potential issues the research-advocate might come across in their research efforts with differing communities. These paradigms have been created as tools for research-advocates whose backgrounds might not be in social theory, sociology, or in the field of education.

Applying Concepts in Linguistics to Understand Issues of “Power” in Research: Synchronic and Diachronic Viewpoints

“As Stanfield (1999) and Scheurich & Young (1997) point out, a privileged absence of race in theory and research not only perpetuates Eurocentric privilege but it is also a form of epistemological racism.”

--Pillow (2003, Pg. 196)
It is important to consider the historic, Euro-American, White, legacy relative to research publications, peer-reviewed articles, review essays, and American/European textbooks that intentionally omit Indigenous history or the role of Indigenous peoples in formation of the “New World,” etc., that has impacted Indigenous/marginalized communities when traditional research methods have been conducted, or history has been Whitened, and then applied to and within Indigenous populations. Consider then, how such work has been presented to external entities? As discussed early in this dissertation, a diachronic view of culture, in general, allows for fluidity, whereas a synchronic perspective presumes that humans are stagnant and set, which is far from the truth, particularly, in regard to group dynamics. Still, it is worth considering how these two linguistic terms can easily apply to culture and society outside of the study of linguistics.

Contemplate the following parallel as related to the use of this term. Power as described by Flyvbjerg’s (1998) scholarship in *Rationality and Power*, who examines how power is used in practice within democracies. Flyvbjerg (2009) defines power “as the ability or capacity to perform or act effectively, including the situation where not to act is most effective (Pg. 1). As well, he adds the following:

In democracies, power is typically divided against itself, for instance in the classic tripartite division of power in legislative, executive, and judicial power. But in contemporary, pluralistic democracies the divisions of power go much further and power is not limited to the realm of formal politics. Issues of power pertain to markets, technologies, science, discourses, designs, fashions, self-improvement, etc. The result is that ‘power is everywhere; relations of power are omnipresent, multiple, and dynamic; they are not limited to ‘centers of power’, like government institutions, parliaments, or political parties (2009, Pg. 1).

In addition, Flyvbjerg (1998) argues that conflict is central to power dynamics. This definition of power easily rests on the ugly legacy of history, conquest, and colonization in which
Machiavellian (1517; 2003) ideas come into play; a man whose well-worn dissertation of old centered on this very unpleasant face of Power, (emphasis is on capital “P”) in his work titled *The Prince*.

Machiavelli’s premise in his 1517 treatise reminds us of a very ancient and important ideal centering on the fact that deception is sometimes better than force, which is a technique that has been practiced on the colonized of the world since time immemorial (Machiavelli, 2003, Chapter XVIII.). As that great strategist of old stated, “he (the leader of the state) must stick to the good so long as he can, but, being compelled by necessity, he must be ready to take the way of the evil” (Machiavelli, pg. 63). Expanding on this ideal of sorts, history and todays media outlets, helps us to understand and recognize, repeatedly, what power is really all about, and it is not pretty. Rather, it is about a continued *epistemological racism* so penetrating and powerful that it deludes us still in spite of time’s slow passing, to the point that we can no longer see it as such (Pillow, 2003).

Power is about deliberate division, the taking of land that does not belong to you; the raping and pillaging of communities; the changing of languages, religious belief systems, and cultures deliberately in an attempt to establish acculturation; a deliberate attempt to remove community epistemologies, group axiology, ontologies, etc…, in short, it is about the pernicious business of profiting for oneself by negating, or doing away with the *Other*. Indigenous people know this well. As that master of old, Machiavelli, taught us, there is no morality to power, and the end justifies the means. Moreover, powerholders understand that they must maintain that power at all costs as “Power” is exclusive and elusive, that is, power is difficult to have and to maintain-- with the exception of the 1% whose finances and clout insulate them.
That ancient beast, “Power”, becomes an even uglier creature when we enter into the arena of political and religious doctrine of which Machiavelli explained that power renounces morality and is maintained through deceitfulness and treachery. What is more, malevolent acts undertaken in order to maintain and preserve power are justified by the powerholder. In this way the power holder retains their place, their possessions and the possessions and goods of others, while managing to keep their place in that hierarchy of old, regardless of the manner in which this is achieved. Once again, the ends justify the means.

In Machiavellian terms, bottom-line results rests on the cruel, but simple, premise that man’s actions without law is judged on the results of the actions themselves. This definition, or expansion on the meaning of power, is more accurate in terms of Indigeneity, and marginalization. Within the lenses of “power”, and just who “holds this power”, of the two, which of these two definitions best suits the dissimilar concepts that divide synchronic and diachronic in terms of history and power? I would suggest that the powerholders prefer a more synchronic existence, as this allows them to preserve and sustain their power, as opposed to a diachronic existence, in which change is noted at some level, and then addressed. Besides, when viewing the world through a historical lens, does it not make much better sense to have a synchronic view of history, as opposed to a diachronic one? In so doing, much of history is left out, as is the “reality” of the historical matter. So, in these latter mentioned ways, the concepts behind the use of DRM in research are appropriate, and in fact, a robust way to view these types of phenomenon.

Although it could be argued that Indigenous groups are synchronic because, it is perceived by many traditionalists, i.e., anthropologists, old-school researchers, etc. that Indigenous and marginalized communities can be observed through a consistent view of their
own histories, culture, and socio-cultural practices, this is done without placing colonization into that formula. Conversely, I suggest that the argument has been made that colonialism has impacted the Indigenous group in ways that must be acknowledged and, more important, documented. Sometimes this impact is a point of division within participant group dynamics; therefore, it is an area of required exploration and cautious and deliberate consideration. As a result, several frameworks will be presented shortly that address these types of dilemmas.

Even so, power aside, it is equally important to recognize that DRM is meant to be communal, and should be approached as such, as the paradigm serves as a means of reciprocated potentiality, meaning that the potential to establish a two way relationship between the research-advocate and the community is a necessary aspect of DRM because it allows for the facilitating of such research in ways that is not currently done. This means that the research-advocate should make clear in the DRM fifteen-page research report (See: Section III) and project that the participant community is thriving, in spite of colonization’s impact—but there will be issues on many levels, for sure.

On the one hand, the interconnected nature of the research objective and the development of a potentially mutually respectful collaborative relationship from both the community and research-advocate perspective creates a space for healthy interaction and transformation, for both the research-advocate and the participant community; therefore, it should be a caring, nurturing, mutually reciprocated relationship that is encouraged by the research project and established between the research-advocate and the participant group because of that academic effort (Lavallée, 2009).

From a structural aspect concerning the research paper itself, a DRM approach incorporates the impact of colonialism and its unsolicited legacy on the participant group into
the corpus of the research work. DRM requires that the research address that history within the body of the completed research report, and it is information that is acquired and delivered in the participant group narrative and not some traditionalist textbook published for states like Texas, Arizona, or California. Respectively, the third aspect of DRM requires an “active” research approach in that the research-advocate must bring, or allow, for first steps to a viable solution, which is something that should be constantly addressed within the research endeavor. This is also addressed within the body of the research paper towards the end of the research report.

**Brief Discourse on Domination and Power in Research**

“I know that some of you, disgusted with Europe, with all that hideous mess which you did not witness by choice, are turning - oh! In no great numbers - toward America and getting used to looking upon that country as a possible liberator. "What a godsend" you think. "The bulldozers! The massive investments of capital! The roads! The ports!" "But American racism!" "So what? European racism in the colonies has inured us to it!" And there we are, ready to run the great Yankee risk. So, once again, be careful! American domination - the only domination from which one never recovers. I mean from which one never recovers unscarred.”

–Césaire, 1972

The DRM paradigm does not necessarily argue anything specific. What DRM facilitates is the much needed space in research methods that promotes the means to understand current socio-cultural, political, and economic dynamics found within Indigenous and marginalized participant groups through the incorporation of a profound understanding of the effects and impact of generational practices associated with imperialistic domination, capitalist eco-environmental factors, geopolitics, and the coming of more European colonizers; in short, the capital “C”, Colonization experience, which continues still in many ways all over the world.
There is no doubt that these are issues of great importance that must be incorporated into the research-advocate’s mind and into the research work for the reader audience; however, this knowledge must be a point of action and not inaction (Mavroudi, 2008). Aside of the impact colonization has left on the people, it has done the same to our planet, as many Indigenous activist and peoples recognize and understand. Césaire (1972) reflects on this in the following:

...And since you are talking about factories and industries, do you not see the tremendous factory hysterically spitting out its cinders in the heart of our forests or deep in the bush, the factory for the production of lackeys; do you not see the prodigious mechanization, the mechanization of man; the gigantic rape of everything intimate, undamaged, undefiled that, despoiled as we are, our human spirit has still managed to preserve; the machine, yes, have you never seen it, the machine for crushing, for grinding, for degrading peoples? (Césaire, 1972).

Césaire’s (1972) fierce words are intentionally used throughout this discourse because they serve as reminders of what colonization was like, and is like still, otherwise, our tendency to forget unpleasant histories disables our ability to understand the depth of this matter. For this reason it should be understood that DRM is an academic approach to research that contributes to, capital “D”, Decolonization. As such, the research-advocate must recognize and understand this very basic principle about the paradigm. Still, the DRM paradigm is meant to be a collaborative and healthy endeavor, despite the colonial aspect of it.

As work that must be done in collaboration and conjunction with the study participants (See Parrado-Rosselli’s (2007) as an example), a DRM approach to research situates itself on the fact that distinguished populations, as in the case of Indigenous and marginalized communities, in spite of their group distinctiveness, change within the context of modernity, i.e., group identity, socio-politically, and economically, aside of the colonial
trauma. This transpires as a consequence of modernity, which is a time in history where diversity is extended to just about every reach of the globe, still, there are distinctive characteristics between the Indigenous, and others.

One such distinction rests on the extraordinarily, non-Western, socio-cultural and religious elements of the Indigenous, as opposed to those of others. In this regard, DRM is designed uniquely for research endeavors with such populations; however, it is vital to recognize that this does not mean that there are not significant changes found within such populations. These too must be addressed in the research. Also, it is ill advised to attempt to apply a unifying element amongst Indigenous and marginalized groups, because there will always be diversity, even within the Indigenous world.

The fact that humans, as an evolutionary species, whether Indigenous, FPL’s (First Peoples of the Land) or mainstreamers, are continuously changing; therefore, these “factors of change” are forces at work which must be studied and discussed openly and addressed ethically, while connecting them to the educational phenomenon studied; hence, they are deemed diachronic points in society or community, that is—they are opportunities for reflection of the systemic changes humans have undergone since time immemorial, whether linguistic or cultural, or genetically. At this point the research advocate must flesh out the distinction between “as an effect, or consequence, of colonization” as opposed to “as an effect, or consequence, of change”.

As human beings, we are consistently reminded and reassured that as long as humans continue to exist, throughout successive points within our histories, change will be a vital part of our existence. The concerns that surround this is that power over others is a part of that existence, which is something that should always be reckoned with, even in research
methods. This fact will assist the research-advocate in distinguishing the differences between the two, change as an effect of colonization, and change as a consequence of modernity.

Along these same lines, although it is important to document socio-cultural and religious cross-cultural differences between groups in the field of education, an integral aspect of doing so requires that proper language be used. An understanding and respectful stance of the cultural worldview of the group studied is always required, as well as an all-encompassing understanding of the inner and inter-communal dynamics and, of course, the usage of the daily language of the participant group—all this must be approached so via a value-free system of study. These intricate considerations will allow for a more fruitful research collaborative, especially when there might be other matters that might interfere with the smooth progression of the research collaborative.

One such consideration is the possible tension that might exist between an “outsider” attempting to gain access to the community. Louis (2007) states that “Indigenous people need to protect themselves from further misrepresentation, misinterpretation, fragmentation, mystification, commodification, and simplification of Indigenous knowledge (Deloria, 1988, 1995; Sue & Sue, 1990; Moody, 1993; Grenier and International Centre (Canada), 1998; Mihesuah, 1998; Nakata, 1998; Bishop, 1999; Smith, G.H., 2000; Louis, 2007, pg. 132). As a Mestiza, I fully concur with these ideals so it should not come as a surprise that this possible “tension” of sorts might show itself. The point is to thresh them out with the community. This is achieved by sticking to the fundamental core principle of DRM, to always put the community’s best interest first.

By attempting to apply DRM into the research project methodology, it is made clear that from the perspective of the research-advocate, it is important that the research-
advocate come to understand the importance of self-identification relative to the participant
group. What this means is that while there might be a unified cohesiveness within the
community, in spite of this, each participant will be different, or separate, from that in one way
or another. Additionally, the research-advocate will have need to also self-identify themselves
and then find commonalities between the group members and the research-advocate, while
acknowledging any cultural/linguistic differences that might exist. At this point the beginnings
of a communal tie should be prompted by this event, with the understanding that the research
project is a means of bringing proper recognition to the group from the group’s perspective.
3.4 Valles’ Diachronic Research Methodologies (DRM)

“At the same time, the metaphoric structure of the non-White as savage is also circulated, and continues to circulate with some modification, within social science texts. In this structure, a hierarchy is established by metaphorically positioning the non-White subject as animal or uncivilized (see Perea, 1997; Takaki, 1993). The persistent coupling of non-White individuals and groups to this metaphor eventually comes to denote an ontology of the “Other”. These alleged traits of savagery are inscribed in the White imagination (Baldwin, 1955; Morrison, 1994). To be sure, this ontology was not one established by people of color for the purposes of describing themselves but was established by White society in its own self-interest (Morrison, 1994). In other words, the metaphorical structure of the "non-White as savage" is the institutionalization of an ontology of a non-White other through projections of discourse whose purpose it is, in all actuality, to define and fortify Whiteness...”

--Buendia, 2003, Pg. 56

The Vallès’ Critical Race theory (CRT) Framework (see: Appendix B, p. 423) for Use in Analyzing Racism is designed for better understanding the historical development of racism going back to ancient times, although DRM is not a race-centered methodology, it is important to recognize how racism has contributed to traditional research methods, as discussed by Buendia (2003) in the quote above. As such, the critical race analysis framework located below addresses how racism is produced in and outside of institutions.

This paradigm is best used in conjunction with educational systems analysis in order to place racism into an analytical context that can assist and contribute to the writing of the colonial/post-colonial aspect of the DRM research report in relation to racism. Certainly, the framework can be used within other contexts, i.e., effort in teaching about racism with students, either at the secondary level or at the university level; as a conceptual literary device, etc…; however, in the case of implementing DRM to a research project, this is only to be done with the approval of the community representatives. Although the paradigm can be used on an individual level, it is more useful as an exploratory tool, which allows it to be used inter-
handedly with other socio-cultural analysis subsets in order to analyze how racism and sexism develop and is maintained, accordingly.

Figure 3.4: Valles’ Critical Race Theory (CRT) Framework

The framework’s beginnings incorporate ancient Middle Eastern/Western histories. The time period covered begins with a pre-Christian, early Middle Eastern/Judeo
linear time frame going back to approximately 5000 BCE. During this early period, religious concepts first begin to rise and are traced back to ancient Sumerian creation stories, as they are the only type of written histories so far claimed by humanity, although I believe archeologists will come to find more in the near future.

Nevertheless, these stories consist of creation stories such as the *Shooter Eli sharrī*, otherwise known as *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, which is an Ancient Mid-Eastern epic poem in which a pre-Noah story of sorts is the basis of the effort. Other important “creation” recordings consist of Ancient Egyptian histories presented in efforts such as *The Egyptian Book of the Dead*, and ancient Mediterranean histories such as Homer’s *Iliad* or *Odysseus*, etc…in which, historically, we are returned to a period of time in human history wherein these stories lay the foundation to patriarchy.

For specific research collaboratives with an Indigenous or marginalized community, it is highly suggested that the research-advocate begin with the religious doctrines or concepts held by the community, which many times is sacred information as they are, sometimes, referred to as creation stories belonging to the community. These are often rooted in relevant historical details relative to where the community’s origins begin and how the community first began. Included into this is the ontology of the community, which will be nestled in the sacred stories. Dependent on the creation story, the role of primary “Gods” or “Godesses” will be explained. This is referred to as the ontology of the community. In some communities there might be a “pantheon” of higher beings whose role is clear and, in general, may have specific duties, attributes, and responsibilities.

Dependent on the number of the participants, and of course their gender, the gender aspect of the framework comes into actuality as it is probable that communities that
consist of a “goddess-like” female ontology or encompass females/female-figures serving as contributors to the sacred stories, then such communities will have a greater appreciation for the female sex. As discussed earlier, from communal ontology springs individual and family epistemologies, which begin to become clearer to the research-advocate, this allows for specific connections to begin to be made relative to the education phenomena.

In research partnerships with Indigenous communities, many of these types of stories are not written nor are they known outside of the community, they are generally sacred stories so revered that only a few tell them, and it is, in general, something that is done orally. No doubt that sacred stories are then shared in private spaces, for example at home between parents and the children, or with siblings and/or grandparents. The point is that the sacred stories become a vital part of the cohesiveness of the community and the commonality that sustains them during the harshest of times as discussed by Gross (2003). The sacred stories and the history community are central to the DRM paradigm; therefore, upon consultation with the community leaders, the research-advocate might have the opportunity to incorporate these types of pivotal communal histories to their work. However, it is stressed again, that this can only be done upon full consent of the community leaders and the community participants.

The sacred stories and communal history will also allow for a better understanding of gender dynamics, which may or may not come into the research parameter. The idea here is not to take a stand gender-wise, but to introduce the gender aspect to the educational phenomenon when required, otherwise, leave it alone. Unless the research is specific to gender, then DRM is specifically for education research that does not focus on gender issues. For that, the research-advocate should visit the DRM-Gender Specific Paradigm,
which I am not addressing fully in this particular proposal but has been specifically designed for gender analysis research.

Nevertheless, from the religious doctrine/theological framing, the next phase in the paradigm is the institutional one, which will reflect the religious doctrine/theological framing, which more than likely will allow for a better understanding of gender and racism. Again, this is not to be fully addressed in the research endeavor unless it is a vital aspect of the research phenomena itself. From here we move to epistemologies, which are consequences of the latter mentioned. In general, they are communal ideals located at the meso-level but are a significant aspect of identity formation at the micro-level.

Following this is the colonization facet of the community history. This particular feature of the paradigm is crucial, as should be understood by now. Once again, it is stressed that this is a collaborative effort and one that must be tread upon prudently and sensibly. It is the second component of the DRM framework; therefore, it will be crucial to attend to this with the most care and thoughtfulness. It is necessary to link this to the educational phenomena being researched.

The remainder of the paradigm focus will be work that is completed by the research-advocate based on the information that they receive from the community and its leaders. The model can be beneficial at the communal level, or at the macro or global level, dependent on the phenomena studied. “Output” is achieved when the phases are in sync and move forward. The “output” does not necessarily indicate racism within the community, how it might mean be applied is as a means to understand it from the point-of-view of the individual, the community, and the institutions that are centered within the community. Again, this is linked to the education phenomena being researched.
3.5 Additional Research Apparatus: Fanon’s Psycho-effective Response Model

“...By invoking the "universal Father" who gave rights to all men and stating with confidence that Jefferson agreed with him on that point, Banneker sent a clear message: The dueling sentiments expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the Notes on the State of Virginia cannot be reconciled. Having put both into the public discourse, it was Jefferson's responsibility to signal which view should guide the American experience...”

--Annette Gordon-Reed (1995)

In the following, another framework (see: Appendix H, p. 430) is introduced to the research-advocate which is meant to be used as an additive analysis tool for analysis related to the psycho-effective responses which come about as a consequence of colonization. Although I am not a psycho-therapist, nor am I trained in these fields, the model is created from academic efforts undertaken, specifically, in relation to a compendium of Indigenous writings on trauma as a consequence of colonization (Hardin, 1995; Cohn, 1996; Bender & Schorske, 1997; Brave Heart & DeBruyn, 1998; Lagemann, 2000; Sandoval, 2000; Mutua & Swadener, 2004; Spring, 2007; Tufiwa Smith 2008, 2012; Chilisa, 2012; Kovach, 2012; Lonetree, 2012; Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2012; Walter & Andersen, 2013). In fact, the basis of the model is Fanon’s seminal work in Black skin, white masks (Peau noire, masques blancs) (1952; 1967) and The wretched of the Earth (1962; 2001).

As such, I integrated central elements consistently found in academic discussion relative to the colonial experience from Black skin, white masks (Peau noire, masques blancs) (1952; 1967), which is perhaps the most well-known, and earliest, literary piece respective to the study of colonization. This particular proposal is one of the first literary discussions attributed to the psycho-pathological residuals of colonization and lays the groundwork for investigation of the multitude of psycho-socio and cultural pathologies that come to be as effects of the colonial experience, as a collective effect, as well as at the micro-level.
Not surprisingly, Fanon was the protégée of Césaire (1955; 1957), whose philosophies and labor are a vital aspect of this dissertation and is cited throughout this work. Césaire, like Fanon, was from Martinique. He published the powerful *Discours sur le colonialisme*, *(Discourse on Colonialism)* in 1955, translated into English in 1957. As mentioned previously, I made it a point to include his quotes throughout the dissertation because of his ability to remind the reader of the blatant reality and tragedy of colonization.

Though I claim no training in the area of psychoanalysis or counseling myself, Fanon was a psychiatrist/psychotherapist himself whose own personal experiences as a colonized Martinican lead to his most celebrated corpus, which is what the models are centered
on. As such, I simply followed what Fanon laid out in his seminal books on colonization, specifically, in terms of the psychological effects that colonization gives birth to as a consequence of its dehumanizing legacy, i.e., *Ecocide, genocide, culturicide, assimilation, separation and termination*. In addition, its damming affect as a collective trauma should also be recognized.

As Brave Heart & DeBruyn, (1998) discuss, as a consequence of the colonial experience, which is something that continues in subsequent generations, colonization contributes to “historical” unresolved grief, which leads to a psycho-social pathology that manifests itself perniciously in high rates of suicide and violence of differing types for many Indigenous people, including high rates of domestic violence and child abuse. Not surprisingly, there are additional socio-cultural factors that are a consequence of colonization such as a high incidence of alcoholism and drug use, as well as other additional socio-economic problems such as high rates of poverty and failing health among Indigenous peoples located all over the planet.

As Brave Heart & DeBruyn, (1998) explain, many of the social ills found among Indigenous communities are predominantly due to a legacy of chronic trauma and unresolved grief which spans across generations and geographic spaces, so clearly, psycho-socio issues can and should be linked to the phenomena that arises from the intentional dehumanizing and deliberately suppression that comes with unwarranted war and conquest.

One of the main purposes associated with the designing of this particular paradigm was the deliberate intention of guiding; hence, assisting, the research-advocate in understanding how humans develop psychologically as a consequence of life experiences. Accordingly, our reactions to these life experiences determine our individual development and
growth, which contribute to our “Psycho-effective Response” development. This then contributes to how we handle reality, or day to day problems, which we either engage with or become resistant to.

As seen in the model below, Fanon’s (1952; 1962; 1967; 2001) scholarship suggests that there are, initially, two personal experience levels that initiate an individual’s psyche-development. The first of these is referred to as the “Primary Experience” level in which we ground ourselves on what we look like, that is, our individual physical appearance. These important individual characteristics such as hair and eye color, skin tone, height, body structure, etc…, allow for the development of a sense of “self” in humans. Additional vital aspects of the “Primary Experience” level include our imaginative, or creative, qualities as well. Another “Primary Experience” attribute is our emotions.

According to Fanon, these are primary self-identifiers that lay the foundation for layering aspects of self-identity formation. How we perceive our physical appearance can be detrimental to the self, and to how others perceive us. A “Secondary Experience” level consists of historical events that impact the individual, as well as the socio-cultural experiences that result because of the historical. From there we move forward to the “Individual Development & Growth Phase” wherein individual and group political experiences layer on top of the latter mentioned. How individuals fare at this level will be reflected in their judgment and reactions to the events that take place around them. This also contributes to the development of individual ethics, what we will and will not do morally is initially a consequence of this phase. Herein is where the core of individual development is situated, in the psycho-effective response realm, according to Fanon’s theories. This will manifest itself
relative to how we deal with reality, which is the output phase of the model. We will either engage with reality, resist reality, or become inauthentic in our dealings with reality.

In this regard the paradigm can be useful in individual or group reflection for purposes of the research project. I think that at this point the research-advocate should be able to better understand how the psycho-effective response can influence students and their progression in attaining education; therefore, I do believe that the model, again, which is fully attributed to Fanon’s brilliant can facilitate the research and bring forth relevant information that the community can use to address potential issues found in, specifically, youth and education.

To be clear, the model is not to be used in any manner except as a tool to better understand and address psycho-socio, cultural events that transpire as a consequence of colonization and the history that is inherited because of that, generationally, for purposes of the education research project. I want to reemphasize the importance of attempting to deal with psychological issues in research. This is an area that the research-advocate should stay away from unless they are trained and licensed to do research in these areas. What can be done is that the research-advocate can acquire a partnership that brings to the community an appropriate health care worker, or workers, who will fit in appropriately with each respective community.

![Figure 3.6: Diachronic Research Methodology (DRM) Discussion Visual](image)
3.4 The Diachronic Research Methodologies 15-Page Research Project Report

“Ultimately, returning to the use of the metaphor of “Indigenous ways”-- within a variety of means, Indigenous Research Methods are about the acquisition of fire and tools.”

---E. Vallès (2015)

In the following, the “DRM 15-Page Research Project Report” (see: Section III) will be discussed. It is recommended that the tools offered thus far be used, when required, conjunctively with the “DRM 15-Page Research Project Report”. The report is meant to be used as a guide for the research-advocate. It is highly recommended that the research-advocate become familiar with the report as they will need to present it to the community that they anticipate collaborating with during the project.

The, optional, fifteen-page report will be discussed in the subsequent section through the use of “snapshots”, which are minimized photos of the document. The full report is located in Section III of this proposal and is comprised of three primary sections designed to keep the research-advocate centered on the needs of the research project and are listed below. A step-by-step guide to using the framework is included as well. It is highly recommended that the research-advocate become familiar with the paradigm first, and then the fifteen-page report before arranging to meet with any potential community that they might want to collaborate with. This is recommended, but in the end up to the research-advocate.

As already discussed thoroughly throughout this academic effort, the three primary sections of the report are centered on the actual DRM paradigm which are as shown below via the frame model. The visual below is included for clarity and consists of the following attributes:

1.) Quantitative Data: Provided by Education Institution or Institution

2.) Colonial/Post-Colonial History: as Presented Collaboratively by
Participant Community

3.) \textit{Plan of Action:} Used to Address Phenomenon Studied, i.e., a grant that allows for the results of the phenomenon studied to be improved or addressed further

\textit{Diachronic Research Methodology, Application: Relative to Report}

In order to complete the \textit{Diachronic Research Methodology (DRM) 15-Page Report} (see: Section III), all three segments of the DRM paradigm must be completed in their entirety. The majority of the effort to be undertaken within the research process is done collaboratively with the study participants and community members. This can be accomplished in a variety of ways. For interviews and group discussions, one such way could be at a communal event with specifically designed for particular work with respective parties, i.e., only tribal leaders/representatives, group participants, women, teachers, etc. This is recommended at the initial stages of acceptance to the community so that the community can become familiar with the research-advocate, and vice-versa.

It should be made clear that Internal Review Board (IRB) requirements must be adhered to at every phase of the project. Additionally, the research-advocate should become intimately acquainted with the entire packet as they will be sharing it with others and should have some type of “plan” worked out before actually arranging meetings with others. Moreover, the packet will need to be made available to the potential participant community when the research-advocate begins seeking-out a viable research site.

\textit{Pre-phase of the Project (Step 1)}

For the pre-phase of the project, the DRM 15 Page Research Report will require that the research-advocate understand and attend to the following:

- The Research-Advocate must approach the community for permission to work with them at least six months to one year before the project begins
Upon acceptance, research project timelines should be tentatively set by interested parties. The forms should be filled out by the Principal Research-Advocate in collaboration with Research Project leaders and representatives. The forms are, specifically, for use with Research Project Tribal Elders, Community Representatives, and Participant Groups. The packet should be filled-out prior to the beginning of the Research Project, to the extent most possible. The packet should serve as a contract between the Research Project Community Leaders, Tribal Councils, Research Project participants and the (and the Research-Advocate’s sponsor(s)) Research-Advocate.

**Project Research-Advocate Information**

Name/Title:

________________________________________________________________________

Project Role:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Project Responsibilities:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Sponsor University:

________________________________________________________________________

Sponsor University Contact Person:  __________________________________________

Sponsor Phone Number:  ______________________________________________________

**Research-Advocate Contact Information:**

Address:

________________________________________________________________________
• **Towards completion of the research project**, the packet should be filled-out collaboratively.
• Upon the signing of the forms, copies of the packet in its entirety should be given to all primary Research Project principals, (to include Institution Representatives), Tribal Councils, Community Leaders, and Research Project participant representatives
• **Please Note:** The Internal Review Board (IRB) process is not a component of this report and should be addressed separately with Tribal Council, Community Leaders, and Group Participants

**INSTRUCTIONS:** By the time that the research advocate has come to this phase of the research project, the research-advocate should have a community agreement with the participant community established. Additionally, the research subject should be set, acknowledged, and agreed upon by the community leaders and the research advocate. It is at this time that the DRM 15 Page Research Report should be filled out.
**Sponsor Institution Information**

Name of Institution Represented: ________________________________________________

Name/Title of Supporting Faculty Member or Chair: ________________________________

Sponsor Department: ___________________________________________________________

Institution Address: ____________________________________________________________

City: __________________________ State: __________________________

Zip Code: ________________

Phone Number: ___________________ Email Address: ____________________________

**Community Contact Information**

Name and Title of Primary Community Representative(s):

_________________________________________  ______________________________

_________________________________________  ______________________________

_________________________________________  ______________________________

Name/Title of Supporting Community Member or Council:

_________________________________________  ______________________________

_________________________________________  ______________________________
Pre-Phase Required Information (Step 2)

Please Note: Upon reviewing the above section, the research-advocate should attend to filling out the first section of the packet up to the section titled “Pre-Phase Required Information (Steps 1-4)” of the DRM 15 Page Research Report.

Pre-Phase Required Information (Step 3)

Research Project Detail Report

Procedure to follow: This section will consist of open-ended questions which should be completed with the community leaders. The research-advocate should be familiar with this section and prepared to answer the community leader’s questions.

The research-advocate should also be familiar with the DRM process. Be sure to explain to the community representatives that this section is a preliminary agreement which can be modified at any time; however, it can also be a means of keeping the project up-to-date.
and on track, therefore, upon completion of the sections, the research-advocate is responsible for supplying the community leaders with an up-to-date copy of this section of the packet.

As this section of the packet is subject to change at any time in the project timeline at the request of the community, it is highly advised that the research-advocate Xerox this section throughout its use and furnish the community leaders with a hard copy of the updated version. Although this section can be used electronically, it is suggested that it not be and instead kept as a “live” agreement between the research-advocate and the participant community, and their leaders. Upon completing these sections, the packet is ready for detailed work for the “first Phase” of the research project which covers the data process of the exertion. Be sure to follow any and all *Internal Review Board (IRB)* criterion with all parties involved, this includes the university, if one is laboring through one; the participant community, if one requires it; and any schools or school districts involved. Please be sure to keep *IRB* information up-to-date and readily accessible.

The following section addresses the actual *DRM* paradigm in which the three specific segments of the design are implemented. These three sections are as follows:

1.) Data collection/Analysis specific to the education phenomenon

2.) Colonial/post-colonial history of the community as told by the community leaders/elders, etc…

3.) Third-party collaborative, agreed upon and approved by the community leaders

The subsequent sections allow for the research-advocate to document this information and to share it with the primary community leaders that they are working with closely. The *DRM 15 Page Research Report* (see: Section III) can serve as a reference document and a document of agreement that can be altered at any point between the community
and the research-advocate. This does not apply to the third-party collaborative, as these are generally agreements agreed upon between the third-party and the research-advocate—and, specific to the education phenomenon being researched; this is why it is imperative that the participant leaders agree with the phase of the project beforehand. As a reminder, in spite of this, the document should be viewed as a flexible agreement.

All research tools offered in this chapter are optional and are designed to assist the novice researcher in work with the application of DRM. Research tools can be used alone, combined, or the research-advocate might choose not to use them at all in the research collaborative. Again, the tools are optional. However, they are designed to facilitate the novice researcher specifically in work with Native tribes and organized marginalized communities.
3.7 Research Project Detail Report, Covering Sections I-III of the Fifteen Page Report: Process to Follow

Data Collection

Step 1: Please refer to the document located in the section titled DRM 15 Page Project Report:

Instructions

In referring to this section of the document, please be sure to fill this out with the assistance of the individual, or party, assigned by the community leaders who will be handling the data component of the research project. This too should be a collaborative endeavor in which all parties concerned have a role in its completion. Essentially, this section addresses how the research project data will be used.

In an attempt to avoid repeated IRB office visits, it is recommended that this section be filled out as accurately as possible. If done so from the beginning, this will alleviate the need for additional office visits, unless they are necessary or an extension of the research project. If there are any questions that require verification relative to the data itself, it is highly recommended that this be done electronically whenever possible. In addition, any written exchanges dealing with the data should be kept as part of the package, in case there is need to return to them for verification purposes. Again, any IRB documentation that is required as a part of the project should be kept with these documents in a safe place, as applies to the entire package. Once signatures are included on the documents, the packet should be kept under lock and key with only a few directly connected individuals having access to them.

At the end of this section in the packet, there is a short section that has been left blank for the use of the research-advocate. It is recommended that the research-advocate use this section of the document to keep up with any and all information relevant to the data. It is further
suggested that the upkeep of dates be a vital part of the record-keeping process as it will be necessary to refer to them at a later date. In the midst of activity, it is possible that this might not be followed, however, I reemphasize the need, and importance, of doing so as it might be necessary to pinpoint a specific date regarding an urgent matter about the data.

Next Steps

In the following section the research-advocate will be addressing the colonial/post-colonial history of the community in connection to the education phenomenon being researched. It is the responsibility of the research-advocate to find the linkages that establish the connection. The use of social theory and/or experience working in the field of education should lend itself to the ability to complete this task successfully; however, the research-advocate should understand that this phase of the project research has the potential to become the most challenging one as it will be dealing with human phenomenon in direction connection to the history of colonization. The research-advocate is encouraged to have read the latest scholarship of Indigenous researchers who have written about this aspect of research phenomenon generally referred to as cultural trauma.

Additionally, it is highly recommended that the research-advocate have established a mutually beneficial work relationship with the community as their role in this phase of the research project is pertinent and necessary, especially since they must approve all information gleaned from focus group sessions. It is suggested that, if at all possible, such members of the community participate in every focus group session of this phase. This will allow for clarity and the continuation and completion of this phase in the most efficient ways.

Colonial/Postcolonial Guidelines

*Diachronic Research Methodology (DRM) Research Project Collaborative: Colonial/Post-Colonial Discussion & Agreement Form:*
Instructions:

In this section, adhering to the DRM paradigm, the Project Research-Advocate and Research Project Community Representatives must collaboratively discuss the following:

The Research-Advocate should document “agreed upon” discussion throughout the process and keep consistent and accurate reports for continued exchange with community leaders, group participants at each oral exchange/ceremony. This information is to be kept confidential and only exchanged with community leaders and group participants. In addition, the Research-Advocate should provide the reports to the community in hard copy format at each new oral exchange session for their approval before continuing renewed discussion.

It is recommended that this be done at the beginning of the new oral exchange session and that the Research-Advocate not proceed with new discussion until the hard copy format has been fully addressed and approved by all present. As an important part of the research process, the research-advocate should keep these reports in a secure area and not share with anyone else aside of the parties previously mentioned. Adhering to DRM, the research-advocate should address and document the following:

1.) Data Offered:

- How was data collected?
- How has data been verified by community and Research-Advocate?
- How will data be used?
- Significance of data results
- Implications of data results
- How does community view the data results?
- What does the community want in relation to Research Project data results?
- How will the Research-Advocate address those needs?
- What does the Research-Advocate offer the community in direct relation to the data results?

2.) Colonial/Post-Colonial History directly related to phenomenon
The Research-Advocate must ensure that the concept of “colonial/post-colonial” is understood and agreed upon by community leaders and group participants.

The Research-Advocate must connect data results with current community needs and potential challenges.

The Research-Advocate must address these needs with community leaders in order to find a means of rectifying/addressing the phenomenon.

The Research-Advocate must understand the needs of the community via group discussion, site visits, additional data exchanges, comparative/analytical studies.

Based on oral exchanges with community leaders and group participants, the Research-Advocate must document discussions and present to community members and group participants agreed upon documented reports that reflect the inner community view of the phenomenon in order to ensure the accuracy regarding the impact of colonial/post-colonial experience.

The Research-Advocate should refrain from using recording devices, photographs, video/audio tapings, or mainstream documentation, unless presented to community leaders and group participants for approval and implementation into the documented report.

Such productions should reflect positive aspects of the community and should be approved by community leaders in tandem with reports.

The Research-Advocate must furnish community leaders with a completed Research Project hard copy for final approval before any type of publication or external exchange opportunities.

Section II Instructions:

3.) The Research-Advocate and community leaders must discuss and agree upon the grant project/learning exchange offered by the Research-Advocate to the community. A clear understanding of the grant project/learning exchange must be presented to community and documented within this packet and should be addressed as follows:

- Does the community fully understand the results of the phenomenon studied?
- Has the Research-Advocate addressed the ways in which the phenomenon can be addressed, or countered, with community representatives?
- Does the Research-Advocate offer a plan of action specifically for the phenomenon studied?
- What does the Research-Advocate offer within the plan of action that might adversely, unintentionally, affect the community?
- In conjunction with community leaders and group participants, the research-advocate must address any unintentional negative implications that might result due to phenomenon in order to address and rectify the possibility of negatively impacting the community.
- The Research-Advocate must discuss confidentiality with community, and address potential issues so that they can be avoided.
● Grant/learning exchange must be documented using this report, prior to any publication of the Research Project work
● The Research-Advocate must offer a concrete time frame for the grant/learning exchange
● The Research-Advocate must address the grant project/learning exchange in the body of the competed publications, which must be approved by community leaders/Tribal Councils/community representatives.

Additional Specifics to Consider:

This concludes Section II of the report. As discussed in specific sections relative to this particular section, this particular section is key to the diachronizational/decolonial aspect of DRM as it is the section that addressed the colonial and post-colonial history of the group, as well as the use of sacred stories. Again, all effort undertaken in this particular section must adhere to the following:

1.) Be collaboratively acquired
2.) Reflect the history of the community from their perspective
3.) Be linked to the education phenomenon
4.) Adhere to the community’s specific instructions as to how to incorporate it into the work
5.) Approved by the community upon its completion
6.) Adhere to these details, when used for publication purposes
7.) Must be approved for use outside of this context
8.) Any additional agreements should be completed in writing and added to the packet

Diachronic Research Methodology (DRM) Grant Project & Third Parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Project Information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Supervisor*:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Phone:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Procedure**

In this particular section, the collaborative or grant funded project is discussed and recorded. The research advocate should describe the grant project that will be offered to the community studied and the time frames in which the collaborative is expected to last. As such, the community representatives should take a role in its completion. All required signatures will be recorded, and the document should be kept under lock and key with only a limited people having access to it.

Dependent on the type of collaborative agreed upon, all details of the research project should be discussed with the community/community leaders before filling out this section. This can entail miniscule details, as it should; however, filling out this section can only be completed upon having acquired the grant or the collaborative, so it is highly likely that this section will be filled out before the actual research collaborative begins.

In the case of a grant, it is more than likely that the grant funders will want something in exchange for the funding or for whatever it is they supply to the community. These types of specifics should be pre-arranged and pre-discussed with the community as their approval is required before accepting any grant. So, it behooves the research-advocate to plan, and plan, and plan, relative to this process as it is very serious business once the third party
enters into the existing collaboration between the community and the research-advocate. Of course, it will be difficult to fill out this section if the research-advocate is accepted into a community without the grant or collaborative. This might be a prudent approach, but one that will require a long-term relationship between the research-advocate and the community.

In other cases, it might come to be that the research-advocate already comes with a grant or collaborative. In following the *DRM* criterion, that grant, or collaborative, would need to be approved by the community participants post-awarding, so it is a good idea to be upfront about all these matters with the community, and, of course, the grant funder. To do otherwise is potentially problematic. The collaborative should be approached as a celebratory event as it will bring additional resources to the community that will assist in addressing the research phenomenon.

In addition, the collaborative can actually be a first-step endeavor between the grant funder, institution, or both that could, possibly, be the beginning of a long-term relationship between the grant funder/s and the participant community, so the role of the research-advocate will be an important one in attempting to setting the project off in the most productive manner possible. In the following are examples of projects that could be pursued:

1. High school-to-college bridging program
2. Mother-daughter/father-son district project
3. University to community tutoring program
4. Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Collaborative
5. Gender Equity Collaborative
6. Reading program, to include books, software, computers for use in the community
7. Indigenous studies partnerships with public schools- university\ties
8. Mental health collaborative
9. Indigenous studies doctoral program collaborative (research)
10. Indigenous medical program collaborative
11. Indigenous art museum collaborative
12. Indigenous environmental project

The above listing demonstrates several potential collaboratives that could
enhance the community by promoting education, specialized training in fields which current
demographics reflect a lack of Indigenous peoples, and, they are opportunities that promote
Indigenous ways outside of the community. I have no doubt such collaboratives will open doors
for the community in ways not currently done. All of these projects have the potential to promote
a transformative and healthy worldview that holds Indigenous epistemologies dear. Moreover,
these opportunities allow for Indigenous communities to support their community members so
that they can step outside of the Indigenous space, and come back to it again, should they choose
to.
3.6 Chapter Conclusions

The above section concludes arguments made for the use of DRM. Additionally, it has covered the three objectives of DRM, which are as follows:

1.) Data collection/Analysis specific to the education phenomenon

2.) Colonial/post-colonial history of the community as told by the community leaders/elders, etc...

3.) Third-party collaborative, agreed upon and approved by the community leaders

Additionally, this section has covered the Nine Core Components (NCC’s) of DRM, which are as follows:

1: Axiology is Reflective and Appropriate to Community

2. Cosmology is Reflective and Specific to Community

3. Epistemologically is Appropriate for Community

4: Work Produced is Ontologically-Sound

5. Non-Western/European Conceptualization of Time & Space are recognized and addressed when necessary

6. Work is Communal, Involves Community

7: Work is Ceremonial

8: Work Does Not Objectify

9: Work Serves as a Nexus –a meeting point between Community, Research-Advocate, and Potential Third Parties

Finally, this chapter offers the novice researcher, and others who choose to incorporate into their research collaboratives, what is deemed as the necessary tools for conducting the collaborative. In the following section, the DRM paradigm will be applied to an actual research collaborative.
CHAPTER 4. THE RESEARCH COLLABORATIVE: APPLYING DIACRONIC RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.0 Part I: Background Information Specific to the Research Collaborative

In order to test the feasibility, reliability, validity, and replicability of the Diachronic Research Methodology, (DRM), framework; in this chapter, (Ch IV), what is presented throughout the following sections is an the research collaborative that has been established between the Oglala Lakota Culture & Economic Revitalization Initiative (OLCERI) organization of Pine Ridge, South Dakota, and myself. OLCERI is headed by Bryan Deans, an Oglala Lakota Sioux tribal elder. In addition, OLCERI consists of a Board of Directors who work in tandem with each other in order to address the needs of the Oglala Lakota community of Pine Ridge. Other OLCERI partners/collaborators consist of, but is not limited to, TIYOSPAYE WINYAN MAKA, Engineers Without Borders, The Coordinating Committee of International Voluntary Services (CCVIS), Grow Permaculture, Come to Life, RE-member and others.

I first met Bryan Deans (and others), initially, in La Union, New Mexico, during the one week eco-fest. As I am, personally, invested in creating positive change for our planet, both from a social-justice and environmental justice standpoint, I was serving the community while learning how to build eco-friendly latrines, which mirrors the OLCERI service learning approach to teaching/learning. Upon discussing the DRM framework orally with him and others, then following up with the paradigm in writing at a later date, we addressed potential avenues in which the application of DRM might be able to assist in the important work OLCERI is committed to on the Pine Ridge Reservation, also referred to as “the Rez”. Subsequently, Deans and the OLCERI Board of Directors allowed access and a venue for the Diachronic
Research Methodology (DRM) framework to be applied to. Thus, the research collaborative was set with an invitation opened up for me to go to Pine Ridge. Upon my arrival and stay on Pine Ridge, the collaborative was established. To be clear, the collaborative is specific to work with OLCERI and not the tribal council. It is for this reason that I was able to receive “IRB exemption-status” from the university. Had I been allowed the opportunity to work directly with the tribal council, IRB requirements would have been quite different.

As recognized by US researchers, any type of research collaborative with US Native communities requires a variety of stringent Internal Review Board procedural processes at the University, federal-level, and at the tribal-level. Although I, too, will follow IRB protocol, it will only be at the University-level and it is with specific stipulations that I will be allowed to commit to the partnership. At the same time, because of this fact, entry to Pine Ridge is specific to OLCERI and the district in which it is located in; hence, it will not require going through the tribal council nor the US Federal government IRB system.

As a consequence of early US-Native relations that went drastically awry, it should be emphasized that US Native communities are extremely reluctant to work with “outsiders”, of which I am considered as one, in spite of my Mestizo genetic heritage. OLCERI facilitated this fact and in so doing I was able to enter into Pine Ridge by means of the OLCERI collaborative. As far as IRB status applies to the collaborative, full exemption status will facilitate the collaborative, while limiting what I can and cannot do within the research exchange.

---

40 “The Oglala Sioux Tribe’s government is comprised of a twenty-member council, who are elected officials in accordance with the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934. The Executive Officers of the Council are the President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer. Primary elections are held in October and the General election in November every two years. Council members serve a term of two years. There are nine election districts on the reservation. One representative is elected for every 1,000 tribal members…” Quote Source: Oglala Lakota Nation Website: https://www.oglalalakotanation.info/government.html.
41 Spanish originating term, meaning of mixed genetic ancestry consisting of Indigenous and European, specific to the content now called “America”.
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Pine Ridge’s Nine Districts

To better understand this, it is important to explain that Pine Ridge is divided into nine districts. Those districts are as follows:

- Eagle Nest District
- Lacreek District
- Medicine Root District
- Oglala District
- Pass Creek District
- Pine Ridge District
- Porcupine District
- Wakpamni District
- Wounded Knee District

Each district elects their own president and officers alongside that of the tribal council representatives. OLCERI is located in the Wakpamni District, which is the community that the collaborative is centered in; however, it is acknowledged, following the Lakota ways, that what benefits OLCERI is shared with others outside of Wakpamni. With this first disclosure, emphasis is made that this research collaborative is with the OLCERI organization located in Wakpamni.
The Great Sioux Nation: The above map represents the “reservation” divisions of The Great Sioux Nation. The Pine Ridge Reservation is a vital part of the Great Sioux Nation which consists of the following reservations:

- Oglala (Pine Ridge Indian Reservation)
- Síčangu (Rosebud Indian Reservation)
- Hunkpapa (Standing Rock Indian Reservation/Cheyenne River Indian Reservation)
- Minniconjou (Cheyenne River Indian Reservation)
- Sans Arc (Cheyenne River Indian Reservation)
- Two Kettles (Cheyenne River Indian Reservation)
- Crow Creek Indian Reservation
- Lower Brule Indian Reservation
The Great Sioux Nation stems from seven, main, Native tribal “bands”, referred to as the Seven Council Fires, according to Gaines (2000). These tribal divisions are as follows:

1.) The Mdewkanto (*Dakota Language*)
2.) The Wahpeton (*Dakota Language*)
3.) The Wahpekute (*Dakota Language*)
4.) The Sisseton (*Dakota Language*)
5.) The Yankton (Nakota Language)
6.) The Yanktoni (Nakota Language)
   a.) Upper Yanktoni
   b.) Lower Yanktoni or Hunkpatina
7.) The Teton (Lakota Language)
   a.) Brule—upper & lower
   b.) Hunkpapa
   c.) Miniconjou
   d.) Oglala
   e.) Oahenonpa or Two Kettle
   f.) Sans Arc
   g.) Sihasapa or Black foot

Gaines (2000) states that the Sioux are divided into three groups called the Dakota, Nakota, and Lakota, (2000: 4). In the 1700’s, French traders and trappers will begin to refer to them as the “Sioux”, which means ‘little snakes’ or ‘lesser enemies’ in Ojibwa, according to Gaines” (pg. 4). As Bryan Deans elucidated, the distinctions amongst these three divisions, Dakota, Nakota, and Lakota, is consequential of the differing dialects of the languages each group speaks, respectively. Linguistically, each group incorporates a variation of dialects specific to the present-day Lakota language. The Oglala Lakota of today state that the current Lakota community originates from five bands, and not seven, according to Deans

---

42 **Source:** Mails, T.E. (1973). According to Mails, “...the Black Foot are also known as “Two Pipes” as well (pgs. 226-27).

43 **Source:** Gaines (2000, pg. 4).
(2019 conversations). As such, Pine Ridge is home of the Oglala Lakota, a tribe that is a part of The Great Sioux Nation.44

The Oglala Lakota, like US Natives located throughout the Northern American continent, will be impacted by two, early, major treaties, The Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868, and the Dawes Act of 1887. In the 20th Century, US Natives will be directly impacted by the “Termination and Relocation Policy,” under Federal Indian Policy, 1945-1960, which will be The 1861 Fort Laramie Treaty.45

To better understand power distribution at the Pine Ridge Reservation-level, in general, the Pine Ridge District “presidents” call, oversee, and head, respective, district meetings regarding all matters pertinent to their respective community. Consequently, they are a vital part of how governing takes place on the Rez. Each district, at the community’s discretion, consults with representatives of the US Department of the Interior (DOI) whose responsibility it is to:

- conserve and manage “the Nation’s natural resources and cultural heritage for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people,
- provides scientific and other information about natural resources and natural hazards to address societal challenges and create opportunities for the American people,
- and honors the Nation’s trust responsibilities or special commitments to American Indians, Alaska Natives, and affiliated island communities to help them prosper,” as stated. All this according to the DOI Website. 46

Nonetheless, it is important to recognize the long history of colonial institutionalization when considering the current status of US Native affairs and the highly

---


46 US Department of the Interior Website: https://www.doi.gov/about
questionable role of the DOI and its impact on US Native communities. Just as important, from
the perspective of the DOI, following US long-held practices of colonial institutionalization
reinforcement, it should be noted that the emphasis on their website “mission” statement seems
to be on “the American people” as opposed to the tribal nation members it is supposed to serve.

In regard to matters of local interest, district representatives “can also make
recommendations to the tribal council, or the superintendent, or to the Commissioner of Indian
Affairs”. District presidents/leaders “undertake and manage local enterprises in furtherance of
the purposes set forth in the preamble” of the Oglala Lakota Nation’s Constitution.47 Also,
district leaders “may levy assessments upon members of the district, may expend moneys in the
district treasury for the benefit of the district, may keep a roll of those members of the tribe
affiliated with the district, and may exercise such further powers as may be delegated to districts
by the tribal council…,” this is, as explained, according to the Oglala Lakota Nation’s Tribal
Website.48 At the least, on paper.

In a very short retelling, this is the “power” that district leaders hold under the
Oglala Lakota Nation Constitution,49 which is important to understand when assessing the ways
in which power is distributed within this particular Nation, while emphasizing that each
Indigenous community located within the US will have distinct approaches to governance
unlike this one. Once again, this chapter only covers Pine Ridge and what their Nations’
constitution directs respective to power distribution. In relation to this, other specifics, relative

---

47 For further see: National Indian Law Library, TRIBAL LAW GATEWAY | OGLALA SIOUX TRIBE
https://narf.org/nill/constitutions/oglala_sioux/index.html  Also see: TRIBAL CONSTITUTION, Direct Website URL link located at:
https://narf.org/nill/constitutions/oglala_sioux/index.html
councils shall not be inconsistent with the constitution and by-laws, and ordinances of the tribe.” – ARTICLE VI – DISTRICT ORGANIZATION
OST Constitution and By-Laws (Amended 2008)
49 For Further See: CONSTITUTION, Direct Website URL Link located at: https://narf.org/nill/constitutions/oglala_sioux/index.html
to power, to be considered will be presented in Section 4.1 of this work, which discusses the first component of the DRM framework.

Institutional Review Board Procedural Background Information on the OLCERI Collaboration

In compliance with the National Research Act of 1974 and as mandated by The Office of Human Research Protections under the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and in acknowledgement of the University of Texas, Internal Review Board (IRB), regarding IRB requirements\textsuperscript{50} for the OLCERI-Valles collaborative; upon meeting with the University of Texas,’ Internal Review Board representative, Ramirez, I will, eventually receive “exemption status” with the following mandated stipulations specific to my collaborative work with OLCERI:

- No original pictures or recordings of any type can be taken or used by me outside of the University IRB approved questionnaire
- Only use of already public information/data/recording/videos/website content, etc…, is permitted for publication purposes
- An University of Texas IRB approved questionnaire (See Appendix) is the basis of the questions allowed in the collaborative “diachronization” interview and can be recorded for verification/preservation of interview for research-advocate purposes only
- Video recording cannot be posted anywhere or used outside of this specification.

\textsuperscript{50} The IRB was approved in March of 2018 with these stipulations (See: Appendix for email)
4.1 Part II: The Research Collaborative Partnership: Introduction to the Oglala Lakota Cultural & Economic Revitalization Initiative (OLCERI)

As previously discussed in earlier chapters, the DRM framework is a research paradigm proposed for work with Indigenous/marginalized communities specific to education; however, the DRM paradigm can be used in other socio-cultural situated research collaboratives. To reiterate, the DRM framework consists of nine core components and three specific objectives, as has been previously discussed in earlier chapters. As a reminder, the three objectives are centered on the nine core components and are as follows:

The first objective (Section 4.1) of the DRM framework consists of the collection and sharing of data/demographics for the Pine Ridge Reservation which has been provided to me by ReMember upon Bryan Dean’s request. Additional data specific to the Pine Ridge community has been provided to me via the Oyate Omniciye, Oglala Lakota Plan, which Bryan spear-headed decades ago and has, generously, shared with others, as well as myself. Additional data and information as found throughout the next two chapters will be provided with sources appropriately cited.

The second objective (Section 4.2) of the DRM framework is the diachronical history of the Oglala Lakota Sioux community of Pine Ridge, as narrated by Bryan Deans. This section consists of the “diachronizational” history of the community currently living on the Pine Ridge Reservation. This, too, will be shared with the reader in a subsequent chapter.

Finally, as to the third DRM objective, the internal and external research collaboratives and exchanges: this information will be shared in Section 4.3 of this work specific to any additional collaboratives OLCERI and the research-advocate have undertaken together in their continued efforts in addressing and bringing additional resources to the Pine Ridge Community.
Background Information on Oglala Lakota Cultural & Economic Revitalization Initiative (OLCERI):

Bryan Deans is the founder and director of the Oglala Lakota Cultural & Economic Revitalization Initiative (OLCERI), which is located in Slim Buttes in the Wakpamni District, on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation (Rez) of “The Great Sioux Nation. Just as important, Bryan Deans is the nephew of the late, honorable Wilmer “Stampede” Mesteth, who was greatly admired and trusted by all and honored for his wisdom. “Uncle Wilmer Stampede” was tribal “Thpo,” which is the “designated tribal preservation official of a federally recognized Indian Tribe.” A tribal Thpo is also known as the tribal historian or war captain. Interestingly, Wilmer left this world at the time I had finished defending for “All But Dissertation” (ABD) status of this work. Although I never had the privilege and honor of meeting Wilmer in person, I believe that the Até (Ancestors), often times, work to create intersectional points. My work with OLCERI is an example of this and I will offer similar examples throughout this work as to the ways in which this understanding has manifested itself in this collaborative.

Renowned for his great love of his people, Wilmer served on the Pine Ridge Tribal Council, as did Bryan Deans. As tribal Thpo/historian, Wilmer “Stampede” Mesteth was fiercely protective of his community. Without a doubt, Wilmer “Stampede” was a celebrated Lakota Sioux tribal leader of the highest caliber. Not only was Wilmer a brave warrior but he also taught at the Oglala Lakota College (OLC) for over twenty years. At OLC, “Uncle

---

51 Wilmer’s work as protector of the Tribal community is best exemplified in work he undertook to protect the humans and the ancestral artifacts located throughout the Rez. For furthers, see https://www.nrc.gov/docs/ML1523/ML15239B083.pdf.

52 See Appendix: Wilmer Stampede Mesteth, US Federal Government Tribal THPO Documentation

Wilmer” was a cultural instructor who took great joy in teaching traditional Lakota songs, dance, medicine, etc… Wilmer taught classes on how to use traditional herbs and foods.

Wilmer Stampede Mesteth was a firm believer and advocate of repatriation initiatives, as well as a leading voice demanding the full return of the Lakota language and the people’s history, recognizing its recapture as a means of returning “community” to the Rez.

From what has been explained to me by Bryan Deans, Wilmer recognized that without those two main core components, the language and a return to “Lakota ways,” any further disconnection from Lakota culture and language could negatively impact next generations in profound ways. Moreover, it would mean a continued loss of the language in ways in which it would be difficult to recuperate from.

We fully dedicate this chapter to the memory of Wilmer Stampede Mesteth, and to the beautiful, heroic, and proud Lakota Sioux People of Pine Ridge whose battles have been many and continue to this day. Our work here is evidence of that fact. We continue to honor the great and noble Até (Ancestors) from years past, recognizing the vital role they have had in bringing us to this point in human history. It is noteworthy to recognize that the precious histories and prophecies of the Lakota Sioux continue to be carried to this day by means of the Ancestor’s progeny, as exemplified in the case of Bryan Deans.

Through Bryan Deans sharing of these precious oral histories and narratives, as will be presented to the reader shortly; we recognize that the sharing and publication of the histories, as presented by Deans, will continue to serve as daily reminders that nothing has been forgotten in spite of attempts by others to take them away. We recognize that no one can take away further from the Lakota that which only the Great Creator gave. To the Até (Ancestors), we honor your memories through our work calling for the promotion of the Lakota ways and
language. To the *thiwahe*, (family), we give thanks for your strength and continued endurance, especially so in times of strife and struggle. We ask, fervently, for continued prayers of protection and healing for all Lakota people and Mother Earth.

When others speak of the *Oglala Lakota Sioux*, let it be known that the ancestor’s sacrifices were not in vain. To the contrary, no matter what has been thrown at the tribe, whether attempts at genocide; the unjust taking of their sacred lands; their beautiful language; their priceless culture; let it be known, the fight continues. The fight to preserve and persevere. Even now, after all that has been committed against the *Lakota Nation*, still, the *Lakota* offer their wisdom and their love to Native and non-Native alike. In spite of the long List of US-Native historical injustices, the *Lakota* people continue to share with others, whom they continue to see as their extended relatives. In their infinite wisdom, the *Lakota* people harken to that infinite cosmologically-centered message, passed from one generation to another, “*A’ho, Mitákuye Oyás’iŋ,*” from the beginning to the end, we are all related… *OLCERI Infrastructure*

![OLCERI Permaculture Skills Convergence](image)

Figure 4.3: OLCERI Permaculture Skills Convergence
OLCERI promotes Native cultural and economic revitalization and unrestricted, community/individual self-sufficiency practices that are free of federal/tribal council interference. Alongside the Pine Ridge Reservation of the Great Sioux Nation, OLCERI advocates for tribal sovereignty, recognizing that many of the White man’s illnesses linger still on the Rez and can only be done away with when the people return to the ways of the ancestors. In spite of the long history of Wašiču injustices that have taken place against the Oglala Lakota/Great Sioux Nation and their people, it is important to note, OLCERI extends its Lakota knowledge to Native and non-Native, alike, even to this day.

For three consecutive years, OLCERI has hosted “Convergence,” a yearly Indigenous-grounded, social-justice/ecological summit hosted at the OLCERI farm/ranch site in Slim Buttes, Pine Ridge Indian Reservation. The above image is the invitation used for the 2018 OLCERI Convergence event. Convergence is housed on Bryan Dean’s property. Based on decades of community work on and off the Rez, the OLCERI organization has maintained a highly respected communal status and has established partnerships that are especially vital in today’s Native world, particularly so when one considers the type of health/mental/economic challenges the community has undergone and continues to experience. Amongst other partnerships, some of OLCERI’s current partners are:

- **TIYOSPAYE WINYAN MAKA,**

- **Engineers Without Borders,**

- **The Coordinating Committee of International Voluntary Services (CCVIS),**

---

54 For Further: Please See, OLCERI Convergence Website: [https://www.iwpsconvergence.com/](https://www.iwpsconvergence.com/). Permission and access granted by Bryan Deans (2019/2020). Also: Visit [Convergence](https://www.iwpsconvergence.com/)
● Grow Permaculture,
● Come to Life,
● RE-member

In the short time that Convergence has been established and has taken place, it has become somewhat of an international event in which Natives and non-Natives from throughout the world come together to learn, teach, interact with each other, and prepare further for the future challenges heading humanity’s way, that was, initially, pre-COVID 19. It is important to note that at the time of this publication, the world is living a COVID19 existence, it is one that is so drastic that life has changed irretrievably, and in some ways will resemble aspects of Native diachronization as the US continues to tip over the mess it has failed miserably to address. This, too, impacts life on the Rez in ways not fully appreciated outside of the Rez. For instance, food shortages, the effects of climate change, the spread of deadly diseases, etc…, once considered norms for US reservations will now become aspects of US American life. The point is, even OLCERI is impacted directly, specific to Convergence, as OLCERI could not host it in 2020 precisely because of COVID19.

Pre-COVID19, traditionally, the yearly event promotes work within the Pine Ridge Community, while Convergence serves as a “living” space wherein participants learn self-sustainability practices, permaculture, as well as healing practices, which OLCERI advocates and promotes with the firm understanding that such an approach to living will soon be needed by all humanity as a consequence of climate change and the coming economic challenges that await the world in the near future. Especially now, post-COVID 19.55

55 Please Note: I refer to this phase of humanity as post-COVID because recognition of the existence of the virus was challenged, minimalized, numbed and stupidified, in particular by the US President of the time, Donald J. Trump. His “cultish” followers embraced Trumps dangerous and dumb-downed rhetoric concerning the virus, accommodating the fact that the US leads in the highest number of positive cases and, tragically, deaths. For too many Americans, the seriousness of the virus is only revealed when Bob Woodward releases the recordings in
As a “living” service-oriented organization, OLCERI is cognizant not only of the internal struggles that take place on the Rez, but of the continued challenges found throughout the world specific to Indigenous peoples. Relative to this, OLCERI is preparing a global manual for communal preparation created and intended for global use which is based on earlier work undertaken by the Pine Ridge community referred to as the Lakota Plan.

As I write the last of this dissertation, the world Americans once knew has slipped away. Again, this is reminiscent of what has happened to US Natives since the arrival of the Wašíču. Now the US, as well as the rest of the world, will be forced to experience dramatic and significant life changes, from needless deaths to further racial divisions, to economic collapse. Perhaps, the old adage, “what goes around, comes around,” is really true. The point is, Convergence was not hosted in 2020 and we are not certain, at this point in our human history, what the world will be like in 2021. What OLCERI does know is that permaculture will be necessary, as well as the further preparation of the continued effects of climate change on our planet.

The Oglala Lakota Cultural & Economic Revitalization Initiative (OLCERI), Lakota Plan

Almost two decades ago, under the leadership of Bryan Deans, founder and director of The Oglala Lakota Cultural & Economic Revitalization Initiative (OLCERI), Deans began to “put the pieces together” important ideas as to how to begin to address the type of issues confronting the Pine Ridge community. By that time, Deans had served on the Pine Ridge Tribal Council, had spear-headed economic initiatives for the community, and had served in the US Military Forces. Furthermore, he had served on other community-centered initiatives.

which he and Trump discuss the virus. This revelation has allowed for the recognition that, yes, the virus is real and, moreover, deadly. This recognition has lead to a dramatic and drastic change in Western countries wherein it has become the norm to use face masks and gloves when one enters into public spaces. At the time of this dissertation, there is no vaccine for the virus. Consequently, this is a post-COVID19 world.
Greatly influenced by “Uncle Wilmer”, who had adopted him, which is a Lakota practice highly regarded within the Tiyospaye, Deans and others began working on the *Oyate Omniciye, Oglala Lakota Plan*, (2012), which we will refer to as the *Oglala Lakota Plan (OLP)*. The OLP is a communally-designed, Lakota-inspired, “how to” manual designed for the promotion of tribal/individual self-sufficiency.

![Figure 4.4: Bryan Deans on Pine Ridge](image)

The OLP is designed to address and offer first-steps to “recovering” from the seemingly insurmountable economic hardships plaguing the community, retrieval of the Native language, healing from the type of socio-cultural challenges experienced by tribal members on a daily basis, these, and others, are the continuous challenges that the Pine Ridge tribal community has undergone as a direct consequence of colonization; the taking of their lands/livelihood; the attempted destruction and displacement of Lakota culture, language, etc..., reaching into some vital aspects of Lakota spirituality.

Throughout the subsequent sections of this work, the OLCERI organization and the OLP will be further discussed. To be clear, the challenges facing the community do seem insurmountable, even for “outsiders”. They have ever since the arrival of the whites to the
continent. Still, it is Deans, and my, intent to present the positive aspects, the potential solutions, as well as viable initiatives to addressing these types of issues and legitimate concerns.

As an attempt to become a self-sufficient tribal community, that is, an Indian Nation free of federal/state intervention, and, more important, as an attempt to remain Lakota; to follow Lakota ways; to follow the paths established by the ancestors; the OLP serves as a viable means to address those diachronizational challenges that Deans, and others within OLCERI, and I, recognize have impacted, negatively, not only the tiyospaye, but individual existentialism. Essentially, the OLP is a “hands-on” manual offered to the community as a means to address those challenges. The OLP welcomes Native and non-Native alike to its use, and, in fact, recognizes this as a positive outcome of the work that lays ahead for the Pine Ridge Community. The OLP is a repeated resource that OLCERI references in the work they do which, in the end, centers on individual self-sufficiency and healing.

In a paradoxical sense, Deans points out that the Lakota will begin the process of healing when the issues, which are grounded in economics, loss of language, weakened spirituality, loss of psychological and physical well-being, are addressed. Deans recognizes that what is needed is that each member of the tiyospaye must be capable of “standing” on their own. Deans explains that this is the first step to healing, i.e., the micro-to-meso-level. Meaning, to find individual life fulfillment, first, self-actualization and self-sufficiency are critical and required—this can only be accomplished at the micro-level, initially. For the Lakota, the secondary aspect of this consists of, once having done so, for Native, one cannot help but to want to return to the tiyospaye as the individual and the community are, ultimately, one. OLCERI’s work centers on that essential recognition.
Established in 2002 by Oglala Lakota Sioux tribal elder and wisdom keeper, Bryan Deans, OLCERI provides “interested individuals opportunities for learning and implementing self-sufficiency practices that promote daily ‘how-tos,’” which includes but is not limited to the following:

- water-capture practices
- planting and producing nutritious, foods
- hunting
- applying Earthship-building techniques in building one’s home, etc.…
- language and cultural reattachment
- building community

OLCERI does so by teaching and implementing traditional, Oglala Lakota Sioux skills in gardening, perennial agriculture, permaculture, horse capture/adoption programs, and low-cost sustainable home-building initiatives. These simple approaches to self-sufficiency also accommodate a unique system of bartering, far from predatory capitalistic practices. Instead, one barters to help each other out by sharing/exchanging produced goods.

According to Deans, OLCERI promotes economic and cultural revitalization and designs its programs with the intent of providing the necessary life skills for Pine Ridge members. As such emphasis is on one’s ability to be able to “self-sustain”, respective to food production. Just as important is the promoting of building eco-friendly, individual housing free of monthly utility payments, which is one of OLCERI’s biggest initiatives, building as many houses as possible for tribal members, at the lowest costs possible. Also, OLCERI initiatives

---

promote the ancient Lakota practice of sharing with others via the highly-valued, “Lakota way”, which is unlike “for-profit” White man’s ways.

Correspondingly, included in the initiatives is Lakota language preservation and promotion, as well as, re-emphasis on traditional socio-cultural practices that step-away from Euro-American cultural idealism. Also, addressing the need to reconnect to Lakota spirituality as promoted by the teaching of community elders is critical, as well as reconnecting the generations in a healthy manner by means of interacting with community elders via Rez community events, for example, build a garden, or help build an elders’ home, etc…., These are Lakota ideals that can only happen when Lakota ways are centered on community life, in conferring to Deans.

A common theme for OLCERI members is that we return to the self when we interact directly with Mother Earth. As such, planting/farming are especially important in order to ensure our food supply, while sustaining Lakota ways. In essence, it is necessary for individual well-being. To the followers of traditional Lakota ways, language, culture, and community are indissolubly tied to existence. Consequently, OLCERI has become a space for teaching/learning while building-on Indigenous knowledge, which, ultimately, leads to building community on and off the Rez. By means of hands-on experiences, OLCERI offers Natives and non-Natives, alike, the “know how” and the resources to learn and practice Lakota traditions, while promoting traditional Lakota ecologically-minded life skills, even when people aren’t Natives.

As referenced earlier, Pre-COVID19, OLCERI hosted Convergence. At some point, Convergence had become, somewhat, internationally known, as people from outside the US began attending. Convergence events host numerous workshops centering on many of the
topics already referenced in the latter, i.e., Earthship (home) production; farming; water-capture techniques; harvesting concepts; language and cultural revitalization initiatives, etc…, that, in due course, empower participants. Whether a future caretaker at the micro-meso-level or a future community leader, Lakota concepts of well-being recognize that the process of revitalization involves social justice consciousness-development, language promotion, and the building of cultural nexuses, while promoting self-care via permaculture and eco-friendly, home design.

As advocated by Wilmer, one of OLCERI’s points of emphasis is revitalizing the Lakota language and reconnecting it with the Lakota culture. As such, OLCERI hosts Lakota language-learning opportunities, socio-cultural events, and promotes a global-community interaction approach that welcomes Natives and non-Natives from throughout the world. As Deans’ argues, OLCERI’s work is, especially, necessary within federally-recognized tribal communities, and in a world that is deeply impacted by climate change and corruption at every level of government. In this way, OLCERI moves towards the creation of a Global Lakota Plan (GLP), which is one of Bryan Dean’s and OLCERI’s next step. Hold in mind that the GLP will be discussed in the final sections of this work.

Post-colonization, as data substantiate, Indigenous peoples from throughout the world suffer from the highest rates of poverty, as well as from de facto and de jure epistemic racism. What must be recognized about the latter statement is that we are, and continue, to measure Indigenous existence from a, totally, white, Western-centered, Euro-American lens. At the same time, the reader should be able to recognize by now that the Indigenous people of the continent now called “America”, and this extends outside of that continent, --pre-colonization—existed holistically and happily, free, in spite of not living within a Westernized, manner-of-
existence. However, what must be re-emphasized is the fact that the “post-colonial”, Indigenous-individual has, post-colonization, been forced to exist within that contextualization.

It should not be surprising that the Lakota Tribal community is not faring well. Similar to US Native tribes from throughout the continent, the residual negative aspects of colonization, as well as the continued legislative and environmental abuses US tribes are placed under are enormously overwhelming. The fact that US tribal communities attempt to remain Indigenously-rooted people, still, is a challenge within itself (Rossatto, Valles & et al, 2019). The Lakota are remarkable within that context alone for they were the last tribe to be controlled by the US federal government. They also defeated, and captured, the early American flag in several battles fought against the US in their attempt to remain a free people and to protect their sacred lands and ways of living.

The brave Lakota continue to fight, on and off the Rez. Historically-speaking, the Lakota will be/are brutalized, their lands stolen, and their culture and language devastated by the Western colonial powers of yesterday, and by those of today. Initially, for the early US colonizers forming a “democratic” system of government in which they created a legislative system to facilitate the process, their original intent was not only to steal Native lands, but to take the “savage out of the man.” (Alvarez, 2014; Pevar, 2012; Clarkin, 2001; Deloria, Jr., 1985; Dunbar Ortiz, 1974; Echo-Hawk, 2010; Fixico, 1986; Foreman, 1976; Getches & et al, 1998; Grinde. Jr. & Mann, 1998; Hertzberg, 1972; Johnson, 2005; Josephy, 1982; Lyons, Mohawk, Deloria, Jr. Hauptman; Berman, Grinde, Jr. & Mann, Berkey, Venables, 1992; Means, 1995; Prucha, 1997; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, 2012; Weber, Ed., 1973; Wilkinson & The American Indian Resources Institute). The Wašiču’s intent will continuously change with the primary objective being to fully control the “Native.”
Again, I emphasize that the *Great Sioux Nation* is, historically, unique in that they were the last tribe to be mobilized, that is, placed on a reservation. More important, they are the tribe that, to this day, holds on to the US flag they captured after defeating the US in the *Battle of Little Big Horn (1876)*, which was led by Custer who was brutally defeated by the *Lakota* and *Cheyenne*, to the point that the battle has been memorialized as “Custer’s last stand”.

As the US government continues to colonize the continent, their rapid expansion as well as their acquisition of land accommodates white men, who, unashamedly, hide under their hypocritical flag of democracy. This long-practiced, duplicitous, dialogue, on their part, echoes throughout the halls of the early congressional and legislative arms of their colonial government system, which claims that “they”, *Natives*, must be like us, which is, in all reality, an never-ending, impossible feat—especially so for the Lakota who, still, recall proudly that they were, in fact, the last Native tribe to go down and who captured the US flag of an earlier time in US-Native history. The Lakota will resurrect in their continued defiance on several occasions. In the end, they will be forcibly placed into the positions of powerlessness and utter marginalization.
4.2 Servant Leadership - vs- Corruptive Leadership

“Tiyospaye embraces the beauty of living in harmony, taking care of one another, and trusting each other. Your tiyospaye will support you throughout life’s journeys, whether the road is rocky or the path smooth. For the Lakota, you are not only a member of the family through birth, marriage, or adoption, but your family extends far beyond to include the whole Lakota nation. Throughout history, whenever the Lakota would travel somewhere, they could expect to be welcomed and supported as if they were in their own immediate family….”

--Native Hope

Figure 4.5: Lakota Family Photo

Another distinctive aspect specific to OLCERI’s work on Pine Ridge is grounded in the Lakota concept of “servant leadership.” As Bryan Deans has explained, for the traditional Lakota, cheating or taking advantage of a member of the community is like cheating or taking advantage of your mother, father, sister, brother, cousin, etc… Accordingly, “This type of practice, wholeheartedly, goes against Lakota teachings”58. Consequently, not only is it seen as a vital aspect of the ways of the Wašiču, at the same time, it is considered one of the

57 Quote Source: Copyright © 2020 Native Hope - All rights reserved. Privacy Policy: https://blog.nativehope.org/tiyospaye-the-heritage-of-lakota-family
58 Quote Source: Bryan Deans, private conversation 2018.
highest degrees of bad manners and corruptive behavior offensive to the ancestors. Moreover, it is a practice perceived as unhealthy to the individual committing the act, which reflects poorly on the Ancestors. Any *Lakota* who commits such an offense should be “ashamed of themselves,” according to Deans

As elaborated on by Deans, the traditional *Lakota Leadership Structure* (LSS) is based on the ancient *Lakota* practice and concept of “Servant Leadership.” As Deans’ explains, instead of applying a “top-down” management style of governance, *Lakota* leaders were expected to “take care of their people and each person took care of many others, in ever-widening circles.”

Furthermore, as Bryan Deans has explained to me in private conversations, the idea of tribal councils has become beyond problematic as a consequence of internal corruption, which in many ways could be argued, directly, goes against the *LSS* (*Lakota*, servant-leadership) concepts. To clarify, under traditional *Lakota* principles each community member has the right and responsibility of doing what is honorable and specific to the *Lakota* way, which is an approach to living that discourages corruption, abuse, and unethical behavior.

When *Lakota* fail to follow those teachings they are considered an “embarrassment-of Sorts” to the community and they are ostracized when they continue to commit such offenses. Still, under colonial influence, internal and external corruption, historically, has plagued Natives from throughout the world; leaving the impression that the extent of the Wašíču’s continued diseases on Natives goes beyond the physical. Bryan Deans explains that “corruption [is] due to [a] this top-down structure in organizations and governments. By the time the resources move through the top and ‘trickle down’ to the people, there is not much left for the people, and it is not distributed in a fair way - often leading to

---

inter-tribal mistrust, corruption, and a continued scarcity mindset,”60 understandably. Incidentally, this is not a phenomenon specific to Pine Ridge. Other non-Lakota tribal members have referenced this same phenomenon to me in private conversations.

Deans argues that if Lakota leaders embrace traditional ancestral teachings, then leaders will practice “servant leadership,” wherein leaders view themselves, and act, as the servants of the people. Whenever they fail to do so; as in the cases in which they will hoard resources for themselves first, and then for their respective, immediate, family members, followed by their cronies; in doing so, they fail all Lakota, as well as their ancestors. Under such circumstances all others will receive the leftovers/scraps. This, clearly, goes against Lakota teachings and practices wherein traditional ways teach that all are considered related. Moreover, when Lakota fail to distribute goods equitably, then these actions are perceived as an offense to the ancestors, and such individuals should be ashamed of themselves.

“For the Lakota, you are not only a member of the family through birth, marriage, or adoption, but your family extends far beyond to include the whole Lakota nation,”61 as such, whenever a Lakota in power takes advantage of their positions within the community, it is as if they are stealing and cheating their own mother and/or father, accordingly. When this happens, one cannot blame the Wašíču for such actions. One must acknowledge the great offense they commit against the Tiyospaye and the ancestors, 62 as Deans has repeatedly explained. This type of anti-Lakota practice is unhealthy for the person committing the act/s, as

60 Source: Bryan Deans. OLCERI Website, located at www.olceri.org. Used with consent of Bryan Deans. The messages surrounding the illness of “corruption and cronyism” is one that is part of many private conversations between Bryan, OLCERI Board Members, and myself as well with other Indigenous colleagues I have had the privilege to converse with specific to tribal issues. See: https://www.olceri.org/leadership for furthers.

61 Quote Source: Copyright © 2020 Native Hope - All rights reserved. Privacy Policy: https://blog.nativehope.org/tiyospaye-the-heritage-of-lakota-family

62 Tiyospaye: Def: The Lakota Family. The Native family includes immediate family/blood relatives at the micro-level, then extends to the meso-level, i.e., all those within the tribal clan, according to Deans.
well as for the tiyospaye. By itself, OLCERI centers this particular philosophy into the proverbial, heart of the work they do.

Within Native community after Native community, a similar message resonates and is heard sorrowfully because corruption and cronyism impacts countless Native families everywhere. Is it not enough that the Wašiču has taken advantage of Natives throughout US history? It is even worse when Natives takes advantage of their family members, both their immediate and extended. It is a noteworthy issue in cases in which resources are shared on the Rez and only people at the top first serve themselves, “a la Wašiču,” those at the bottom of the power pyramid fail to get their fair share, which is a characteristic aspect of US tribal councils, according to Bryan Deans and other Natives I have interacted with and discussed the matter with.

“Shared resources” can vary covering such things as federal monies, grant awards, scholarship opportunities, to food and/or planting resources for nutritious food production, which is, often times, presented to the community as a consequence of awarded grants or the doling out of federal monies. Still, as Bryan Deans advocates, “acknowledging it,” corruption and cronyism, “is the first step to getting rid of it…,” OLCERI’s work recognizes this fact and advocates for a positive and productive approach to countering corruption and cronyism. To do so, OLCERI harkens back to traditional Lakota teachings, which they refer to as the “Guiding Principles,” or, the “Seven Tenets for the Next Seven Generations.”

OLCERI’s Guiding Principles: Seven Tenets for the Next Seven Generations

The Lakota teach that “the five basic needs of life are: food, fire, water, shelter, and earth. These basic needs are what must be met for an individual to actualize by finding self,
and spirit,” as Bryan Deans explains.\(^\text{64}\) The final two, “self” and “spirit” make up OLCERI’s seven core creeds. Without these basic needs being met, as Bryan Deans has explained repeatedly, “individuals are stuck in perpetual states of insecurity, poverty, and scarcity - making it harder for them to do good by themselves, which then impacts the entire tiyospaye (community/Lakota family),”\(^\text{65}\) re-emphasizing, once again, the ways in which micro-level wellness impacts the entire community.

From an educational perspective, as well as a societal one, individual well-being at the micro-level, clearly, impacts the entire meso-level, community, specific to the quality of life on the Rez and it does so in ways that extends and penetrates outside of the socio-cultural, the economic, and impacts in an, overall, physical/psychological/spiritual-sense. In short, all these variable influences how well a community fares. When these basic needs are not met, it is a matter that is disadvantageous to all. Accordingly, it is an unhealthiness that leads to all types of psychiatric, physical, and spiritual problems. Today, on the Pine Ridge Reservation, Deans argues, “these needs are not being met.”\(^\text{66}\) This fact goes against traditional, Lakota teachings of service and community.

**Putting Convergence to Work**

As a counter-initiative to these realities, the OLCERI work-site serves as an experimental location for participants to work at, allowing them to learn and apply cutting-edge, self-sustainability practices, while contributing directly to the Pine Ridge Reservation and its people by assisting with other community members projects. This is achieved through work involving a multitude of projects. One such project is OLCERI’s yearly Convergence event. For

\(^\text{65}\) Ibid: tiyospaye/family Used with consent of Bryan Deans: https://www.olceri.org/leadership
\(^\text{66}\) Ibid: Used with consent of Bryan Deans: https://www.olceri.org/leadership
the past three years, volunteers and attendees from across the nation have gathered together with renowned ecological teachers and tribal leaders for one week, or more, of side-by-side work, in learning to plant, build, hunt, etc., in short, vital life skills essential for self-sustainment, which eventually allows for the lessening of dependency on federal government hand-outs, according to Bryan Deans.

*Convergence* attendees practice ecologically-minded skills through hands-on experiences and participate in workshops that empower them as leaders so that they can learn to take on the countless, institutional, judicial/political, environmental and social injustices that continue to plague and challenge Natives to this day. Challenges that are, too often, aimed at Natives. Below are additional goals intended for *Convergence* participants, as promoted by Bryan Deans:

**Goals of the Convergence Gathering**

1. Complete Lakota-initiated projects that increase food security, build sustainable infrastructure, and enhance economic opportunity on the Pine Ridge Reservation.

1. Provide scholarships through Community Stewards Program for Pine Ridge residents to join as paid stewards and learn useful ecological design and construction skills.

2. Attendees learn and practice permaculture design through hands-on workshops and leave the *Convergence* with a deeper understanding of natural building, aquaponics, traditional ecological knowledge, and appropriate technologies, projects which were selected as beneficial by our Lakota partners.

---

3. Create community through music, skill shares, and meals that are open to the 

    Pine Ridge community.

4. Build long-term relationships through Working Groups that support the

    resiliency of Indigenous and Earth-centered networks.

    As Bryan Deans further clarifies, “At OLCERI, we teach skills to meet basic

    needs so that our people will once again live in harmony and dignity.” Furthermore, “OLCERI

    seeks to instill the seven teachings down through the next seven generations, over the next three

    hundred years,”68 which is generally referred to by Bryan Deans and OLCERI members, as the

    7/7/300 approach. This serves as the basis for the OLCERI mission and vision, according to

    Bryan.

    The Lakota Concept of Wicozani, “To Live in Harmony” and the “7/7/300 Core Tenets”

    Another important OLCERI concept rooted in the Lakota Plan is the idea of

    Wicozani, meaning, “To Live in Harmony.” OLCERI’s approach to Wicozani centers on the

    Lakota’s “7 Core Tenets – 7 Generations – 300 years” paradigm. As Bryan Deans explains,

    

    Figure 4.6: The Lakota Plan Icon

    ———

    68 Source Image and Quote: Bryan Deans. OLCERI Website, located at www.olceri.org. Image source borrowed from site with Deans
    consent.
traditional *Lakota* practices teach and place focus on the five basic needs of life (food, fire, water, shelter, and earth). Without these individuals will not “actualize”. Self-actualization is achieved by the individual connecting with self and spirit, the final two of the *Lakota* seven core tenets practiced at OLCERI. 

This is the way of the *Lakota*.

Through OLCERI’s continuous work via the promotion and advocacy of the *Lakota Plan (LP)*, it is expected that Natives, and Indigenous people, from throughout the world, will be able to self-sustain/support themselves, then the community; hence, returning to a healthy, pre-colonial, Indigeneity and spirituality. Deans trusts that as the *Lakota* re-engage with their priceless and essentialist, pre-colonial history and community members return to Native ways, i.e., returning to using the *Lakota* language and returning to their irreplaceable *Lakota* culture and knowledge systems, the process of self-actualization begins. At the same time, OLCERI recognizes the importance of achieving such status, specific to individual and communal well-being.

*Wolakota, “To live in a good way”*

Similarly, OLCERI supports another traditional *Lakota* principle called *Wolakota*, meaning, “To Live in a Good Way,” according to Bryan Deans. Moreover, Deans considers it as critical to self-actualization. *Wolakota* is achieved by breaking unhealthy lifestyle practices such

---

69 Image Source: OLCERI Website, located at [www.olceri.org](http://www.olceri.org); #OLCERI; #IndigenousWisdom, #CenterForIndigenousWisdom, or by email at deansbryan@gmail.com. Image source borrowed from OLCERI Website, with consent from Deans.
as drinking, using drugs, practicing abusive behaviors of any kind, and includes living full, healthy, and ethical existences as taught, originally, according to Lakota traditions, pre-diachronization. An example of this goes back decades to a yearly event Deans/OLCERI members first began with its outdoor “horse-back riding/camping event.”

Recognizing the ways in which Lakota youth had become disconnected with the ways of the ancestors, e.g., didn’t know how to ride/control horses or how to hunt, camp, live outdoors, etc… Deans and other community leaders hosted a Lakota youth “ride out”. Initially, the event was opened to Lakota youth and their respective parent/guardian/grandparent but could only be attended if they were “dry and clean”. Horses and leadership for this popular event were provided by Deans. Initially, the yearly ride-out became so popular that Deans felt it had become “too commercialized” when it extended outside of the Rez.

Other ways in which OLCERI does this today is by discouraging the use of harmful drugs and drinking at all their events, and, by addressing and rectifying such addictions on the Rez as they come OLCERI’s way. Recognizing that the enormity of the addiction situation on the Rez today can be viewed as overwhelming; to attempt to counter other addictive issues, emphasis on individual well-being centers around the psychological after-effects of the
US American colonial period in which the Lakota suffered greatly as a community. It is at this point, historically, that “booze” was introduced to Natives across the US.

Other factors that will contribute to this is the institutionalization of “forced-upon” practices of the Wašíču, such as the institutionalization of their schools, their religion, as well as their capitalistic-fueled, greedy practices, etc…, which go against traditional Lakota teaching. Furthermore, the reader should become familiar with early US history, which is one in which the Lakota, like all other Indigenous people on the American continent, will be stripped of land, language, culture, and spirituality. Moreover, attempted genocide against Natives is advocated by the early US and its leaders. Acknowledgment of this can only be achieved when one knows the history of the Lakota, according to the Lakota and not the Wašíču. As such, it is important to teach this and, then, to align it with the negative and devastating addiction issues that continue to plague Pine Ridge to this day.

With this recognition, vile, non-Native habits must be combatted and diminished for starters. Although not a “step” program for addiction, essentially, OLCERI advocates a return to practicing self-sufficiency respective to the five basic needs of the seven Lakota ways. Staying busy keeps addictive behaviors at bay. In spite of this particular monumentally-seeming challenge, still, each morning, the Lakota rise and face the East with generosity, patience, wisdom, and boundless thanks to the Great Creator. With that said, it is necessary to note that the US colonial legacy impacts Lakota ways in tragic and needless ways, which is a significant matter that requires further discussion.

Concluding Overview on OLCERI

From OLCERI’s inter-generational programs to their anti-hate/racism initiatives, hope is in the air for Pine Ridge community members as a consequence of its establishment as a
pro-Lakota, traditional advocacy initiative. As Bryan Deans explains, “OLCERI’s regenerative work promotes Indigenous well-being—physically, mentally, and psychologically. Healing is achieved through planting, building, and the pursuit of repatriation enterprises, which all works in solving micro, meso, and tribal issues.”

Examples of these projects, and many other similar OLCERI endeavors, are fundamental to initial micro-level healing and representative of a basic return to earlier life that is promoted as holistically-calming to the Oglala Lakota. More important, these types of initiatives are instrumental in addressing generational trauma, as well as for enriching the Lakota community further. With those objectives in mind, no doubt, OLCERI will continue to bring to fruition a wave of cultural revitalization for the Oglala Lakota Nation, and Indigenous people everywhere. In this way, OLCERI serves as a model program for Indigenous people everywhere. In conclusion, OLCERI’s mission rests on revitalizing the Indigenous experience, here and abroad, and does so by incorporating the Lakota Peoples’ long tradition of sharing, caring, and daring to make positive change.

Figure 4.8: Bryan Deans at 2018 Convergence

\textsuperscript{70} IBID
Current and Future OLCERI Projects/Initiatives for the Research Collaborative

The following listing consists of some of the examples centering on the type of work in most need specific to OLCERI, according to Bryan Deans. This information will serve as the staple of our research collaborative. They are the “next steps initiative,” specific to OLCERI’s continued work on the Pine Ridge Rez. The “needs” solidify the collaboration between OLCERI and the research-advocate. Although, the list is extensive, the idea is to try to accomplish as many of the initiatives as possible, collaboratively. These are the areas of work we will address and attempt to reconcile with.

To be clear, these are incremental initiatives as each enterprise requires specific funding, and some initiatives “layer” off of other enterprises. In short, OLCERI is continuously building the infrastructure necessary to address centuries-old issues as found within the Pine Ridge community. It would be unrealistic for me to say that OLCERI will have these goals funded by the time I complete this dissertation, in spite of how long it has taken me to do so. As such, these are “areas” to be worked on in parallel with the progress we achieve specific to the “stages/steps” listed below:

Initiative I: Funding

- Hiring a full-time program coordinator/planner by means of grants, and/or gift funding
- Hiring a part-time IT Webmaster by means of grants, and/or gift funding
- Addressing monthly website upkeep fees by means of grants, and/or gift funding
- Addressing monthly “incidentals” budget needs, i.e., fuel costs and other services by means of grants, and/or gift funding
- Expanding garden hubs to the northern half of Pine Ridge Reservation by means of grants, and/or gift funding
- Hosting nature connection/wilderness camp(s) for Lakota youth & families
Implementation of the OLCERI Food/Bus Program: on-site bus for delivery of healthy, tribally-grown, food staples, and for necessary travel on Rez for community events, such as tribal meetings, voting, etc., by means of grants, and/or gift funding

Initiative II: Indigenous Socio-Cultural Justice Program

- Implementing Oglala Lakota anti-hate/racism initiative with local college/public schools
- Addressing continued budget needs for completing construction of the Indigenous Wisdom Center
- Creation, and first-steps” of the yearly “Warrior/Brave—In’a/Hunk’chola/Maiden Program”
- Through OLCERI’s collaboration with public schools and college, OLCERI aims to send 5-6 Lakota youth to sustainable building training camps with an adult to the Mike Reynolds in Taos, New Mexico. Mexico. Reynold’s is considered the leading expert on Earthship building, self-sustainability practices, and creating eco-friendly human habitats

Initiative III: Pine Ridge Housing Project

- Continued development and implementation of the Sustainable-Housing, Eco-friendly, Demonstration Sites (SHEDS)
- Producing the Fourth Annual Indigenous Wisdom & Permaculture Skills Convergence, (open to the public/post-COVID 19)

Introduction to the DRM Collaborative

In the next section of this chapter, part one of the DRM paradigm will be applied to the Pine Ridge Community of South Dakota wherein the Oglala Lakota Cultural & Economic Revitalization Initiative (OLCERI) organization has established a partnership between OLCERI and the research advocate, specifically, the author of this work and the designer of the DRM framework. It should be noted that the following demographic information is provided by OLCERI, the Oglala Lakota Plan (OLP), and its partners, including Re-Member; Aude Chaisnais, Ph D., who serves on the OLCERI Board of Directors as lead researcher; Patrick
Strickland, a social justice reporter from *Al Jazeera*; Meteor Blades from *Daily Kos*; *The US Census Bureau*; and others.

*Re-Member* is located on the *Pine Ridge Reservation* and is a non-profit comprised of over twelve hundred members who are committed to the *Pine Ridge* community. *Re-Member* volunteers are comprised of individuals who work closely with the *Pine Ridge* community and recognize the significance of the Lakota American experience, the Lakota culture and language, and the *Lakota* people. *Re-Member* volunteers assist, side-by-side, with the *Pine Ridge* community in order to improve lives on the *Rez*. From building communal resources to repairing homes, and/or assisting the elderly and disabled, and/or, facilitating projects focused on building “better homes, better jobs, better health, and a better life,”71 *ReMember* volunteers are so invested in their commitment to the community that they live on the *Rez*.

In addition, Aude Chaisnais, PhD, a sociologist from Colorado State University has graciously provided data which she has reaped from her professional interactions and collaborations with the *Pine Ridge* community. Dr. Chaisnais has worked closely with the *Pine Ridge* community, specific to *Lakota ReZilience*,72 and serves as a member of the *OLCERI Board of Directors*. Any other data applied to section 4.1 of this work will be cited appropriately, to include any additional photos/maps/graphs, etc…. or individual/s, organization/s, applied to the dissertation. The point is that there will be a variety of demographic resources applied to this section as a means of verification and substantiation. The

---

71 Source: *ReMember*. [https://www.re-member.org/history.aspx](https://www.re-member.org/history.aspx).

following narrative consists of all the data provided, with data and data tables located in the Appendix of this work.
4.3 Part III: Research Questions, Applying the DRM Framework to the Research Collaborative

For this dissertation work, there are two specific research questions tied to DRM. The first research question centers on the DRM paradigm and addresses the effectiveness of the DRM paradigm as presented as a more just and holistic approach to research collaboratives with Indigenous/marginalized communities. In short, what we want to know and better understand is

**Does the DRM paradigm work?** Yes, or no?

To test this, the OLCERI collaboration is referenced as a “committed research collaborative,” in that we will use the research collaborative as an opportunity to apply the DRM paradigm to our work, OLCERI and I. Additionally, we want to better understand whether the DRM paradigm adheres to the following three objectives, as well as the nine DRM components in actuality. To reiterate, the three DRM objectives are explained, once again, in the following:

1.) Does the **DRM Framework** provide a non-Euro-American, traditionalist, quantitative-modified research paradigm, specifically, for work in the field of education in mutual collaboration with Indigenous/marginalized communities in which the community will be the ones to provide communal data centering on the project/phenomenon agreed upon?

2.) Does the research collaborative include a “Diachronizational Accounting” of the community’s history, borrowed from the historical perspective of the participant research collaborator/s, and, has it been approved and given consent to be published by the research-collaborative participant community representative?

3.) Upon agreement with the community, has the research-advocate introduced third-party/external resources to the community specific to the research collaborative in order to further accommodate the collaborating community?

Moreover, for the proposed paradigm to work, the three DRM objectives must center on the following, non-traditional, nine DRM core components as listed below:
1.) “Axiology,”\(^\text{73}\) is reflective and appropriate to/for the community

2.) “Cosmology,”\(^\text{74}\) is reflective and specific to/for community

3.) The research collaborative is “epistemologically”\(^\text{75}\) specific to/for the participant Community

4.) The research collaborative is “Ontologically-Sound”,\(^\text{76}\) and it is specific to the community

5.) Is a non-western/European, conceptualization of time & space respectfully recognized?

6.) The research collaborative is communal, meaning, that the research collaborative involves/surrounds itself around the needs of the community

7.) The research collaborative is ceremonial: At the request of the community, aspects of the research collaborative might include the use of sacred objects/ceremonies, etc….in such cases, the research advocate must be cautious in publishing or sharing such practices with others. Under such circumstance, the research-advocate should consult with the participant community in those instances, and should fully discuss the matter with appropriate community representatives before publishing any information specific to this

8.) The research collaborative does not, in any way, objectify the community

9.) The research collaborative serves as a nexus —A meeting point between the community, the research-advocate, and any potential third parties/externals

The second research question centering on this dissertation, asks, “in which way can the research-advocate best serve the community collaborative?” The response to this

\(^{73}\) According to Wilson, (2008), “An Indigenous axiology is built upon the concept of relational accountability,” i.e., the integrity of the methodology of the collaborative (pg. 77). The research-advocate recognizes an ethical responsibility to the community and to academia and ensures that it is reliable, relative, statistically significant, etc.\ldots

\(^{74}\) An Indigenous cosmology, according to Valles (2005), is the distinct understandings tribal communities have in understanding the cosmological relationships of existence, includes planets, stars, “Gods”, and creation narratives that have been passed down generation-to-generation that explain the purposes and histories of the cosmos and their relationships to individual existence, which includes animate and inanimate entities/objects.

\(^{75}\) Wilson, (2008), explains that an epistemology recognizes that knowledge is relational and expands beyond individual knowledge in which the “concepts or ideas are not as important as the relationships that went into forming them,”\ldots In short, Indigenous epistemology is the understanding/recognition of Natives relationship to “our cultures, our worldviews, our languages, our histories, our spiritualities, and our places in the cosmos” (pg. 74).

\(^{76}\) An Ontology, according to Wilson (2008), from an Indigenous perspective, recognizes that there are multiple realities and is dependent on the relationships we have with that reality/truth; thus, “the ontology may have multiple realities” (pg. 73). Wilson (2008) explains that, “This is our epistemology. Thinking of the world around us as a web of connections and relationships. Nothing can be without a relationship, without its context” (pg. 77). As such, in an Indigenous epistemology knowledge is built “by and around and also from these relationships,” according to Wilson (2008, pg. 77).
second question will be contingent on each collaborative and is not for the research-advocate to
determine; however, within each collaboration the response to the question should come from
with inside the community, in collaboration with the research-advocate. In fact, for the DRM
paradigm to work as it is intended to do so, that response requires that the community tell the
research-advocate in which manner they might best be able to serve their community. This is
something that should be discussed with the collaborating partners from the beginning of the
DRM process, once the research-advocate has been permitted into the community by the
participant group.

The responses to this question will vary. It may include grant writing or doing
further research centering on a specific matter the community might need at the time. It might
even include having the research-advocate tutor community adults or children in statistics,
reading English/translation (when appropriate), or, in working on locating sacred objects for the
community, doing further research as requested by the community, or even in planting gardens
throughout the Rez, building homes/outhouses, walipinis, and yakchals, etc.... The research-
advocate—community collaborative can also include participating in the process of building
further internal infrastructure specific to the community needs, or, by bringing-in pertinent
people, and/or, facilitating advantageous connections on behalf of the community. Again, all
must be agreed upon within a communal, cooperative approach.

In the following, what will be presented is discussion on some of the agreed
areas of need consulted upon between the OLCERI director, Bryan Deans, the OLCERI
Executive Board of Directors, and I, the research-advocate. These are the areas of potential
collaboration/s which I will discuss in greater detail in chapter five of this work. Again, these
mutual agreements have been determined by the OLCERI and members of the collaborating
organization, and not the *Pine Ridge Tribal Council* or communities outside of the partnership, or outside of the *Wakpamni District*. Any attempts at addressing how to best move forward respective to the projects will require that the research-advocate consult further with the *OLCERI* community director/contact individual who is Bryan Deans.
4.4 Part I: Formation of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation

“How can you own anything that never belonged to you in the first place? This is the thinking of the White’s, who measure life by owning the un-ownable…”

--Bryan Deans (2016)

In terms of geographic location, the Great Plains are located on the North American Continent, east of the US/Canadian Rocky Mountains. The US region of the Great Plains consists of differing geographic sections comprised of ten US states, which consist of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico. The sacred Paha Sapa/Black Hills are also located in this region of the present US. As such, this is and has always been a sacred place to the Lakota people.

Humbly, we give thanks to Tunkasila, the Creator, for our lives, and make prayers of gratitude for Unci Maka, Grandmother Earth, for the place to live them. We are grateful for our brave ancestors who carried forward our strong Lakota lifeways and language in spite of great hardship and adversity. From the victories at Little Big Horn to the struggles at Wounded Knee, we are reminded of how fierce, humble, patient, and resilient our relatives had to be for today’s generation to even exist. We live to you [Até /Ancestors] and honor the great sacrifices made so that we may have a chance to live and rediscover for ourselves again as Oglala Lakota.

(From: Oyate Omniciyé, The Oglala Lakota Plan,

---


The Establishment of the *Pine Ridge Indian Reservation*

![Figure 4.9: Pine Ridge & Rosebud Map](https://www.lakotafriendscircle.org/pine-ridge-2/pine-ridge/)

*Pine Ridge* was established in 1889 by the US government in their pursuit to capture Native lands and to control Natives by, forcibly, placing them onto “reservations”.

During the periods of 1868 through 1934, in the original treaties between Natives and the US Government, reservation lands were supposed to be accessible, only, to Natives. This was never the case. Land was absconded by the new US government system by applying a “starve or sell” strategy against Natives. Whatever Native lands were, eventually, granted to the original inhabitants of the continent by the new US “democratic system of government”, time after time, such lands were exchanged for little money and/or inferior goods, as well as other imbalanced...

---

79 **Map Source:** Lakota Friends Circle: [https://www.lakotafriendscircle.org/pine-ridge-2/pine-ridge/](https://www.lakotafriendscircle.org/pine-ridge-2/pine-ridge/)
interactions undertaken at the proverbial hands of the Wašíču. Furthermore, Whites became a part of the Native landscape at the discretion of the US Government, in spite of the treaties mandates which had, originally, made it clear that only Natives were to be on Reservations.

Accordingly, the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation consists of Oglala Lakota County and Bennett County,\textsuperscript{80} Jackson County (southern half), and a portion of Sheridan County.\textsuperscript{81} Bryan Deans, president and founder of OLCERI, explains the matter as follows:

What Bennett County was and Dawes Act, starting with the Dawes Act, they [US Government] allotted un-ceded territories to white people, without having clear title, no exchange for those lands, after the United States lost the war and signed a treaty which says and reinforces eleven times in the Constitution, “all treaties, henceforth, shall be the supreme law of the land.” Okay, now they [US Government] violate that right away with the Dawes Act. But when it comes to Bennett County, this is a reserve, “a reservation,” "reserved land”, for the sole occupancy of the remaining Indigenous population. All right. And when they put that out to be settled by non-native peoples, that's kind of making a statement that "you guys [Lakota] are not going to go on and reproduce." There's no room for expansion, right? So each family member was Supposed to get 160 acres. Once that was allotted out, they got that accomplished. We're [Lakota] still going to have kids, and the lands were reserved for sole occupancy of the remaining people. But instead, they allotted it out to non-indigenous peoples. So, that was a complete and total violation of the agreements of the treaties. It was a complete and total theft at that point, because to steal those lands for the use of White people, without any kind of clear title, any kind of transitional anything. I mean, that's just blatant theft.\textsuperscript{82}

\textsuperscript{80}Note: According to John Andrews, (in Between the Reservations, Dec 29, 2015), “Bennett County is young compared to its 65 counterparts. It was organized in 1909 and named for Granville Bennett, a justice of the Dakota Territory Supreme Court, delegate to Congress and probate judge in Lawrence County,” according to Andrews (2015). Bennet was a non-Native whose legal power over the Oglala Lakota is best demonstrated by this, further, historical and unjust acquisition of Native lands by Whites. As such, the land area now referred to as “Bennett County,” once belonging to the Oglala Sioux people was, legally, “ceded to the federal government and opened to settlement in 1912,” as Andrews (2015) explains. This move allowed for the further breaking up of the Pine Ridge Reservation, securing further non-Natives who will be protected under US law and military action as the settle into this area. This move, legally, protected further colonization of the land area between the Pine Ridge Reservation and the Rosebud Reservation. Direct Link: https://www.southdakotamagazine.com/bennett-county.

\textsuperscript{81}Note: Sheridan County was added by Executive Order No. 2980 in 1904.

\textsuperscript{82}Please Note: Full transcript available in Appendix
Comprised of more than 2.8 million acres situated in the southwest borderlands located between South Dakota and Nebraska, as displayed in Figure 4.9 the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation is the second largest reservation in the US, following the Navajo Nation, which is located in the Four Corners, Southwestern USA. Intrinsically, Pine Ridge, currently, consists of 3,468.85 square miles of actual acreage making it one of the largest US Native reservations, and yet, it holds some of the poorest counties in the US, accordingly. Several continued land disputes have been established, as well.

*Paha Sapa and Kȟe Sapa*

![Image of Paha Sapa and Kȟe Sapa](image)

One such major dispute takes place when the US Government, forcibly, takes the sacred *Black Hills* from the *Great Sioux Nation* when gold is discovered in 1874. Although the

---


Ft. Laramie Treaty of 1868 demarcated this sacred, “God-given,” ancestral space to the Lakota- the original peoples of the continent; hence, the legitimate “owners” if land could be owned--by 1877 the US Congress will “legally” take ownership of the hallowed Paha Sapa\textsuperscript{85} after numerous battles between the two. Undoubtedly, the US will obtain the area and will do so “legally,” not surprisingly, and with no “conflict of interest” issues whatsoever. This will establish a viable pattern of “legal” land acquisition on the part of the “democratically-grounded” government system wherein “truth, justice, and liberty” prevail—except for Natives and marginalized population members. Deans (2020) refers to a quote by the late Supreme Court Justice Harry Blackmun who wrote in his 1980 brief dealing with the “illegal taking of the Black Hills from the Sioux Tribes,” that “A more ripe and rank case of dishonest dealings may never be found in our history” (Echo-Hawk, 2010, p:33). Echo-Hawk (2010) will go on to document the “ten worst Indian law cases ever decided by the US Supreme Court in his critical analysis of US Federal Indian Law, fittingly, titled, In the Courts of the Conqueror…..

Nevertheless, the US Government will defend its right to possess Native lands and their role in the “illegality” of this land grab in a future court case, \textit{US-v-Sioux Nation of Indians}, (1980),\textsuperscript{86} almost one hundred years later. The US will argue that they obtained the sacred Paha Sapa “legally,” although there is nothing concrete to substantiate that claim. If anything, there is enough Wašíču history to piece together in order to counter such arguments

\textsuperscript{85} In a 2009 response to David Swallow, Russell Means describes the Paha Sapa’s as such: “…The sacred Black Hills have two descriptions in the Lakotah language. Paha Sapa and Kȟe Sapa. The white man says that Paha Sapa means ‘Black Hills’. I will attempt to correct their interpretation of my language. The word ‘Pa-ha’ is broken up into two meanings: Pa describes the mountains emerging from the earth. Paha Sapa all together gives you a picture and a description of our sacred mountains as seen from a distance. The Ponderosa Pine gives the illusion of black from a distance and the mountains emerging from the earth. Paha Sapa. Therefore, what you see is holy. The words ‘Kȟe Sapa’ also gives you a description of what the sacred mountains look like close up, with the white stone cliffs, the meadows and the trees and the valleys. Therefore, you know it is holy. Think how profound Paha Sapa is. Just by linguistic interpretation, it begs the question, ‘Were we here at the plate tectonic movements and creation of these hills?’ Wow!…”, from: \textit{Republic of Lakotah, Kȟe Sapa and Paha Sapa – Russell Means’ response to David Swallow}, July 29, 2009 by admin1, Filed under Culture, News, Russell Means, “Kȟe Sapa & Paha Sapa”, Direct Link: \texttt{http://www.republicoflakotah.com/2009/k%26e-sapa-and-paha-sapa-russell-means-response-to-david-swallow/},

and to prove that this is not the case. Echo Hawk argues that the US judicial system has served to, repeatedly, demonstrate that it serves as the “tyranny of the majority,” especially so, when considered in treatment of US Natives.

It is worth briefly mentioning those ten “worst Indian law cases,” many of which I covered in earlier chapters of this work. They are as follows:

1.) Johnson -v.- M’Intosh: Legalizing “how the Indians lost legal title to America”
2.) Cherokee Nation -v.- Georgia: Legalizing “how the courthouses doors were shut down” to Native Americans
3.) Connors- v.- United States and Cheyenne Indians: Legalizing the Indian wars?
4.) Lone Wolf -v.- Hitchcock: Legalizing “the breaking the treaties”
5.) United States -v.- Sandoval: Legalizing non-Native “guardianship”
6.) In re Adoption of John Doe -v.- Heim: Legalizing “the taking of the kids”
7.) Wana the Bear -v.- Community Construction: Legalizing the “taking the dead”
8.) Employment Division -v.- Smith: Legalizing the taking Native religion
9.) Lyng -v.- Northwest Indian Cemetery Association: Legalizing the “taking the holy places”
10.) Tee-Hit-Ton Indians -v.- United States: Legalizing the “confiscating [of] Indigenous habitat”

US Law and History & the Problem with Treaties

Initial treaties between the US government and The Great Sioux Nation are complicated and beyond problematic, especially so, when historians attempt to view the US native experience via a democratically-sound, social justice, ethical lens. In such instances, what comes to light, after brief deliberation, is quite the opposite, a clearly undemocratic treatment of the Indigenous people of the continent, and, a lack of social justice and ethical treatment for US Natives. When taken into consideration, these facts assist in helping us to understand the demographical reality of the good people living on the Pine Ridge Reservation today.
To emphasize the extent of this inequality, the *Oglala Sioux Tribe Constitution*, would not be established until 1936, despite the fact that US Natives have been on the continent way before the arrival of the Wašiću. Still, this should not be surprising once the reader understands that the US Native population, as a demographic, will not be granted US Citizenship until 1924, and, then, voting rights until 1962. This happens, only, as a consequence of the *Civil Rights Movement* of the 1960’s. Again, this serves as another example of how the Wašiću, US politics and legislation, as well as American-born and bred racism, has marginalized US Natives further; thus, disempowering them to the fullest extent. This, too, aside of the practice of continued attempts at genocide. By forbidding US Natives access to the government system/institutions (political and other) /suffrage, etc., in the ways that Whites have access; as a demographic group, basic, fundamental, human rights—citizenship and the right to vote within a democratic government system will impede US Natives to this day.

Little’s article titled, “Native Americans Weren’t Guaranteed the Right to Vote in Every State Until 1962,” explains that “Native people won citizenship in 1924, but the struggle for voting rights stretched on much longer”, serving as another reminder that US White culture, no matter time’s passing, deliberately intimidates and controls minority population members in very significant ways. Little (2018), also, explains that “Native Americans couldn’t be U.S. citizens when the country ratified its Constitution in 1788, and wouldn’t win the right to be for 136 years,” Furthermore, “When black Americans won citizenship with the 14th Amendment in 1868, the government specifically interpreted the law so it didn’t apply to Native people” (See Footnote 40).

This aspect of Americana best appreciated as an intentional attempt to disable and undermine “Others” is best appreciated in the lack of Native American civil rights granted
from the beginning. Clearly, this is an urgent matter that continues to this day and is, easily, traceable to the type of early 18th Century US politics and the type of American racism safely established in the US under White Privilege. This extensive, socio-culturally, colonial history aspect of US cultural bias and racism is best appreciated in the following quote:

“I am not yet prepared to pass a sweeping act of naturalization by which all the Indian savages, wild or tame, belonging to a tribal relation, are to become my fellow-citizens and go to the polls and vote with me,”

--Michigan Senator Jacob Howard87 (1805-1871)

US Treaties and Land Allotment Policies and the Institutionalizing of Whiteness

In terms of US-Indian Nation treaties, it is worth noting that Bryan Deans, Wilmer, and other Oglala Lakota Sioux Natives acknowledge the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868 (FLT 1868) as the initial binding treaty between themselves and the US. Consequently, land allotment policies will not take place between the US government and the Lakota people until the Dawes Act of 1887, which, once again, will lead to a long and repeated history of injustice after injustice, as well as a “forced assimilationist policy, overseen by US Government officials and missionaries,” as Josephy (1915-2005) discusses in Dunbar Ortiz (1977: 26). Note, then, that Lakota history through the lens of academics will refrain from acknowledging US history from this perspective. It will not be until scholars like Josephy, (b.1915-d.2005),88 and other

87 Direct Quote Source: Oxford, AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONALISM, VOLUME II: RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES, Howard Gillman • Mark A. Graber • Keith E. Whittington
For furthers on these types of 19 the Century, political discussions in Washington D.C., see: The US Library of Congress, A Century of Lawmaking for a New Nation: U.S. Congressional Documents and Debates, 1774 – 1875, Congressional Globe, Senate, 39th Congress, 1st Session, pgs. 2880-2900/3840, Library of Congress direct URL link:

social-justice advocates, Indigenous researchers, critical race theorists, environmentalist, and others, begin to challenge this White, Anglo-Saxon, nationally-grounded, colonizer interpretation of history.

Josephy is credited as one of the first non-Native historians to, reliably, interpret early American-Indian history, specific to the Native experience. His work will, eventually, be considered one of the most dependable, consistent, and well-researched resources for both non-Natives and Natives. Josephy will achieve a lifetime of high respect and admiration for the quality of his academic work and, moreover, because he will, eventually, commit to serving Native people in ways that were/are/continue to be beneficial to the Indigenous of the US, exactly, because of his work as a “White”, Native-America historian. It is worth noting that during his early life, Josephy will become the standard of future-environmentalist and social-justice advocates dedicated to Native American rights. Nonetheless, I refer to his work, precisely, because Josephy is a well-studied historian who specialized in Native American history and makes similar references, as briefly discussed in the latter.

Josephy is recognized for interpreting US-Native history as it really happened to Natives, e.g., grounded in the actual historical writings and journal entries of that time, as well as the oral histories of Natives. Josephy will describe early-on, and throughout, his extensive publishing career how those diachronical events will impact Natives, precisely, from outside the nationalistic, historical interpretations of Whites. In so doing, Josephy steps-away from the academic standard, which is intertwined in Euro-American, ethno-centrism and Whiteness, again, centering on the needs of the White academy. As such, Josephy (1974) recognized the great injustices committed against all US Natives, both in and out of American history books.
Of the once-free, proud and beautiful Lakota, Josephy writes, “their spiritual and governmental values in structures of society had evolved through thousands of years and were satisfying to the people. They governed themselves; they managed and controlled their own affairs; and they neither required the assistance of outsiders, nor menaced others” (Dunbar Ortiz, 1974: 19). As Josephy (1974) further explains, in the beginning of the 1600s the first Europeans/Whites who will eventually arrive and begin interacting with Natives are fur traders from Québec and Montreal:

They impose themselves on the Sioux people living in Minnesota, trying both to wean them away from the spiritual beliefs of their fathers by Christianizing them, and to enroll them as allies in the fur trade against the British from Hudson Bay and various other Native peoples whom the English were already aggressively exploiting as procurers of furs (Dunbar Ortiz, 1974: 19).

Josephy explains that as the English begin appearing amongst the Sioux an “imperialistic rivalry for control of the continent harmed all the Native Americans, including the Sioux—seducing and forcing Native groups into roles as armed auxiliaries in the white men’s wars, introducing alcohol and disease, and corrupting societies with European materialistic traits” (Dunbar Ortiz, 1974:19). As Josephy explicates further, still, “the Sioux, nevertheless successfully maintained throughout the period of French and English disruption their own sovereignty, independence and traditional values and ways of life” (Dunbar Ortiz, 1974:19). This moment in US history will be, especially, critical to the well-being of early Natives. What begins with the mass and consistent arrival of White, Anglo-Saxons, in particular, is the beginning moments of Native diachronization as a consequence of the changing demographic, as Josephy discusses in the following (Dunbar Ortiz, 1974: 19):

After the transference of the so-called Old Northwest and Louisiana Territories to the new government of the United States, American fur trappers from St. Louis began to meet
groups of western, or Teton, Sioux, including Oglalas, Hunkpapas, and others, along the Mississippi and Missouri rivers in present-day Minnesota, Iowa, and South Dakota. During the passage through Sioux lands in 1804, Lewis and Clark reported such a meeting (Dunbar Ortiz, 1974: 19).

As whites continue to arrive to the continent, Josephy (1974) outlines that in 1805, Lieutenant Pike will attempt the first ever “American” treaty with a group of Sioux Indians located, at the time, around what is now called present-day Minneapolis, Minnesota. To be clear, Pike’s intent is to purchase two tracts of Native land for use as a military post, which should have served early Indigenous peoples as an early warning of what was to come to all Natives. Natives of that time had no idea that their ancestral lands would soon be stolen away from them and become overridden with White colonizers. Moreover, as Josephy explains, it is at that moment in history that Pike asserts “full sovereignty and power over said districts forever” (Dunbar Ortiz, 1974: 19).

Accordingly, as Josephy tells, “The agreement neither intended to assert power over the Sioux people, nor said so, and the treaty itself was never fully proclaimed by the president of the United States” (1974:19). Pre-1812, British presence in the new “America” was too strong and will only disperse after the War of 1812, which was a war that centered on a conflict in which continued fighting between the early “Americans” of that time and the English, who arrived from Great Britain, was incessant. The War of 1812 centered over British violations of U.S. maritime rights respective to what will, eventually, become the United States of America. Consequently, when the War of 1812 begins, the British effectively ban Americans from the upper Mississippi and middle Missouri rivers, according to Josephy (1974).

After the War of 1812, as Josephy (1974) explains further, as well as other progressive, critical theorists, and Indigenous historians document, illegal entry by Whites
saturates the continent, entering, even, into, once, sacred, Sioux lands. This migration will continue throughout the 1820’s-1830’s. At the same time, led by “American officials” in pursuit of Native lands, White “officials” begin a prevailing movement to gain Native lands, initially, by trickery and, then, by any other means possible. Natives will, eventually, recognize the impossibility of fighting against the entry of so many “illegals,” eventually recognizing that they cannot do so by force alone. As Native warriors and chiefs continue to first-handly, witness the demise of not only their land, but their people, they begin to consider the possibility of further negotiating with Whites. Consequently, Natives are unwilling to give up what has always rightfully been theirs.

In the end, whether Natives fight back against the White, European invasion, or, if they attempt to reconcile differences with the Whites by means of Treaties, the Indigenous people of Turtle Island will be tested by the strength and viability of an early US military force and an early, White, Euro-centrist, bureaucratic system designed to work against them. Eventually, much will be taken from them, and much of the taking will be done legally through “Doctrines of Discovery,” to earlier White, European concepts such as “Manifest Destiny,” or by “Papal Bulls.” With great and unending sorrow for Native and the continent, the invasion of Whites will, irrevocably, change Native existence on the continent, whether located in the Northern, Southern, Central, or other Latin regions of the continent now called “America the Great.”

*How the US-Native Treaty Process Worked Itself Out*

Recognizing the inevitable powerlessness of a, once, independent people who had lived and roamed freely on saddleless horses on a continent once devoid of any “White” or “White mans’ technological war advances;” from a post-modern, historical lens, it is not too
difficult to recognize what will befall the Natives of the continent. To be sure, all tactics will be implemented by Whites, leading-up to a very contentious period of early American history. Consequently, attempted “treaties” between the two groups will always seem to result in having short-changed and/or cheated Natives, who will repeatedly lose-out in this new “land of the free,” as Josephy, Deloria, Dunbar Ortiz, and other prominent critical theorists/historians discuss in their work. Directed by the likes of early whites like Henry Clay, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, and other early colonizers, tragically, this will be the beginning of the end for Natives, while at the same time, early American nationalism and racial sectionalism, sanctified by the *US Supreme Court*, will take off.

These types of policies are first introduced by the US Congress serving during the federalist administration of George Washington, and, then, later, federalist ad anti-federalist US presidents who envisioned the payment of the national debt and the expenses of the government as something that could be achieved through “the sale of western lands—which would be procured by purchase from the Indian tribes,” according to Josephy (Dunbar Ortiz, 1974: 20). Furthermore, as Josephy (1974) explains on this historically, critical, version of the American-Native saga-of-sorts,

Almost from the start, however, it was clear that the Indians did not wish to sell their lands, and beginning in 1790 bribery, deceit, fraud, and armed force were all used to dispose the tribes and move them westward ahead of the advancing white land speculators and settlers. Thus, military force was used under Generals Harmar, St. Clair, and Wayne to seize present-day Ohio and much of Indiana from Indian owners.

President Jefferson encouraged a speed-up of the process of driving all Indians out of the East and across the Mississippi River, giving license to such unprincipled agents as General William Henry Harrison to use bribery, to make Indian negotiators drunk, to forge their marks, and to use individuals with no authority in order to produce treaties that ceded land to the Americans (1974: 20).
To appreciate what will, inevitably, transpire at the time, the reader should imagine the worst things possible, wrongfully, committed against others in order to obtain something that is recognized as priceless; highly, coveted-after; and “a thing” that possesses boundless, potential sources of wealth and prestige. Consequently, as Josephy (1974) explains, “the first treaties with the Sioux, who lived in lands beyond the immediate need of the westward-movie whites—were to procure their friendship, rather than their lands” (1974: 20).

The initial Treaty of 1815 was signed with one group of Sioux who had been in contact with the British, rather than the Americans, during the War of 1812, and was merely to ‘establish perpetual peace and friendship’ between those Sioux and the Americans,” according to Josephy (1974: 20). As such, this treaty was intended to keep peace amongst Natives and incoming White illegals.

As Josephy (1974) clarifies, the first “treaty” [1851] states that the Lakota Band of that place and time, “placed themselves under the protection of the United States, and no other nation, power, or sovereign, whatsoever.” For the early American colonizers, the major impetus for doing so centered on “preventing the Indian signers from becoming allies in the future of any potential enemy of the United States,” according to Dunbar Ortiz, (1974: 20). Furthermore, Josephy (1974) explains that:

This wording and similar phraseology in other treaties is important to present day Indian peoples in at least two respects. First, the wording itself aside of how it was conveyed to the Indians, and what they understood it to mean, obviously conferred to the United States no authority or sovereignty over the Sioux group. It was, as stated in its preamble, the Treaty of peace and friendship between two independent parties met on equal terms.

Secondly, white historians when reviewing documents made with Indians, have been derelict. Victims of ethnocentricity, they have viewed the written word from the point of view of the white men
who wrote it, but, in general, had failed to question how it was communicated to the Indian who did not speak English, or spoke and understood it falsely; what the Indian understood that it said; how the Indians among themselves reacted to it and; what replies, and objections Indians might have made; how the white men treated those replies, and how the treaty was finally signed, and by whom…

Dunbar Ortiz, (1974: 20)

Essentially, what Josephy (1974) is making clear, even in 1974, is that Whites took advantage, have taken advantage, and continue to take advantage of Native peoples in the US. In attempting to contextualize this history, for starters, academics must recognize the fact that such a standpoint is a representation of another version of American history that is, traditionally, negated in public school curriculum and in the academy, as well as in American teacher preparation schooling (Rossatto, Valles, & et al, 2020). Key to understanding this is the, necessary, recognition that the academy is complicit in maintaining the history of the colonizer, even in teacher preparation programs.

Josephy (1974) will argue throughout his illustrious career that “the written words of a vast number of Indian treaties, including most of those made with the Sioux, are deceptive, hiding the facts that again and again, a white man’s ‘gist’ was often deliberately false or misleading, hiding or distorting what the words of the treaty actually said; that the communication that was made to the Indians by an interpreter, often a Frenchman or half-breed faulty in English or the Indian language, or both, and sometimes by a man who had trouble with the Indians, that wished to see them harmed, and played mischievous tricks in his role as interpreters; that frequently the actual Indians with authority to speak, and sign a treaty for their people, refused to do so, and the Indian signatures on a document where those of individuals who were bribed, or gotten drunk, or who had no authority to sign for the people, or, are actual
forgeries, placed on the document by the white negotiators after the treaty meeting (Dunbar Ortiz, 1974: 20-21).

In short, early treaty making initiated by White colonizers is, to say the least, beyond problematic. Instead, it should be acknowledged as a typical characteristic of an American agenda, evident, even, during the early formation years of this nation. In many ways, it will come to set the bar for future “treaties” between the US and colonized territories, or lands. The policies will repeatedly be unethical, unjust, and seeded in one type of deception or other (Alvarez, 2014; Pevar, 2012; Clarkin, 2001; Deloria, Jr., 1985; Echo-Hawk, 2010; Fixico, 1986; Foreman, 1976; Getches & et al, 1998; Grinde, Jr. & Mann, 1998; Hertzberg, 1972; Johnson, 2005; Josephy, 1982; Lyons, Mohawk, Deloria, Jr. Hauptman; Berman, Grinde, Jr. & Mann, Berkey, Venables, 1992; Means, 1995; Prucha, 1997; Weber, Ed., 1973; Wilkinson & The American Indian Resources Institute).

Josephy (1974) consistently argues, and rightly-so, that “all these ramifications to written treaties, ignored by whites, have become clear to Indians in recent years, as they had begun to examine the documents for themselves. From their own oral accounts, they know their own people’s understanding of the treaties as it was handed down to them, and they know, as well the individual accounts of false treaties secured by episodes of white men’s bribery, deceit, forgery, and military force. But, adding substance to what they know from the reference of their own people, has come the modern research and scholarship undertaken in claims cases, and by present-day historians, examining the records of the white man himself, in the American National Archives and elsewhere, revealing the letters, the diaries, and official report of the negotiators who boasted in detail how they cheated the Indians in the treaty sessions… (Dunbar Ortiz, 1974: 21).
To my reader, this is a reflection of by what means things have been accomplished, beginning from the very start, in a country that places sacred, personal ideologies on white men’s tenets surrounding a faulty narrative that claims, “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness…” — unless you’re NOT white (Declaration of Independence, 07/04/1776).

To further expand on the above analysis, I acknowledge that the Declaration of Independence, (07/04/1776), clearly pits Natives (who have always been Indigenous to this same continent, a continent which they have inhabited for millennia) against Whites. In terms of democratic ideals, this fact is beyond problematic but benefits us in appreciating why US Natives experience the type of socio-cultural, economic, political, and, overall, mental/physical, well-being issues that circumvent them, which begin with the arrival of the Whites to this continent. After all, these early Anglo-Saxon, White, “Christian,” slave-holding, demigods are trying to take what has always belonged to the Natives of the continent. It is theirs. The extent of this is best exemplified in the US Declaration of Independence, as cited by the framers against King George of Great Britain:

…He [King George] has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our Frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known Rule of Warfare, is an undistinguished Destruction of all Ages, Sexes and Conditions…” (non-enumerated list of grievances against King George)

Likewise, The US Constitution, ratified in 1789, will cite the power of the US Congress against Natives, who eventually will be placed on Reservations; that is, at least, those Natives that remain. Accordingly, The US Congress has the power “To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;.”
Relative to the *US Census*, which is the culmination of the state-by-state population count mandated by the *US Constitution* that determines the number of members in the *House of Representatives* allotted per district, Native Americans will not be counted; hence, they will be denied a voice in the American government system from its inception, and, even after the US Civil War. What this means is that if you are not counted in the US Census, essentially, you do not have the right to representation in the political process. If you are *not* a part of the demographic count, how is political/legislative representation assured to the people of the US? The *US Constitution* is very clear about this matter and states that regarding “the actual enumeration,”

… Representation and direct taxes shall be appointed among the several states which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound for service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths all other persons...

---*US Constitution, Section II, The House of Representatives*

Going further back in time, in order to secure limited economic opportunities, if any, for Native Americans, *The Articles of Confederation, (1781)*, under *Article 9, The Powers of the Congress*, states that:

…the United States in Congress assembled shall also have the sole and exclusive right and power of regulating the alloy and value of coins struck by their own authority, or by that of the respective states—fixing the standard of weights and measures throughout the United States—regulating the trade and managing all affairs with the Indians, not members of any of the states, provided that the legislative right of any state within its own limits be not infringed or violated…

The noose around US, feigned, ideals of democracy continues to get tighter as we further examine the laws that will be created from there on, many affirmed by the highest

Consequently, legislation/laws that will be put into the books in order to ensure capture of Native lands and Native economic systems, which are necessary in a hyped-up capitalistic nation, will be born and best appreciated when one parallels US-Native American history with the US Judiciary (Rossatto, Valles, & et al, 2020; Saiz & DeMaio, 2019; Danforth, 2015; Harjo, 2014; Derezotes, 2014; Pevar, 2012; Williams, 2012; Giddens & Duneier, & et al, 2011; Josephy, 1970, 1978; Lilienfeld, Lynn, & et al, 2009; Wilkinson & *The American Indian Resources Institute*, 2004; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, 2012; Getches, Wilkinson, & Williams, 1998; Deloria, 1985; Foreman, 1976; Weber, 1973). From micro, meso, macro-level court systems, including the *Supreme Court of the United States* (*SCOTUS*), the highest court in the land, from the beginning the early US colonial system will deliberately work against Natives in order to take what isn’t theirs, and in so doing, will forcibly (physically /militaristically), legally, politically, and socio-culturally begin the continual process of US colonization.

*The Early US Colonization Machine and the Creation of Institutionalized Inequities: Racism and Economic Oppression in the “New World”*

Beginning with *Johnson v M’Intosh*, U.S. 543 (1823), following the legal practices of Great Britain, the US Supreme Court will establish and uphold this new law which states that early “American” citizens are prohibited from purchasing lands from Native Americans. In so doing, the US Government will begin the practice of safeguarding Native
lands, legally, for its early “leaders” and the US institutions they represent. *Johnson v.M’Intosh* will set the colonization stage by securing the foundational tenets behind the *Doctrine of Discovery*, which goes back to that early period of White, European exploration that will eventually have them land on *Turtle Island*. As such, as the explorers land in new geolocations, inhabited or not, by the power of their nation’s leaders they are to claim all new territories as those belonging to their king, queen, or pope. As colonization begins on Turtle Island, the concepts behind Papal Bulls, combined with White European bravado will make it very difficult for Natives to resist, or frankly, challenge the new colonial system as it is a system expressly designed for the oppressors needs and their continual conquests.

Essentially, the *Doctrine of Discovery* has been a colonization tool used throughout European history in order to support the oppressors decisions to take-over lands/possessions belonging to others. The *Doctrine* supports White, Euro-American belief that they have the “right” to dispossess others from their native lands. They do so by annulling and/or disregarding Native rights, and then proceed to make it “legal” by use of their White, Euro-American, legal system; hence, Natives are legally dispossessed of their land in favor of colonial or post-colonial governments. In the case of *Pine Ridge*, the community I am collaborating with, Strickland (2016) writes that the *Pine Ridge Reservation* is “established” by the colonizers “in 1889 as *Camp #334* for Native prisoners of war, as white colonists pressed westward across the North American continent” (pg. 1). This is another example of how the US has doled out harmful and unjust policies against Natives in order to benefit non-Native groups.

Returning to Josephy’s lifetime work as a White man, initially, working indirectly in relation to the issues surrounding Native sovereignty policy, Bernstein (2005) explains that “Mr. Josephy’s work captured the attention of government officials, including
Secretary Stewart L. Udall. He became a consultant on federal policy toward Indians, even writing a study on the status of Indian affairs for President Richard M. Nixon. Nixon wanted to reverse the Eisenhower-era policies,” which ended the autonomy of reservations, and “that Nixon felt tarnished the Republican Party.” 89 Apparently, Josephy’s convictions circumventing Native sovereignty appealed to Nixon, who considered Eisenhower’s policy “disastrous,” according to Bernstein (2005). 90

Miles (2005) explains that in 1969, Josephy advised Udall and the report addressing the issues surrounding Native sovereignty was forwarded to President Nixon, in which Josephy explains, the “‘Indians’ ongoing fears of ‘termination,’ a policy developed under Eisenhower during the 1950s.” At the time, under Eisenhower, “More than 100 tribes lost federal recognition and tribal land holdings when they were involuntarily ‘assimilated’ into white culture,” according to Miles 91 and other academics specializing in Federal Indian Law (Rossatto, Valles, & et al, 2020; Saiz & DeMaio, 2019; Danforth, 2015; Harjo, 2014; Derezotes, 2014; Pevar, 2012; Williams, 2012; Giddens & Duneier & et al, 2011; Josephy, 1970, 1978; Lilienfeld, Lynn, & et al, 2009; Wilkinson & The American Indian Resources Institute, 2004; Tuhjwai Smith, 1999, 2012; Getches, Wilkinson, & Williams, 1998; Deloria, 1985; Foreman, 1976; Weber, 1973).

Miles (2005) elucidates further and explains that “The policy, in theory, had ended by the 1960s, but many tribes feared its revival. Josephy explained the history of this destructive policy, and his report contributed to the Nixon administration’s new approach,

---

91 Source: Alvin Josephy: A gentle, graceful advocate for sovereignty". Rebecca A. Miles, High Country News, December 12, 2005
called “self-determination,” which fostered political autonomy and cultural survival”\(^92\) (see Clarkin, 2001). Miles (2005) further explains that “Based significantly on Josephy’s advice and encouragement, the Nixon Administration adopted a policy of ‘self-determination’ for Native Americans, and furthered policies and practices to encourage their cultural survival.”\(^93\) Evidently, throughout his lifetime, Josephy will be a critical leader and fighter for Native rights, as well as an early reputable and highly accomplished environmentalist, tying it to Native rights.

Not surprisingly, beginning in the 1990s, Josephy would become the founding board chairman of the *Smithsonian Institution’s, National Museum of the American Indian* (*NMAI*). As in his life, Josephy played a significant role in the creation and design of the educational curriculum and research aspects of the *NMAI*, a White institution that attempts to preserve, to this day, that which it houses. Dependent on the politics of the coming future, Native repatriation issues will, surely, be critical in determining how Native artifacts housed at the *Smithsonian* will be returned to their respective communities. I imagine that similar to Dawes attempts to retain Native lands for Natives through the use of Congressional legislation, Josephy recognized the need to hold on to whatever he could on behalf of Natives, especially because of the politics of that time.

I recognize that I just hit a sore spot with that statement, but in retrospection, what is clear to me, as an Indigenous researcher, is that US history has, repeatedly, worked against marginalized peoples. It could be argued that is through White intervention, those who worked from within who might have attempted to hang-on to some aspect of Native/marginalized culture in order to protect it, preserve it for a posterity that will, we pray, step


Similarly, Miles (2005) contends that Josephy was critical to modern Native policy, as such, Josephy “helped others to understand that tribes were sovereign nations before Europeans arrived on the continent and that fundamentally they remain so today. The government did not ‘give’ tribes their rights and powers; they hold them inherently and retain them in their treaties. Reservation lands were also not given to tribes; they were retained by the tribes and represent important parts, if often sad remnants, of former homelands.”94 Deans and I will return to Josephy’s work in a subsequent chapter.

Getches, Wilkinson, & Williams (1998) will elaborate on US Federal Indian Law throughout the remaining sections of this work; still, it is important to understand just what it is and what it consists of, and then place that information into a colonial, White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant (WASP) lens, which is one that, historically, newly arriving WASP control of the military, the political landscape, and the US court system while they create a “democratic” government system whose foundational principles lay in the ideal of a government system “for the people, by the people, and of the people. All this should be considered within the context of

the arrival of countless illegal immigrants into this “new” continent, which they have forcibly
taken full ownership of.

Nevertheless, as Getches & et al (1998) expound, US Federal Indian Law is
“expressed in separate volumes of the United States Code and the US Code of Federal
Regulations, in some 380 treaties, in hundreds of opinions of the Solicitor of the Department of
the Interior, in thousands of cases, and in scores of law review articles,” which continues to
expand (pg. 1). It must be pointed out just how problematic this fact is. Going back in time, the
critical thinker and, even, the novice US historian should recognize that at the time the treaties
are being created, Natives do NOT speak English, do NOT read English, and more important,
do NOT have anyone on the US side looking out for their interests or that of their progeny. To
the contrary, early WASP Americans have only one item on the agenda of that time, and that is
to take over the continent. Instead, White colonizers will implement on devious tactics to ensure
that they, eventually, end up with Native lands, as Getches & et al (1998) explain:

…..Originally, Indians governed themselves free of outside interference or control. As the New World was colonized,
something had to be done about the continent’s Aboriginal inhabitants. Very early it was apparent that the tribes could
be contained Or decimated by force. But the cost in lives, material, time and conscience were far too great. Indians
were in the way; their lands were needed for settlement and the frontier was too vast to defend against “hostile Indians.”
Thus, the United States’ policy of negotiating land cessions in treaties and, with certain promises and rights in return
was born of necessity and convenience. It drew on an age-old theory of the colonizing nations of Europe that arrogated to
Christian “discoverers” the right to extend their dominion over aboriginal people… (1998: 2)

It is amongst this brief historical background that current data will be situated in. We begin the
process of better understanding this fundamental and profoundly disturbing truth circumventing
the US Native experience in a country that declares to itself and all others that, “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness” (US Declaration of Independence, 1776). Oh, the great, and painful, irony.

Disputing these Self-Evident Truths: “that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness...”

America, like other colonized White spaces found throughout this planet, has not been good to the original occupants of the continent. Now referred to as “America the Beautiful,” if the US were to be put on trial for human rights abuses committed against peoples, Natives will be at the top of that list. As the US continues to be the place called home by Natives, since millennia’s ago, it is important that this fact be acknowledged, similar to what Pope Francis did, as described in a previous chapter. Furthermore, as suggested by Valles (2020) in Rossatto, Valles, & et al, “public and college/university, as well as research regarding Natives, must acknowledge this great injustice.” Moreover, what really needs to be done at the tribal-level is to begin the process of accommodating, promoting, and creating future Native American attorneys specialized in US Federal Indian Law—with the caveat that they know their own Native history and are comfortable enough with themselves to embrace it and protect it. Just as important, they need to be on the side of the Native people; hence, on the side of their ancestors whose loss of people, culture, language, and lands have been significantly damaged by Whites/the status quo, in short, the Wašiču.

It is worth noting at this point of the dissertation that the DRM framework attempts to address the latter mentioned. At the same time, the DRM framework will make clear that Natives have been so disenfranchised from Western American society that all might seem
lost to the research-advocate, and others who make the time to do and read the work. Similarly, it might seem to the writer of the work, and, possibly, the reader, that US Natives have reached a point in history of no return. Natives cannot go back, nor can they ever. Likewise, Natives throughout the world can never be like Whites in terms of human rights because they have, historically, worked against the Indigenous of the world.

Until the progeny of the White colonizer reckons with that history and the role, and toll, of what was committed against Natives by the White ancestors is acknowledged, nothing will come of this work or framework. Redress can only be achieved when Non-Natives become familiar with the contemporary Native experience. That is the ultimate penultimate motivator behind the DRM framework. I acknowledge that it will be a difficult one to achieve. Still, hope lives. Once acknowledged and understood, Whites must work with Natives in redistributing and reckoning with the unjust laws their ancestors have established that have worked against Native peoples, historically, in tandem with racism.

What remains, as in the case of the collaboration between OLCERI and I, is the recognition that Natives must move forward while capturing all Indigenous fragmentations remaining from early Native society. They must continue to move forward and can only do so by becoming self-sufficient. Just as important, they must educate their children in the ways of the Whites and ensure that their children complete schooling, while centering their identity in their Indigeneity (Dunbar Ortiz, 1972; Hertzberg, 1972; Means, 1995).

In spite of all the tragedy, betrayals and broken treaties directed, specifically, against Native peoples, like the priceless land given to the Native people by Wakan Tanka, the Great Mystery, what remains is the people of the tribe. In spite of everything that has been forced upon the Indigenous of the world, still, they continue to stand tall and proud of their
inestimable and, temporarily, obscured heritage—always recognizing that is somewhere near them. Perhaps, it is something that is genetically carried in their being, their essence.

I am always amazed by that fact. Although US Native people continue to grapple in re-gaining their language, their culture, their economy, still, they continue to stand tall, cognizant of the fact that they continue to serve as proof of their ancestors insurmountable struggles, and ultimately, successes, for they are still here. Precious ancestors, who, repeatedly, were recipients of a relentless barrage of conflictual dead ends, costly challenges to life and Earth, and innumerous injustices—precisely, attributed to European colonization—directly, triggered, aimed, and fired at Natives in order to wound, if not kill them, as a consequence of white infiltration of the continent. If they did not kill them, then, like the cybernetic organism of science fiction called the Borg, the Indigenous must assimilate. Resistance is futile…:

We are the Borg. Lower your shields and surrender your ships. We will add your biological and technological distinctiveness to our own. Your culture will adapt to service us. Resistance is futile95

Returning to the reservations “belonging” to America the Beautiful, the living Native grandfathers and grandmothers, many of which are currently caring for their grandchildren, must be protected, internally and externally, at all costs. At the same time, acknowledgment of those struggles must be documented, published, and shared through our research, the academy, and through social movements. In due course, and in harmony, as a grand collective we must demand Indigenous rights. It is expected that Natives will experience a restorative period, perhaps, at the cost of the destruction of the world as we currently know it. What might that look like? It will be witnessed as a return to Native ways, Native language.

Native culture, customs, and spirituality, which will begin the long process of continued healing for one of Americas greatest human resources, the Indigenous peoples of this continent (Derezotes, 2014).

The Native American experience is one that must be documented, tribe by tribe, published and shared with the world. Too similar to the Holocaust of Nazi-Germany, the Native American experience is, indeed, one of disease, deliberate genocide, economic, socio-cultural, political, psychological, and spiritual oppression. The big difference lays in the fact that the oppression has been instigated by a nation whose most sacred political documents decry injustice, inequality, and the religious oppression of its people which was experienced by the first colonizers at the hands of their fatherland, Great Britain. Herein is where it really stinks. What was committed against them by their true government, the English monarchial system, they too will commit against the Native peoples of this continent, the true “Americans.”
4.5 Part II: Institutionalization of the Great Sioux Nation, *Pine Ridge Indian Reservation*, South Dakota

“We the people of the United States in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution for the United States of America…”

--Preamble, *The U.S. Constitution*, (Ratified, 1789)

“…The strength of the Indian philosophy is dramatically shown by the survival of tribal societies in the prehistoric. But the Indians record of tenacity since the arrival of Europeans is especially impressive. Typically, tribes were forced to give up their historical homelands and to change their traditional ways....”


Upon the arrival of White Europeans to the “Edenesque” continent now called “America” after the 16th Century, *Italian*, explorer Amerigo Vespucci, White Europeans will begin the hasty process of capture, control, and colonization. After the ratification of the *US Constitution* in 1789, the continent will be infiltrated by Europeans who will begin the process of forming a new type of government system modeled on the Ancient Greek concepts of democracy, “a government of the people, for the people, and by the people.” By 1830, the early American colonizers have established the *Indian Removal Act*. Renaissance man and a great lover of the concept of democracy, *Le Comte de Tocqueville*, will document this tragic and lamentable era as he first-handedly witnesses the rapid western expansion of White-Europeans while, paradoxically, the First nations peoples are forced onto US federal reservations, as described in the following:

*The Indian Removal Act of 1830 (IRA of 1830)*

The *Indian Removal Act of 1830, IRA of 1830*, was a US policy signed into effect by, then, US President Andrew Jackson. Jackson, who holds a troubling history in a nation that
prides itself on equality and justice for all, early on, recognized the need to secure Native lands for the White settlers of that time. He was willing to do so at any price. Essentially, *The IRA of 1830* authorized US presidents the right to negotiate with Indigenous tribes for their, eventual, westward displacement. Taken from their ancestral lands in exchange for US currency, Natives were to be placed on a reservation as a collective group, initially, as recounted by the *Count de Tocqueville* in 1831 who will witness, first-handedly, how European colonization dismantles entire Native populations at the whim of the colonizer.

Although the repeated injustices directed against the Indigenous of the continent will never go away with the arrival of the first Europeans millennia ago, it is beyond interesting to read the witness accounts from the perspective of a European; moreover, a colonial collaborator:

> At the end of the year 1831, whilst I was on the left bank of the Mississippi, at a place named by Europeans, Memphis, there arrived a numerous band of Choctaw’s. These savages had left their country and were endeavoring to gain the right Bank of the Mississippi, where they hoped to find an asylum which had been promised them by the American government.

> It was then the middle of the winter, and the cold was unusually severe. The snow had frozen hard upon the ground, and the River was drifting huge masses of ice. The Indians had their families with them; And they brought in their train the wounded and the sick, with children newly born, and old men upon the verge of death. They possessed neither tents nor wagons, but only their arms and some provisions.

> I saw them embark to pass the mighty River, and never will that solemn spectacle fade from my Remembrance. No cry, nor sob, was heard amongst the assembled crowd. All were silent. Their

---

96 According to Lewey (2004) & The Smithsonian, Native Museum of the American Indian (2015). “The act has been referred to as a unitary act of systematic genocide, because it discriminated against an ethnic group in so far as to make certain the death of vast numbers of its population...,” For further see: Smithsonian, Native Museum of the American Indian: The 'Indian Problem.' (March 3, 2015). When you move a people from one place to another, when you displace people, when you wrench people from their homelands ... wasn't that genocide? We don't make the case that there was genocide. We know there was. Yet here we are...” YouTube: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=if-BOZxWZPF. Also see: Lewey, Guenter (September 1, 2004). "Were American Indians the Victims of Genocide?". Commentary. Retrieved March 8, 2017. Also available in reprint from the History News Network.
calamities were of ancient date, and they knew them to be irremediable.

The Indians had all stepped into the bark, which was to carry them across, but their dogs remained upon the bank. As soon as these animals perceived that their masters were finally leaving the shore, they set up a dismal howl, and, plunging altogether into the icy waters of the Mississippi, swam after the boat.

Comte de Tocqueville

The Trail of Tears

Winter, 1831

Under the IRA of 1830, “Proceeds from the land sales were to be placed in and used by the [US ] government as an account for supplies provided to Indian people,” which will begin the process of dependency for the once free and self-sufficient Indigenous peoples of this continent (Lewey, 2004). Throughout US-Native history, the American government, overwhelming, will work against the good of the First Peoples of the Continent. This will be true for all First Peoples of this continent; however, this also stands true for Native populations located from throughout the world.

As a critical aspect of the IRA 1830, lands not partitioned to Native Americans now living on the reservation were to be purchased by the US and would be opened-up for White homesteading, further dividing the tribes while allowing for the continuous accumulation of what is now becoming the nation state. The scattering of Whites amongst Natives will be another way of ensuring continued control of the Natives, lessening the possibility of rebellion. While this phase of history cements itself, negatively, specific to the essence of Indigeneity, for many members of the Tiyospaye, to this day, a form of continued resistance will follow these proud and brave people as they continue to fight back, to the point of no return.

During these, significantly, life-altering, years of early colonization and pro-assimilationist policy promotion on behalf of what is now becoming the US nation state; the
Lakota Sioux of *Pine Ridge* begin to experience poverty, hunger, addiction, and further inter-tribal divisions, which will rampantly increase, not just on *Pine Ridge*, but throughout US Native reservations. In this “new” Whiten world, which, by this time, has become largely inhabited by White-Europeans, major changes continue to take place outside of the Rez, while major changes take root at the micro-meso-levels of the Tiyospaye.

As Natives continue to settle onto reservations and be forced-fed, White food and White way “a ’la scraps” by the White powerholders, the once proud and free Indigenous peoples of Turtle Island will continue to receive the “over-seers” slops from that point forward. What else can they do at the time? Tribes are outnumbered, tired, and constantly the target of Whites. With heavy hearts, the tribal chiefs of that time recognized this dilemma. Either they ceased resisting, or they would be completely eliminated by the white colonizers, who had by that time overwhelmed the continent with their continued arrival.
“America is Stolen Land,” The Beginning of the US Reservation Period

The beginning of the US reservation period marks the beginning, and the end, of the old ways of the ancestors, which will impact the essence of Turtle Island Indigeneity throughout the generations to come. As contemporary data from throughout the world substantiates, these types of policies, in the end, surprisingly manifest unexpected positive results. For US reservations in particular, as a byproduct of these types of vicious US Federal policies, “The Rez” will end-up preserving elders as a collective group, which allows for a sense of continuity and inner-socio-cultural, psychological survival within the tribe, in spite of counter efforts to socio-culturally, linguistically, and psychologically decimate US Native Americans further. This aspect of modern-day tribal life is now allowing for third spaces, within many US tribal communities, in which, once, scattered language is being reconstructed, inter-tribally.

The US Rez, today, is the only place on the planet where remnants of native language continue to be spoken, correspondingly. On some US reservations, as in the case of the Navajo Nation, tribal communities air news, Native and American music, and local community events on radio stations in which their language is spoken for all tribal community members to hear whenever they wish to, presuming one has the means to do so. This is a popular medium for many tribal members as it, further, allows for a type of psychological healing from the diachronizational effects of Whiteness and colonization, on many levels.

Imagine what that might feel like for tribal members. Aside of the re-familiarizing of oneself with the language of one’s grandparents and community elders, airing Native language for all to hear brings the community closer together; hence, the abstract
outcomes of White mans’ technology is becoming an important staple in rebuilding the essence of the Native, both at the micro- and meso-levels. This will be further discussed in a subsequent chapter in which language repatriation will be discussed by Deans in his section on Lakota diachronization.

Returning to IRA 1830, a pattern of the US Federal government doling-out second/third-hand, hand-outs is, intentionally, historically-seeded and established. It is one that will, continuously, be debilitating to US Natives. As it begins to gel, this practice sets the pattern of inferior treatment of US Natives for posterity’s sake, that is, from the point-of-view of early American power-holders and legislators. Not much has changed as it continues to be practiced by the US, specifically, against Natives. This is not a practice specific, only, to perishables and non-perishable items alike, i.e., old, dirty, blankets infested with filthy mites and spotted with rotting holes, and/or, foul-smelling and tasting, perishable goods not meant for human consumption but given to Natives by the US Federal government—all common practices during the 19th and 20th century. We could go on and on with these types of examples. This is not a matter, generally, to be talked about in US history books or in US public school/institutional spaces.

The 1830 IRA was supposed to serve as an exchange of sorts, instead, it becomes the low-bar for setting unjust, and devastatingly, critical, historical legislation and practices into motion on the part of the US Federal government. Native leaders did not fully enter into the agreement, which is a topic of great, heated debate that I will not undertake at this time; instead, I offer a general perspective specific to IRA 1830 which some Natives accept. The legislation behind IRA 1830 is a moment in Native-US history in which tribal leaders of that time
recognized the apocalyptic event taking place before their very eyes—the rapid demise of their people.

Post-modern, sci-fi watchers could easily parallel this period of Native history in the US with a film in which the Earth is being taken-over by extraterrestrial aliens. At the time of IRA 1830, many Native tribal leaders recognized that they and their Tiyospaye could not keep up with the huge wave of White, illegal-immigrants, many of who owned guns and were, forcibly, and desperately, entering into this, once, free-roaming Native-dwelling continent, once called Turtle Island by many Natives. For many Indigenous people, then as in now, Turtle Island is the closest thing to Eden humans will ever see, and experience in the way the planet has allowed us to. Due to many factors in Europe at that time, Whites leave their native homes en masse and infiltrate Native spaces in order to seed their White, Euro-centrist culture, language, religion, and their White ways of being.

There exists a multitude of consequences specific to the IRA 1830 that I will not go into at this time; however, one of the most significant costs to Natives attributed to IRA 1830 is that Native fates grew more and more controlled, and dependent, by, and on, the powerholders of that time. Likewise, IRA 1830 establishes Native dependency as the American government system begins, setting-forth that long history of incremental diachronization that the Indigenous of Turtle Island will begin to experience. By 1831, as a consequence of the SCOTUS ruling, Cherokee Nation vs Georgia, Indigenous peoples of that time will become fully disempowered as they become legally, boxed-in under the SCOTUS ruling.

As a consequence of the 1831 ruling, tribal nations are not deemed a foreign nation, nor a state of the new government now calling itself the United States of America. Instead, irony of ironies, Natives will be deemed “domestic dependent nations.” While
acknowledged as US tribal nations by the US Federal Government, Natives of that time will not be subject to the laws of the early states, nor will they be considered citizens of the new government system. In fact, US Natives will not be able to have a say, federally nor state-wise, as they are not considered US citizens under the law, nor did they have the right to vote.

For Native leaders of that time, conflict after conflict, not only diminishes the Indigenous population in terms of size, but more important, it allows for tribal leaders to recognize the reality of the matter-at-hand. Like a pandemic let loose on a once peaceful and beautiful, free-living continent, the arrival of the White European leaves a massive footprint in the cosmos of existence for Natives everywhere.

By 1854, Chief Seattle lamented over the, seemingly, unstoppable arrival of Whites, and was quoted about the matter as saying, “His people are many. They are like the grass that covers vast prairies.” ²⁹⁷ Although the date of Chief Seattle’s oratory speech is disputed by scholars, the point is that by that time, Turtle Island as it once was, no longer existed. Tragically, for the Indigenous peoples of this continent, the arrival of White Europeans ensures that fact. As more White, Europeans enter, settle, and colonize this “new land,” shortly upon their arrival they will begin the process of institutionalizing their right to the new continent. By adhering to ancient, Christian, European concepts such as the Doctrine of Discovery, or belief in Papal Bulls, or even the ideologies stacked firmly in favor of White man’s Manifest Destiny, it will be through White man’s law that Native lands will be stolen from the Indigenous of this continent.

One of the most deliberate, and powerful, colonizing tools consistently used by White Europeans is the application of their legal systems from back home. To be clear, these are

ideologically-situated, centuries-old, European-crafted, approaches to law specific to their respective countries. Comfortably situated in their beliefs, their Gods, their histories, their language, and, is specific to their rights—which are deemed as rights inherited to them by their God and handed-down to them by their kings, queens, and popes—this, perhaps, will be the most, long-term, effective tool established against Natives in order to acquire aboriginal lands by whatever means possible.  

*Johnson -v- M’Intosh (1863)*

As the Spanish enter by means of the Southern regions of the “newly discovered” continent, they will bring their *Papal Bulls* with them in which some pope has crafted a title/deed to whatever they discover, which upon possession will, then, become part of the crown and country’s newly acquired assets. The French will do the same, as will the English. As inner-continental conflict continues between these three major colonizers of that time, and as the early English-Americans succeed in their battles with the other colonizers and the Natives of that time; similar as in the manner of the American landing on the Moon in 1969, by firmly placing the American flag deep into the ground of the moon, as moondust splatters, the Americans have, literally, “staked their claim.” So too will the Europeans do during this tumultuous time specific to early American history.

*Johnson -v- M’Intosh (1863)* will be such a law. After winning the physical battles and confrontations over-taking the continent at that time by all parties, deeply, involved, i.e., initially, and later, during Western-White expansion, Spain; followed by France; then England; while the Natives of that time fight it out amongst themselves, only to then join one or another, European-camp. Ultimately, the English will persevere and, finally, begin the legalization of their conquest by the establishment of necessary colonizing tools. As such was
the matter, the newly-created, United States of America, will, soon after, begin the process of creating their White, European, ideological-grounded, institutions in what, once, were Indigenous spaces. This particular court case, *Johnson v. M’Intosh* (1863), in my estimation, is, perhaps, the first and most powerful jurisprudence established by the colonizers because, essentially, it enforces the *Doctrine of Discovery* concepts of old-Europe.

During the early US colonial period, as Europeans continue to duke it out amongst themselves and Natives, upon “European-wins,” what they are actually doing is claiming Indigenous spaces for themselves, even so when battles/skirmishes/confrontations are amongst the Europeans alone. It is in this, exact, manner that the early formation of the Thirteen Colonies will be successfully, solidified, then, followed by the successful acquisition of Native lands, “legally.” Under the judicial system of the Whites, from that point on, they will continue to divide and conquer Natives, then, copiously, conquer and acquire the entire lower-Northern, continent. They solidify the process, legally, through the use of highly questionable treaties, and, ultimately, by placing Natives on US reservations. I dare say that the Natives of that time had no inkling whatsoever of how this would work-out as the process is a highly, White-European, one used throughout the centuries, at the least, in the places these groups decide to hunker-down in.

With the arrival of the Europeans, Natives will be impacted apocalyptically. Firstly, by disease; followed with, continuous, conflict and war, while, at the same time, experiencing deliberate attempts at genocide aimed directly at them; then, through the creation of treaties which will make legal, under the new government system of White Europeans, the taking of their lands. Again, the creation and institutionalization of White man’s politics/laws/legislature will facilitate the process for the Whites, with rulings, in general,
favoring, only, Whites. Alongside all of this, the racism White Europeans seem to carry with them everywhere they go, will lead to the demise of the Indigenous in a multitude of ways.

For “arm-chair” historians, or within the context of this, particular, early American history, hypothetically-speaking, if the history surrounding US colonization, specific to the treatment of Natives, were to be used as a case study in an ethics course, surely, the great deceptions and injustices, the massive inhumane treatment, and the, overall, collective experiences suffered by Natives of the continent under White colonial rule would be deemed as entirely wrong. Consider then, what would happen if the American public and university systems would incorporate that aspect of colonial American history, from a non-White, perspectives—would Americans learn anything at all? Or, for that matter, would the world learn anything from that tragic saga, aside of the fact that in the US, might is right? What we should learn is that the White colonial experience, significantly, impacts Natives to the degree that it is manifested in the demographics of today.

Aside of all the other traumatic and devastatingly damaging initiatives aimed against Natives, besides White man’s diseases and their constant warring, are the treaties and the taking of their lands that will end-up benefitting White Europeans in the long run. Federal Indian policy and legislature beginning in 1830 and during the period from 1870 to 1900, will, significantly, alter Indigeneity and Native rights, negatively. For the Oglala Lakota Sioux, there are several monumental points in history that should be recognized and acknowledged in order to better understand the implications of their diachronizational-experiences.

As directly related to present-day Pine Ridge demographics specific to the Lakota experience, with that first, fateful day—the arrival of the first Europeans to the continent—for Natives, that sad day will change their people, their language, their culture, their
way of living, their spirituality, infinitely. What can academics, historians, researchers, professors and teachers learn from the experience? At the least, it will, hopefully, make it necessary to recognize just how detrimental to the well-being of all Indigenous peoples located on the continent US history has been. Perhaps, this could serve as a first-step towards, really, creating a democracy, and a Christian-grounded one, at that.

For what will later be thought of as the “home” of the White Europeans at the time and to the present-day, the continent on which White folks have made their homes is now endangered by the same hands that fought so desperately for her. In the short time that Whites have invaded this once sacred place, they have committed serious crimes against her. From their oil and frack wells; to the trashing of the streams, rivers, lakes, oceans; to the contamination they have exposed all humans to due to their filthy practices that pollute once pristine air; is there not a valuable lesson to be learned in regard to this? Instead, with their arrival and laws, the ever growing US will continue to practice crimes against humanity and nature in abundance.

From the attempted annihilation committed against Natives by the white colonizer, to the multitude of abuses committed against our Earth, again, by the white colonizer; the planets, precious, wildlife; fauna; and other natural resources, alike—at the hands of the colonizer, will, surely, lead to the demise of the continent and its’ people. For the white man, who is ever insatiable, this is progress, especially when embedded with war. Again, that reckless, messy, truth is essential to understand. As modernity continues, the status quo, the military, and the scientist will bury their toxic residuals in the belly of the Earth, as if she could consume it. Moreover, the countless “accidental” oil spills, to the continued abuses related to
man’s creation of nuclear material, all will, negatively, impact humanity’s future. This is what they call civilization.

The drying-up, poisoned, water ways and chemically-altered, noxious, fumes that consume our, once, pure oxygen supply—both, of which our species depends upon for dear life—has been altered by white ways, by their ideas of “progress.” This has left our species with few alternatives—both, here in the US and in the case of other colonized continents of which habitable spaces once thrived before the arrival of whites, before the arrival of “progress.”. It is said, that Natives recognize that Grandmother Earth, eventually, forces all humans the opportunity to learn the valuable lessons that come with neglect and abuse of our living spaces, something the power holders/the status quo seem to be oblivious to. For US Natives and marginalized population members alike, US legislation will continue to impact such groups negatively, and the continent, irreversibly.

In studying and learning more about the colonial experiences of the First Peoples of this, inimitable, continent, we should be vigilant of how colonization displaces, attempts to destroy, and debilitates our species, especially so in the cases of the type of abuses, historically, committed against the poorest of the poor, people of color, and, even, our planet. It does not make any sense whatsoever that a nation that prides itself on freedom, liberty, and “justice for all” fails in preserving such rights to all peoples of the country—unless viewed through the lens of systemic racism. Furthermore, it is illogical for a species to continue to abuse the planet in the way that whites have done so, even when they believe that trust in “Jesus” will save and protect them from anticipated climatic changes.
In the spring of 1864, J.M. Chivington accused Cheyenne warriors of stealing cattle. Chivington and other members of the Colorado volunteer militia used the accusation to attack the Cheyenne camps killing men, women, and children indiscriminately. In an effort to resolve the problem the Colorado governor convinced the Cheyenne to settle at Sand Creek. On November 28\textsuperscript{th} of 1864, Chivington, with approximately 1000 men, attacked the village once again without orders.

At the time of the attack, a United States flag and a white flag floated over the lodge of Black Kettle. Chivington shouted, “Kill and scalp all the big and little; nits make for lice.” The brutality of the attack became a rallying point for the Native Americans for the wars that would continue for the next decade. Big Kettle’s wife was shot nine times but managed to survive. A majority of those killed were women and children and practically all were scalped. The Cheyenne suffered at least 300 casualties. Hours after the attack, when no hostile Indians were left in the camp the militia used children as targets. Soldiers prowled the devastated camp and mutilated bodies. Limbs and heads were taken to Denver where people paid money to look at the bloody body parts.

Four years after the massacre, a federal commission concluded that Chivington and his men acted with a degree of barbarism that even the most brutal of Indians could not
match. Adding insult to injury, Chivington was never brought to trial, and while many criticized his actions, many others praised him to the end.

*White Man’s Schooling: US Boarding Schools (1860-1978)*

For early US Natives who attempt to stay on the Rez, they too will be further “assimilated” in another, devastatingly, Borgian-manner as the *wakanyeza of the Tiyospaye*, the heart of the community” are forcibly taken from their Tiyospaye, i.e., their mothers, fathers, grandparents, etc… Beginning in 1860, as a consequence of US federal government policy, straight out of a “bad guys” scene from a, once, popular, contemporary American Spielberg film, “The Crystal Skulls,” helpless *wakanyeza* (children/minors) will be snatched from the arms of their Tiyospaye during the era of the US Boarding Schools. From a Native, historical perspective I offer the following Native version of this part of US-Native history:

The boarding school experience for Indian children began in 1860 when the Bureau of Indian Affairs established the first Indian boarding school on the Yakima Indian Reservation in the state of Washington. These schools were part of a plan devised by well-intentioned, eastern reformers Herbert Welsh and Henry Pancoast, who also helped establish organizations such as the Board of Indian Commissioners, the Boston Indian Citizenship Association and the Women’s National Indian Association.

The goal of these reformers was to use education as a tool to “assimilate” Indian tribes into the mainstream of the “American way of life,” a Protestant ideology of the mid-19th century. Indian people would be taught the importance of private property, material wealth and monogamous nuclear families. The reformers assumed that it was necessary to “civilize” Indian people, make them accept white men’s beliefs and value systems. Boarding schools were the
ideal instrument for absorbing people and ideologies that stood in the way of manifest destiny. Schools would quickly be able to assimilate Indian youth… Aside of “reading, writing, and arithmetic,” White, Christian Protestant socio-cultural ideologies were a necessary aspect of the school curriculum.

The first priority of the boarding schools would be to provide the rudiments of academic education: reading, writing and speaking of the English language. Arithmetic, science, history and the arts would be added to open the possibility of discovering the “self-directing power of thought.” Indian youth would be individualized. Religious training in Christianity would be taught. The principles of democratic society, institutions and the political structure would give the students citizenship training. The end goal was to eradicate all vestiges of Indian culture.

The boarding schools hoped to produce students that were economically self-sufficient by teaching work skills and instilling values and beliefs of possessive individualism, meaning you care about yourself and what you as a person own. This opposed the basic Indian belief of communal ownership, which held that the land was for all people. Still, it is important to recognize the climate of the time and the resentment and hostility even “Christians” felt against Natives of the time, in particular Native children. Reminiscent of parochial schooling from a pre-1960’s perspective, no doubt, the education of the children of the “Others” unleashed violence, sexual depravity, meanness, and shame. A dangerous mix for the innocent, especially so since there were no adults present to defend them at the time.

---


100 *Quote Source*: Partnership With Native Americans (PWNA), History & Culture, Boarding Schools. (2019). No author Named. PWNA Website: http://www.nativepartnership.org/site/PageServer?pagename=airc_hist_boardingschools
As if this approach to early childhood education is not harmful enough within the context of contemporary, 20th Century, early-childhood formation theories, the reader should “put-it” into a modern-day education setting, specific to what we know today and study specific to early, positive, childhood formation practices. Then, the reader should place that mentally processed bit and place it into the framework of child educational psychology specific to minors and young adults. The reader should, then, add an additional layer and “micro-size-it,” meaning, place this information into a personalized version of “what if this had happened to my child, my grandchild, etc...? As if this insensitive, uncaring approach to child education were not damning enough for any child in terms of the socio-cultural, psychological, long-term effects, and affects, that will impact the child throughout their life; educators, academics, and researchers should then apply the long-standing, traditionally-accepted, full-practice of institutionalized racism into the formula, and total that formula and parallel it with US public school education systems of today (Rossatto, Valles, & et al, 2020).

Further, to the latter point referenced above, the US education system specifically created for American, Native children of that time will be further damned against these children in 1879 when Colonel Richard Henry Pratt establishes The Carlisle Indian Schools of Pennsylvania. Pratt will design, flesh-out, oversee the schools when he comes to serve White colonial society as “headmaster“ of what we be called the “off-reservation boarding school system“101 for a quarter of a century. This period of Native American history is considered by many Indigenous, education, critical theorists, etc., and academics as an extremely sorrowful time for all members, child and adult alike, of the Tiyospaye.

---

Contemporary readers should recognize that this early, US education approach to educating “Natives” rests on a system created by Whites of that time, for Whites of that time, and, is designed for “the causes” of the Whites of that time. I have proposed throughout this treatise that in many ways, contemporary US education systems continue to do the same to non-White children. Even within US teacher preparation school programs there is a consistent emphasis on White-Euro-American sensibilities and their agenda, precisely because they are, still, a federally-backed, institutionalize- system representative of a select few, who, generally, are members of that status quo. One only need to reference the current Secretary of the US, Department of Education, Betsy DeVos for proof of that fact102 (see: Appendix for 60 Minutes Interview with Betsy DeVos).

Contemporary US public education systems and their administrators, as well as DeVos, should refer back to Native ideals specific to children, and their treatment. Indigenous wisdom and traditional practices hold that children are sacred and should be treated as such. According to Eagle Woman & Rice (2016), “In the Dakota tribal tradition, for example, children are called wakanyeza which translates to “sacred new life” or “something sacred growing.” The concept is based upon the idea that children are a gift from the Creator and are part of the sacred life force. In accord with this idea, children are to be treated with respect, never hit or insulted, and regarded as important future members of tribal society.103

The problem is further exacerbated with time, but in unique ways in that the American education system, beginning with public school students and expanding to colleges,
teacher prep programs, research divisions at universities, etc…., in that as the US education system continues to expand, now we have teachers from marginalized population groups teaching that same agenda, but not catching themselves (Rossatto, Valles, & et al, 2020). The matter is more intensified when we place economics and politics into the framework.

Like Pratt, DeVos follows an intentional “White” agenda, as does the president who nominated her and securely placed her into that specific oversight role. As non-Americans easily recognize and understand, the political agenda of the 45th president of the US, Donald J. Trump104, has centered his political socio-cultural platform on the idea behind “Making America Great Again,” but for whom?, “cause it sure-in-heck wasn’t Native Americans! Nor was it for Mexica, or African Americans,” all marginalized group members who suffered, significantly, under US education policy repeatedly.

Many critical theorist, educators, and researchers recognize that this issue continues to plague the US public school system. For contemporary, American readers, in particular, if they have been made a bit uncomfortable reading these specific sections, I have no doubt that many non-academic readers implementing my earlier suggestions specific to micro-sizing this aspect of Native history, specific to the US, in which it is suggested that the reader should attempt to recognize how this might have played out for them, if it had to do with their children, grandchildren, etc…., their reply might be, “it wouldn’t have,” or “I wouldn’t let it happen.” Consider the matter more robustly, please.

It must be understood that at no time in the early history of Native peoples did the Tiyospaye have a say-so in the matter. To the contrary. Under Pratt’s infamous leadership, Native children will be forcefully removed from their homes, their families, their Tiyospaye,

---

and there is nothing on this green Earth that can stop them. The US government policy of “forced removal” of their children and grandchildren is devastating to the tiyospaye, understandably, and effects the Native community in ways that continue to impact them to this day, as described in the entry below:

Naturally, Indian people resisted the schools in various ways. Sometimes entire villages refused to enroll their children in white men’s schools. Indian agents on the reservations normally resorted to withholding rations or sending in agency police to enforce the school policy. In some cases, police were sent onto the reservations to seize children from their parents, whether willing or not.

The police would continue to take children until the school was filled, so sometimes orphans were offered up or families would negotiate a family quota. Navajo police officers avoided taking “prime” children and would take children assumed to be less intelligent, those not well cared for or those physically impaired…

[With time], By immersing Indians into the mainstream of American life, the “outing” system created by Pratt had students living among white families during the summer.\(^{105}\)

Pratt’s disrepute in the field of education should go down in history books throughout the world as someone who “got it,” who clearly sets the mark on the forcible institutionalizing of colonial education, in this case, against helpless, innocent, Native children who are violently, crammed into White spaces. As discussed in countless US multi-cultural, higher education teaching courses found throughout the Americas, Pratt’s motto was, “Kill the Indian, save the man.” I would, gladly, argue with anyone that Pratt was successful to a considerable degree in doing just that.

\(^{105}\) Quote Source: Partnership with Native Americans (PWNA), History & Culture, Boarding Schools. (2019). No author Named. PWNA Website: http://www.nativepartnership.org/site/PageServer?pagename=airc_hist_boardingschools,
Respective to Native diachronization, this particular aspect of US-Native history demands attention. At the same time, Many of Pratt defenders, and, yes, they exist/ed believed, like Pratt, “that off-reservation schools established in white communities could accomplish, precisely, the task of, “killing the Indian, saving the man.” By immersing Indians into the mainstream of American life, the “outing” system created by Pratt had students living among white families during the summer. He hoped Indian youths would not return to the reservations but rather become part of the white community.

Attesting to US Federal and state policies, when aimed directly at a specific demographic group, the era of Boarding Schools demonstrates to the n\textsuperscript{th} degree as to how US policies have and continued to divide and conquer. For instance, “Mandatory education for Indian children became law in 1893 and, thereafter, agents on the reservations received instructions on how to enforce the federal regulation,” according to Carolyn J. Marr, (1998), anthropologist and photographs librarian at the Museum of History and Industry in Seattle, Washington.

Furthermore, as she explains, “If parents refused to send their children to school the authorities could withhold annuities or rations or send them to jail. Some parents were uncomfortable having their children sent far away from home. The educators had quotas to fill, however, and considerable pressure was exerted on Indian families to send their youngsters to


boarding schools beginning when the child was six years old…,” ultimately resulting in psycho-emotional injury to many children (Marr, 1998).

As Marr (1998) further explains, “Fear and loneliness caused by this early separation from family is a common experience shared by all former students. Once their children were enrolled in a distant school, parents lost control over decisions that affected them. For example, requests for holiday leave could be denied by the superintendent for almost any reason…” (Marr, 1998). The following photo is representative of the type of psycho-emotional crisis US Boarding Schools prompted in early, and post-Reconstruction US Native society:

I have repeatedly contended that in colonized spaces, non-Whites can never, really, become a vital part of the colonizing community when the status quo, the nation state, is comprised of one particular demographic, as nation states generally are. Conversely, a nation that is receptive to diversity allows for a sense of interconnectedness amongst its citizenry, in spite of the cultural, linguistic, and religious differences that exist amongst such groups. Within a nation state, the privileged positions of the colonizers must be protected at all costs. Power, after all, is the apex of politics.

As I explain to students semester after semester, politics really is about power, how it was obtained, how we preserve it and hang on to it, and the things we are willing to do in order to ensure it to the status quo. National narratives that espouse ideals of freedom, liberty, and justice-for-all should be deemed as faulty when they are specific to one demographic group, alone. And yet, many mainstream Americans have no idea of the types of colonial histories that exist for marginalized population members, which leads to the type of policies alone because they may someday be applied to their particular demographic?. In a country, both Eastern and
Western regions alike, in which racism lays at the heart, it is not unusual to witness the type of Prattian-tactics applied to the colonized, or the marginalized.

It is imperative to note that the US government has played a significantly, vital role in such colonial-reinforcement “strategies.” From legalized “Slaving” to separating Asian-Americans from their homes during a time of war, deliberately, displacing them from their homes, jobs, businesses, lives; to cruelly separating and caging children from their parents in the US-Mexico Borderlands, etc…, it should be clear by now that these types of US Federal and state practices have been made commonplace in a country that dishonestly preaches a false narrative of democracy, “for the people,” “liberty, justice for all,” etc… Similarly, returning to the case of Pratt, his distinctive mark on the early US education system will be forcibly imprinted on Natives, inter-generationally, as one can appreciate in the Native accounting posted on the:

Carlisle and other off-reservation boarding schools instituted their assault on Native cultural identity by first doing away with all outward signs of tribal life that the children brought with them. The long braids worn by Indian boys were cut off. The children were made to wear standard uniforms. The children were given new “white” names, including surnames, as it was felt this would help when they inherited property. Traditional Native foods were abandoned, forcing students to acquire the food rites of white society, including the use of knives, forks, spoons, napkins and tablecloths.

In addition, students were forbidden to speak their Native languages, even to each other. The Carlisle school rewarded those who refrained from speaking their own language; most other boarding schools relied on punishment to achieve this aim…. 

109 US Boarding schools were located in Eastern US, while the majority were located in the West. For furthers see: Partnership With Native Americans (PWNA), History & Culture, Boarding Schools. (2019). No author Named. PWNA Website: http://www.nativepartnership.org/site/PageServer?pagename=airc_hist_boardingschools.

With time’s passing, it has been my great privilege to have met US tribal members with names like Clifford, Melvin, Norman, etc…, even the name “Wilmer”, all have shared aspects of that early, personal, experiences in one way or another. Just imagine that, an Indigenous person of this continent with the first name of “Stanford.” In places outside of the US, I have had the privilege to work with young children whose naming is similar, for example a Mayan female child whose name is “Jane” or “Jaime”, etc...

To this day, the continued living consequences of these types of practices remains and resonate on US reservations located throughout the continent, as well as outside of the US. Psychologically, socio-culturally, linguistically, economically, these US Native “reforms” have not just significantly wounded Native Americans, it has diachronized Native existence. I will argue that it continues to this day. Whether at the hands of Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, or any earlier US president, similar evil-intended policies such as Trump’s/Jeff Sessions/Stephen Miller’s “Zero Tolerance Policy,” a policy wherein minors with adults, either, seeking refuge in the US, or entering “illegally,” have been forcibly separated from their parent(s)/children who are arrested at the time and placed into jail, while the minors are locked-up in cages in US concentration camps, most of which are located in ancient tribal spaces along the US-Mexican borderlands.

Have no doubt, rest assured, in a multitude of ways these types of micro-meso, debilitating practices, prompted by the US Federal government, continue. For early Native American children and the Tiyospaye, the earlier 1893 court ruling will end-up extending the damaging practices of forced removal and the mandatory “white, Christian schooling” of Native
children up until 1978, when, finally, the *Indian Child Welfare Act* will be enacted. One could argue, even then and weakly, that this will return *some* parental authority to Native American parents.

**Significant Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) Status in 2014**

In October of 2014, a judge in the *US District Court* in Fort Worth, Texas, declared sections of the *Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA)* unconstitutional. The case is known as *Brackeen v. Zinke*. In an attempt to protect ICWA legislation, the Cherokee, Oneida, Quinault Nations and the *Morengo Band of Mission Indians* had joined together in order to challenge the federal government to actually defend ICWA. According to Agoyo’s 2019 piece titled, “‘They are not your children’: Future of *Indian Child Welfare Act* in hands of appeals court,” the ICWA was, originally, enacted to return tribal control over children when

---


Source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indian_Child_Welfare_Act

112 Notes: In *Brackeen v. Zinke*, (Beginning of Quote): “Judge Reed O’Connor of the court’s Fort Worth division ruled that the ICWA categorizes children in the child welfare system according to race, not membership or eligibility for membership in a tribe, making those provisions illegal racial preferences. He also struck down a portion of the ICWA that gives tribes the right to intervene in child welfare proceedings, as well as recently enacted regulatory rules implementing the ICWA. [The judge stated]:

‘No matter how defendants characterize Indian tribes—whether as quasi-sovereigns or domestic dependent nations—the Constitution does not permit Indian tribes to exercise federal legislative or executive regulatory power over nontribal persons on nontribal land,” the judge wrote in his opinion.’

*Brackeen* was filed not only by three foster families seeking to hold on to children and a birth mother of one of the children but also the states of Texas, Louisiana and Indiana, which say the ICWA usurps the authority of state child welfare agencies and courts. As the ABA Journal reported in October 2016, the ICWA is unpopular among some foster and adoptive families, as well as politically conservative interest groups. One such group, the *Goldwater Institute*, tried unsuccessfully to overturn the ICWA in a prior lawsuit, *Carter v. Washburn.*” (End of Quote)


Native children were to be placed in foster or adoptive homes, amongst other pertinent objectives on behalf of US Natives.

Furthermore, as Agoyo (2019) explains, the “ICWA was enacted by Congress in 1978 to address the high rates of Indian children being removed from their homes. “The law recognizes the need for tribes and their families to be involved in proceedings affecting their most precious resource,” as Agoyo (2019) points out. One of the concerns, from the perspective of Natives, is, and has been, to prevent, if possible, Native children from being placed in non-Native families when up for adoption or in foster homes. In this case, the judge found that the federal government could not order states to enforce ICWA standards and that by extending ICWA rules over all children who were potential tribal members was unconstitutional. According to this new ruling, citing issues of federalism, the ICWA is considered a violation of the Fifth Amendment of the US Constitution because it did not provide equal protection under the law. In short, this assures power over Native children to the Wašíču, when the state is a conservative-serving states, in general, Republican led.

Although the case will, in all likelihood, end up in the US Supreme Court as it currently stands under this new ruling; still, what is clear is that this another move to return White power over Native communities, specifically, regarding Native children located off the Rez. Some non-Natives might argue, stupidly, “well you can’t even take care of the children you already have,” but the fact of the matter is that protection of the ICWA is a continued effort

---

114 Agoyo (2019) explains that “the Solicitor General of Texas, took a different turn during the hearing, which lasted about 90 minutes. Rather than focus on the "race" aspects of ICWA, they said the law must be struck down because it requires state officials -- including state court judges -- to follow child welfare policies that are not of their own making. [Arguing that]

‘The federal government may not command states and state officials to carry out a federal regulatory program, yet that is exactly what ICWA does,” Hawkins said. "ICWA commandeers states to implement the federal government's preferred policies, contrary to state law.’

“Our commandeering argument is not about whether ICWA is good policy or bad policy,” Hawkins added in an attempt to steer the case away from the underlying issue of protecting Indian children. “The commandeering doctrine is about means, not ends.”
on behalf of Native leaders to keep the tribe intact, as well as to protect children in a multitude of other ways, including the restoration of their Native well-being, and/or essence. Recognizing, once again, that the US Native population stands at 2%, the underlying motivations behind enforcement of the law makes perfect sense to Native leaders.

Clearly, the ruling in *Brackeen v. Zinke* is representative of the type of push-back Natives, consistently, receive from the US Federal Government. Considered a major challenge to many federal regulations on American Indian affairs, the ruling “could fundamentally change the legal standing of Native peoples in the United States,” according to Native community leaders (Agoyo, 2019).

As Agoyo (2019) touches upon in his article, this new policy may counteract an earlier 1978 ruling, which allowed Native parents the legal right to deny their children’s placement in off-reservation schools. Many readers freshly introduced to an Indigenous critical theory, i.e., thinking and analysis specific to US Native history as presented in this dissertation, might question the extent of *US Government* interference within Native existence as it is remarkable just how far reaching many US policies have been and the ways in which they stain, further, US Native existence. Quite frankly, it is unbelievable, raising the consequential question of “how does this happen?” Moreover, *why* does it continue to happen?

The following section attempts to address that. However, it is up to each thinking individual to consider the multiple aspects of Native history, and from both perspectives, not just that of the conqueror. Then, it would be productive to reflect on the possibility of what might happen if such histories were shared in public school places, the academy, or even in prominent research.
After 1831, through the legalization processes of white, *US Federal Indian Law*, Government policies mandated by the same government system had, by now, “taken over” the north eastern regions of the continent, outside of Canada. Consequently, Native existence had been, irrevocably, changed, and forever. Firstly, by the arrival of foreigners who will, consistently, battle with other foreigners who have already laid claim to Turtle Island, while, in tandem, will battle with the Indigenous peoples of the continent.

Eventually, Natives will come to recognize that, clearly, there is no end to the nightmare. In fact, the reality of the matter is recognized by chiefs who by then had acknowledged that every aspect of theirs, and their peoples’ lives, had been, hopelessly, altered. *Reader*, dare to be brave, harken back to the chaos ignited with the massive arrival of whites and their incessant, and perpetual, influx to the continent once called Turtle Island. Understand fully the implications of those arrivals, the damning changes they bring with them, and not just the diseases, but the recognition of what was transpiring at the time to the Native ancestors of not so long ago, the reality of the matter, that all is, almost, lost… This is what the treaties do to the Natives of this continent. They ram, deliberately and repeatedly, against Native existence and all that was theirs…

Undoubtedly, these early episodes of continuous, white migration disturbed the existence of the universe, specifically, in relation to the enormous changes the Indigenous peoples of this place will be forced to reckon with. They have been displaced. Their land has been stolen from them. The buffalo, which once fed the Nations, were intentionally decimated,
to the degree that few exist at this writing,\textsuperscript{115} by the whites. The list seems to go on, and on, and on...

These types of tragic events will bring Natives to a new “low” point in human history. It is one in which, once, proud, free, and generous people—the original, and only, inhabitants of this continent, way before whites understood that there were others unlike them—are, now, being told by the descendants of those earlier Wašiću to go back to where they came from. These descendants of the Wašiću peoples, the progeny of the ancestors who usurped \textit{Native} land; who have, knowingly, cheated against the law of the universe in their allegiance to white privilege—they who continue to push upon the Native their dubious rules, regulations, laws, and decrees, as well as their colonial machinations that include abstract weapons like \textit{de facto} racism, institutionalized racism; forced marginalization, etc.; As they continue to attempt to decimate Native, and creatures alike, by use of their ominous, militaristic tools that can annihilate species (two, four-leggeds, flyers, etc…), these ungodly descendant of the Wašiću continue to boldly demand that the Indigenous peoples of this continent “go back to where they came from…”\textsuperscript{116} \textit{Hello}?

With more whites illegally immigrating on a daily basis to the “new” continent and making it their home for the next centuries to come, the incorporation of treaties will continue to direct, unfavorably, what happens to Natives of this continent. The \textit{Fort Laramie Treaty (FLT) of 1851} will be credited for having “created a short period of peace which allowed

\textsuperscript{115} It is worth noting that there have been initiatives to re-establish buffalo in the Great Plains area. However, there continue to be issues specific to land access, grazing, pipelines, water resources, etc…

\textsuperscript{116} Deans has shared with me that Neo-Nazi members and White Supremist groups living in the geo-spaces surrounding the Rez have been emboldened under Trump, to the point that going to a big store outside of the Rez has become problematic for Natives.
more settlers to enter or travel legally through tribal lands,” according to North Dakotan educators who command a website specific to Native history for their region.\textsuperscript{117}

The website, \textit{North Dakota, People Living on the Land, (NDPLL), (2020), NDSTUDIES.GOV/GR8}, is one such website that attempts to reckon with that tumultuous early US-Native history most public schools fear to approach. Still, I refer to it so that the reader can begin to recognize the differences in historical narratives between the conqueror and the conquered. The NDPLL, (2020), website is important to consider since I am advocating through this treatise that we, at the least, attempt to reckon with the early past by implementing a new and exciting political experiment in which its framework acknowledges that all humans are created equal and that history is not black or white, brown, yellow, or red.

The NDPLL, (2020), contends that the treaties facilitate the arrival of the whites, bringing peace to the continent. Even then, as NDPLL, (2020), acknowledges, “as more non-Indians traveled through Sioux treaty lands, there were more opportunities for conflict and misunderstanding. The conflicts led members of Congress to think that another treaty was necessary.”\textsuperscript{118} Furthermore, as NDPLL, (2020), explains:

The treaties created a new problem for the Sioux. Once the government had established specific territorial boundaries for the tribes, federal agents could negotiate for more land cessions. The Sioux came to the 1868 treaty council with a great deal of power because Red Cloud and Sitting Bull had fought settlers, miners, and the Army. However, the Sioux lost land in this treaty council, and over the next forty years would continue to lose land originally promised to them by the Treaty of 1851.\textsuperscript{119}

\textsuperscript{118} IBID
\textsuperscript{119} IBID
The *Lakota* will challenge this take on history and tell you that the Wašíču are insatiable and they failed, repeatedly, to honor the treaties that they themselves had written, manipulated, and then made legal. Moreover, when the Wašíču wanted more, they took it from the *Lakota*, and the other tribes, as well. Always, sanctified and honored by *SCOTUS*.

Still, returning to the information provided by *NDPLL*, (2020), there were, initially, two *Fort Laramie Treaties* (*FLT*). The *FLT of 1868* is the one current *Oglala Lakota* Sioux honor. The preliminary *Fort Laramie Treaty of 1851* 120 “defined boundaries between Indian tribes of the northern Great Plains,” (See Map 1, provided by *NDPLL*, 2020).

Furthermore, according to the *1851 Treaty*, Natives were to:

- allow travelers, railroad surveyors, and construction workers to enter tribal lands safely
- allow the government to establish posts and roads
- pay for any wrongdoing of their people
- select head chiefs to deal with U.S. government agents
- cease fighting with other tribes

In return, the United States was responsible for protecting Natives from U.S. citizens, ensuring and protecting the land allotted to them under the treaty, *meaning*, no Whites on Native lands, and, “delivering annuities if the terms of the treaty were upheld.” There was a multitude of issues with the *Treaty of 1851*, for example, to the disadvantage of the Natives, treaties were written in English, a language not known to many Natives of the time, much less, in the written or reading forms. In addition, there were limited interpreters, as Josephy has already discussed (1982).

---

A lack of interpreters and a limited number of interpreters available are both problematic, also as Josephy (1982) acknowledges in his important Native American histories. In the first instance, it was to be expected that white interpreters worked with Whites, often times, deliberately working against Natives. Secondly, there were no Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) tests for the interpreters of the time, meaning that even they were wrong in their interpretations in many instances. There was no United Nations, UN, to try to challenge the treaties whenever Natives were deceived, which was often times under the circumstances. Quite frankly, it is surprising that the Natives remained on the continent and were not shipped off to somewhere else outside of their home continent. Still, that did not stop the, now, “democratic,” idealistic, “pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness,” new, American government of that time from moving full speed ahead.

Other noteworthy issues dealing with the 1851 FLT centered on the fact that Natives had not fully voted on, or signed, the treaties, neither the 1851 nor the 1868 treaty. There never was a unanimous accounting for the treaties. They were, essentially, forced-upon the Natives, up until the US government went back on them. As Bryan Deans, OLCERI president, has explained to me, repeatedly, in our private conversations; “in terms of governing, no one can tell a Lakota what they can or cannot do,” not even the tribal council nor the president of the Tribal Council.”

As the NDPLL (2020) explains on their website regarding the matter, “These two traditions clashed. The tribes agreed to appoint chiefs who signed the document, but they could not control the people who were not part of the decisions. A more important problem was that the terms of the treaty were broken by U. S. citizens, the government, and the tribes.” The
Lakota will tell you that it was the US government that, repeatedly, broke treaties. Natives just wanted to live in peace, with no Whites interfering on their land or in their lives.

Still, there was an abundance of additional issues at the time of FLT 1851. In the interim between the 1851 and 1868 treaty, railroad construction will begin on Native lands, breaking/interfering further with the initial treaty agreements. In addition, the continued pursuit of gold will inundate the US as stories of gold busts loom heavily throughout the continent as more and more whites scheme to get rich, by whatever means.. The NDPLL teaching resources for public schooling explains it in the following: ¹²¹

*Gold, that European Enticer of Olde & Native Land Acquisition*

---


---

Figure 4.10: Sioux Treaty Lands
As gold had been found in Montana and Colorado, there were many more people traveling west through the Great Plains. The increase in travel, likewise, led to an increase in conflict. Some of the conflict was centered on the Bozeman Trail in Wyoming that ran right through Sioux treaty lands toward the gold fields of Montana. Red Cloud, an Oglala Lakota, declared that he would continue to make war on travelers and Army posts until the government closed the road and removed the Army. The Army also established military posts in Sioux treaty lands. Fort Rice and Fort Buford on the Upper Missouri River were on or near treaty lands. Sitting Bull, Gall, and other Hunkpapas continually harassed these posts and demanded that the posts be removed.

Nevertheless, many did not sign the treaty. Sitting Bull and his band of Hunkpapas were among those who did not sign the treaty. The government considered the Hunkpapas dangerous because they refused to live on a reservation and continued to hunt north of the reservation (NDPLL, 2020). The Bozeman Trail is worth noting as it will be a continued source of tension between Natives and the whites, as will the Black Hills, especially so, once gold is discovered in them.

*The Allotment Act of 1887*

*The Allotment Act of 1887*, also known as the *Dawes Act*, seals the diachronizational-deal and is best appreciated as that moment in time wherein it is understood that US Natives have been completely displaced, marginalized, and culturally, linguistically, and economically devastated in every human possible way imaginable. *The Dawes Act* essentially mandates the following against US Natives:

- Each Native “head of the household” (family) will be allotted 160 acres of tribal land
Each single Native person is allotted 80 acres

Land titles would be held in trust by the US Government for a period of 25 years and cannot be used to borrow/finance, or secure bank loans by Natives

After the mandatory 25 year period, each individual Native would receive US citizenship, and, at that time, for a fee, a simple title to their land

Tribal lands not allotted to Native Americans living on the Rez were to be sold to the US government

US purchased lands would be “opened-up” to the Wašíču for home-steading purposes

Native proceeds from the land sales were to be placed “in trust” and were to be used by the US government as an account for Natives so that they could purchase supplies from the US Government such as blankets, clothes/shoes, food staples, building/planting essentials which, in general, such products were delivered to Natives as inferior products and/or inferior, rotten, spoilt food staples

Smelling it for the bad deal that it was, it should be emphasized that, at the time, many Native Tribes resisted, including the Oglala Lakota Sioux. “The Cherokee and the other Five Civilized Tribes which included the Creek, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, and Seminole resisted the act,” as well, accordingly. As explained on the NPRA Website, “When the allotment process began in 1887, the total land held by American Indian tribes on reservations equaled 138,000,000 acres.” By the end of the allotment period land-holdings had been reduced to 48,000,000 acres. Since 1934 the landholdings have slowly increased to 56,000,000 acres,”

122 **Quote Source:** Northern Plains Reservation Aid™ (NPRA), History and Culture, Allotment Act — 1887, Direct URL Link: http://www.nativepartnership.org/site/PageServer?pagename=airc_hist_allotmentact

123 **Quote Source:** Northern Plains Reservation Aid™ (NPRA), History and Culture, Allotment Act — 1887, Direct URL Link: http://www.nativepartnership.org/site/PageServer?pagename=airc_hist_allotmentact
More Detrimental Legislation: Incorporating The Dawes Act of 1887

When the US Congress passes the *Dawes Act of 1887*, essentially, “…the law allowed for US Presidents to break-up, once sacred, Native ancestral lands. The fact of the matter is that the entire continent was theirs, although Native’s, as a whole, do not view it as such. Their ontology centers on the recognition that they are part of Mother Earth, and she is within them. Furthermore, all creatures, plants, trees, the air we all breathe and the sacred water we all drink, is a wonderous gift from the Great Creator. Wašiču, repeatedly, fail to understand this simplest, and fundamental, epistemological aspects of life. Clearly, if the foundational concepts behind their Euro-American Wašiču concepts were to be applied, it would still be Native land as they were the first living humans on the continent. This is why the Wašiču had to use their “law” to steal it from the rightful tenants, US Natives.

Simply put, in following the ways of the Wašiču, by recognizing that the land belonged to those who were on it first, before their arrival to the continent, the Wašiču had to
figure out a way to get it. Under *Dawes*, once ancient and hallowed land, freely roamed upon by all for millennia, (although there will be territorial understandings between the tribes), is irretrievably altered and will lead to a new world order, as well as Euro-American ontologies that embrace Mother Earth’s destruction for profit, and for White man’s “science”. The tragic irony is that the Wašiću fails to recognize and understand, that there is no other earth planet to live on, leading to her pillaging, destruction, and disrespect.

Native ways of conceptualizing existence also apply to the countless creatures treasured for millennia by the Indigenous as they, too, were gifted the land by the Great Creator alongside the two-leggeds, the flyers, and the unseen. With the arrival of the Wašiću, precious and sacred land which was, once, understood to be communal amongst all tribes will be divvied-up into small allotments in order to be parcelled out to individuals in the ways previously referenced.

To be “eligible” for the allotments, Native Americans were required to register on a tribal “roll”. In so doing, Natives were, by now, not only landless but on US government rosters, lists that allowed for their monitoring as a consequence of that same allotment process. It is worth emphasizing that “Home” for US Indigenous peoples today, much like Natives from throughout the world, consists of some of the most impoverished, consistently

---

124 *Reference Source:* “Title Indian land for sale: get a home of your own, easy payments. Perfect title. Possession within thirty days. Fine lands in the West..."

Summary:

challenged, geo-spaces on the planet. Land that is often time too difficult to farm/yield crops was allotted to them by the Wašíču; thus, facilitating the Wašíču’s agenda, that is, until gold, uranium, silver, etc…, was “discovered” on it. Then, following the ways of their ancestors, the Wašíču had to devise a way to steal it, again.

I cannot help but to reflect on the work of Senator Henry L. Dawes, a man who has inherited a contentious role in early Native-US history. Dawes was the sponsor of what is referred to as the 1887 Dawes Act, which was legislature designed “…to Provide for the Allotment of Lands in Severalty to Indians on the Various Reservations,” 125 as will be discussed more thoroughly in a subsequent section. of 1887 was an assimilationist tool targeted This initiative is a major attempt to divide and, further, conquer Natives.

Essentially, The Dawes Act of 1887 authorizes the US government to partition Native lands by dividing and assigning Native lands into individual plots as a means to “individualize” Indians, rather than to have them stand as a collective. Furthermore, it was argued and believed by White colonizers, that if you put Indians to work on their own land they will stay busy and “out of trouble,” and at some point, eventually, Natives would be able to feed themselves and their posterity while being contained and controlled by the Whites.

Contemporary Indigenous scholars and critical theorists argue that the primary objective of the Dawes Act, ultimately, was the assimilation of the remaining Indigenous people of the continent and the complete dissolution of Native American tribes in order to mainstream them into US society. I tend to think that the man, Dawes, recognized the reality of the Native situation of that time. In a nutshell, at the rate the Whites were scooping up Native land, soon Natives would have nothing left once the White colonizer was through scavenging their lands.

125 Quote Source: (Bender & Leone, 1998: 20).
At the time of its sponsorship, Dawes was perceived to be, by the colonizers and the Wašíču legislators of that time, a way to create a backdrop of sorts for Natives. Under the Dawes Act, as expected by the Wašíču, Natives would, eventually, fall upon hard times. How could they not? Consequently, Dawes, ultimately, contributes to the slow demise of Natives at the micro-level, and, then, as a community, e.g., Native ways of being, socio-culturally, linguistically, and spiritually specific to Indigenous traditions will come close to the end—but not quite.

Conversely, I hypothesize that in an unattended manner, the Dawes Act may have ended-up protecting Natives as a collective, despite the, unspeakable, enormous, hardships they will be forced to endure. As legal entities of the US Government under Dawes, the distribution of tribal lands among individual members (capped at 160 acres per head of family, 80 acres per adult single person) with remaining lands declared “surplus” and offered to non-Indian homesteaders, will preserve them as a continued collective community. Dawes argued:

…we may cry out against the violation of treaties, denounce flagrant disregard of inalienable rights and the inhumanity of our treatment of the defenseless… but the fact remains…, without doubt, these Indians are to be somehow absorbed into and become a part of the 50 million of our people. There does not seem to be any other way to deal with them…

Bender & Leone, 1998 (F.N.81)

Under Dawes, by securing a small portion of land for Natives of that time, albeit it will be the harshest, most challenging land possible,—and—by forcibly placing Natives on the Rez, the Dawes Act, ironically, will, in the end, preserve the dying remnants of an awesome and highly distinctive and pertinent, peoples, although they will suffer countless life-changing matters to this day.
On the other hand, for the Natives, “Dawes established Indian schools where Native American children were instructed in not only reading and writing, but also the social and domestic customs of white America...,” as explained by the US Library of Congress (USLoC) Website.126 Furthermore, as the USLoC explains, “The Dawes Act had a disastrous effect on many tribes, destroying traditional culture and language. It also attempted to destroy Native spirit. You want to really hurt someone? Mess with their kids.

The Dawes Act will backfire and work against its original intent to demoralize and strip Indigeneity from within Native peoples being. In its place, the Dawes Act, strangely, will ensure continued Indigenous collectivity, in spite of the harshness, tragedy, and repeated downfalls and entrapments the Tiyospaye will have to reckon with as an Indigenous society. Although the loss of as much as two-thirds of tribal land will maim US Native natural reserve, which includes sacred lands, as well as hunting and living grounds, it will not take them out as was, initially, anticipated by Wašiču legislators of that time.

The countless failures attributed to the Dawes Act will, eventually, lead to minor changes in U.S. policy toward Native Americans, but it will take up until the 20th Century. The Wašiču’s drive to assimilate Natives has not been accomplished. All one needs to do is go to a Rez, or, attend a sacred ceremony, or a Pow Wow;127 that is, if you are Blessed enough to be invited to one. To be clear, what Dawes accomplishes is the legal “institutionalizationism” of the giving away of sacred Native lands to the White colonizers of that time. In due course, the Wašiču will continue to seize by disease, brute force, and trickery, facilitated by a White,

127 A Pow Wow is a gathering of Native community in which dancing, praying/singing, and other festivities take place. Often times, Pow Wow venues extend invitations to other tribal nations; thereby, serving as a gathering of tribal nations located from throughout the world (Valles).
nationalist, capitalistic legal system embedded in racism and injustices. In some ways, it could be argued that the US Federal Indian initiative of stealing Native lands will come back to haunt them, presuming the US remains a “democratic” system of government. It is “untied” business that awaits disclosure.

As Dawes required, Natives of that time had to register with the US government as members of the reservation in order to secure allotments, placing their futures further into the proverbial hands of the US government. The Feds distributed allotments of reservation land” as follows:

- To each head of a family, one-quarter of a section
- To each single person over eighteen years of age, one-eighth of a section
- To each orphan child under eighteen years of age, one-eighth of a section
- To each other single person under eighteen years now living, or who may be born prior to the date of the order of the President directing an allotment of the lands embraced in any reservation, one-sixteenth of a section…”

At the time, requirements for Native participation in the allotment “awarding” were as follows:

1.) …members were to enroll with the Office of Indian Affairs (later renamed the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA))
2.) Once enrolled, the individual’s name went on the “Dawes Rolls,” a process which will assist the BIA and the Secretary of the Interior in determining the eligibility of individual members for land distribution…, while allowing for their “tracking”

---

128 Please note: It is not clear how this applies to someone who is 18 years of age, and now over or below 18.


Consequently, Dawes allowed for further control of Natives via US governmental, now, legalized documentation processing, which begins a method of data collection for Natives; recognizing, that at the time, Natives are not considered US citizens. It is through these types of Wašíču initiatives that tribes will be forced to disperse and divide even further. Henceforth, it will be difficult to have the differing tribes band together against the White powerholders, should they choose to host a war party.

It is argued by some politicians, US historians and academics that Dawes was created in order to, allegedly, “…protect Indian property rights, particularly during the land rushes of the 1890s,” However, it is acknowledged that “in many instances the results were vastly different,” according to the NARA The Dawes Act of 1887. Some of the important issues that resulted as a consequence of the Dawes Act are as follows:

- The land allotted to the Indians included desert or near-desert lands unsuitable for farming
- The techniques of self-sufficient farming were much different from their tribal way of life. Many Indians did not want to take up agriculture, and those who want to farm could not afford the tools, animals, seed, and other supplies necessary to get started
- There were also problems with inheritance. Often young children inherited allotments that they could not farm because they had been sent away to boarding schools
- Multiple heirs also caused a problem; when several people inherited an allotment, the size of the holdings became too small for efficient farming

In these ways, and many similar other ones, Native Americans will be forever altered and on the road to perdition, as witnessed by the outcome of *Dawes*. It is worth noting that, pre-*Dawes* (1887), “the total land held by American Indian tribes on reservations equaled 138,000,000 acres. By the end of the allotment period landholdings had been reduced to 35,000,000 acres.” according to the NARA, *Dawes Act of 1887*. As time will pass in the US; Natives, understandably, will need much hope as more and more will be stolen from them in the years to come.

Attempts to “civilize” Natives, includes, but is not inclusive to, the taking of their lands; attempts to take the children from the Tiyospaye and, then, assimilate their children; and, then, to move Natives westward as a “collective” tribe, forcing them to endure extremely harsh conditions, both on paper and in reality. All this will lead to, and become major groundings, for the type of psychological, socio-culturally, biologically, ecologically, and economically devastatingly, dysfunctional Native illnesses that will, inevitably, lead to the type of socio-cultural, historic, economic trauma that US Natives face to this day. Although there are White folks who recognize the injustices of these types of Wašíču practices, even then, the gains for the majority of Whites outweighs the losses the Native peoples of the continent will undergo and endure, then, as in now. What follows are details specific to the types of tragic events that the tribes of Turtle Island will undergo. Each event will traumatize Natives from all regions of the continent.

---

Travesty, Tragedy, & Trauma: The US Native Experience in the 19th and 20th Century

What I will continue to argue throughout these final sections of my work is that it is through those repeated traumatic events, in combination with deliberate, maliciously guided US Federal Law designed to work against early Natives, that the once flourishing Indigenous peoples of Turtle Island will undergo the process of diachronization. All this, even after the devastating spread of White man’s diseases and the colonizers continued warring against the Indigenous of the continent, will, ultimately, ensure the abysmal loss of countless Natives and in too many, precious aspects of Indigeneity.

Unlike language, these, ominously, tragic early episodes of first-contact, Euro-American-Native tensions will, in the end, serve as the source for the type of post-traumatic stress disorders experienced by Natives today which, too often, stains tribal communities in very unhealthy ways which manifest either through rampant addictions of all types, violence, immense poverty, and a deep sense of loss, despair, and, most disturbingly, a great loss of hope.

Feelings of “a loss of hope” are frequently experienced by Native youth to the point of attempts at suicide, sometimes, repeated attempts. US Native youth experience one of the highest incidence rates of suicide. The Center for Disease Control (CDC) reports that “American Indian/Alaska Natives (AI/AN) have the highest rates of suicide of any racial/ethnic group in the United States,” moreover, “The rates of suicide in this population have been increasing since 2003,” according to the CDC Report. 135

Furthermore, the CDC report affirms that “The high prevalence of suicide among the AI/AN population and the comparative differences in suicide circumstances among AI/AN

decedents illustrate some of the disparities this population faces...,” among so many other disparities. What happens to a society when their precious youth choose to end their lives, rather than to live it and create more life? What it implies is that there really exists a profound sense of hopelessness for many Native youth. The preceding work will substantiate this hypothesis.

**US-Native Legacies of the 19th and 20th Century**

All deliberate nefarious maneuverings designed by the White colonizers of that time against Native peoples are intentionally premeditated and intended by the White colonizers. Without a doubt, what is clear is that the intent of the Wašíču is to further oppress and marginalize all Native peoples of that time. To be sure, not just one tribe is put through these tests. No US Native goes unscathed during this early period of early, American history, but you won’t find this kind of information in US public school textbooks, I can assure the reader..

In spite of this, Native people will survive, and they will thrive by preserving and protecting remnants of Indigenous culture, language, and tradition, which remain, awaiting a better time in the future wherein Natives will regain their place on the Earth. Also, what is to come is the return of those portions of their land stolen, although it might seem beyond difficult to get them all back. In regard to the original cosmological order designed by the Great Creator, Natives will continue to regain aspects of their language, culture, economy, which in the end will enhance US tribal existence. Moreover, Natives will survive and thrive as they have done so for millennia. Nonetheless, like the good Jewish people of the Earth, Natives will continue to be tested time again, and again...
What follows are brief accountings of enormous tragic events that continue to be discussed throughout traditional Native homes. I share them with the reader in an attempt to re-emphasize the impact of those old legacies that continues to impact Natives, irrespective of tribe. Even now, despite time’s passing. What I am presenting to the reader in the following is horrible. Still, there are nuggets of wisdom to be gleaned and shared. In a private conversation with a brilliant, young, Lakota woman who is a descendant of Luther Standing Bear, (b.1868-d. 1939), her thoughts on the history of Natives as a demographic group are reflected in her analysis, “I am positive that as a consequence of the Wašíču, [our] Native DNA carries a tragedy gene. It makes us sick, while making us strong.” 136 Harkening back to not so long ago, US federal Indian Law has not changed that much. Reflect on the previous quote while continuing to consume this work:

The Indians must conform to the “white man’s ways” peaceably if they will, forcibly if they must. They must adjust themselves to their environment and conform their mode of living substantially to our civilization. This civilization may not be the best possible, but it is the best the Indians can get.137

(Bureau of Indian Affairs Report, 1889)

The US Native Experience: Socio-Cultural, Psychological Historical Induced Trauma

Throughout human history, evil acts have been, shamelessly, committed by members of our species towards others of our kind. We are left numbed, spiritually and intellectually battered by the sheer wickedness of the act committed, even after times slow passing. Wide-eyed, open-mouthed, broken-hearted, completely overtaken by the extent of our

137 Quote Source: Meteor Blades. (2018): https://www.dailykos.com/stories/2018/12/29/1820334/-For-the-Lakota-December-1890-was-disastrous-Sitting-Bull-was-shot-300-were-killed-at-Wounded-Knee
species violent nature, such moments are saturated in disbelief, great shock, incredulity in the recognition that we are, indeed, capable of committing such offenses against others.

As we grapple and recognize the extent of humankind's penchant for depravity, violence, and sheer evil, the sentient human must reckon with that aspect of humanity, while the racist and power-hungry, evil-doers relish in them. Such overwhelmingly, shameful moments of our history must be recorded, digested, and discussed so that we attempt to never repeat them again. Similar to the Massacre at Sand Creek, 1864, such is the case of Wounded Knee as documented in the following diary entry and carefully preserved in the image below which warns us, “never forget, never forget, never again...

![Massacre of Wounded Knee](image)

*Figure 4.12: Massacre of Wounded Knee*

Although there are too many similar events recorded in the annals of human history, what needs to be recognized is that these types of events leave bloody fingerprints, forever imprinted, on humanity’s pages of history. Moreover, these types of events create a
tremor in the hearts, souls, and the spirit of the people of whom these travesties have impacted, and those of us who re-visit them by means of history books, documentaries/film, etc…. What should be recognized is that all such events stain humanity. In the case of Natives, compounded with the debilitating legislation enacted by whites, as well as the racism, and rounding-up of these noble people, the massacres initiated by whites against Natives will psychologically impact them as a collective, as it genetically alters our DNA as such historical burdens are meant to do.

A Native Perspective on The history of Wounded Knee

In the late 1880s, the Paiute Shaman Wovoka gave the American Indians of the Great Plains some much needed hope. He taught that the traditional ways of the Native Americans could return. The spirits of the dead would return, the buffalo would come back and a tidal wave of soil would bury the whites and restore the prairie. In order to bring these events to pass, dancers needed to dance the Ghost Dance. The dancers would wear brightly colored shirts decorated with eagles and buffalos. The ghost shirts would protect the wearer from the bullets of the soldiers. Sitting Bull encouraged the Ghost Dance religion.¹³⁸

As Native Americans now living on US reservations continue to be captured, contained, and critically diminished in spirit and a sense of inner-tribal, collectivity, the once powerful and free Indigenous of Turtle Island begin a period of mental, spiritual, economic, linguistic, and socio-cultural decline. In 1880, led by the powerful Paiute, prophet and medicine man,, Wovoka, for the Lakota of that time, Wovoka brings a much-needed sense of re-awakening as he introduces the tiyospaye to the Ghost Dance.

As a consequence of the **Dance**, there, then, begins a very brief period of hope for the Oglala Lakota Sioux *tiyospaye*. Participation in *The Dance* promotes a renewed sense of tribal inter-connectedness that is much needed after suffering one-blows, after another. In this moment of renewed hope and collectiveness, at that moment of time, all seems to be regained amongst the *tiyospaye, only to be stopped dead in its tracks by the US military in the horrific and vicious attack now known as *Wounded Knee*.

On that day, approximately, three hundred Lakota will be brutally murdered, or wounded, by US troops. Ninety men will be savagely killed. What is most tragic about the event, which serves as testament to the depravity of the types of heinous acts committed against the *tiyospaye, is that two-hundred, defenseless, women and children will be heartlessly, massacred on that day, as well. *The Ghost Dance movement, a last attempt for collective spirituality for the Lakota tiyospaye* will leave a blood-stained, human-imprint, both on the Earth itself and in the memories of future generations of Americans. This day in Native-American history remains a sorrowful day still honored by Native and non-Native, alike, as recounted in the following:

By 1890 white settlers and the Indian agents in charge of overseeing the reservation were fearful of the encouraged Native Americans. General Nelson A. Miles assembled an army of over 5,000 to contain the bands in the area. The government ordered that chiefs were to be arrested.

While attempting to arrest Sitting Bull, troops killed the famous Lakota chief. Upon hearing about the death of Sitting Bull, Chief Big Foot and approximately 300 of his band headed south, seeking the protection of the *Pine Ridge Reservation*. Col. James W. Forsyth and his troops intercepted the group at Wounded Knee Creek.

On the morning of December 29, 1890, Big Foot and his warriors were meeting with the Army officers. A
shot rang out. The soldiers turned their rifles on the Native Americans. From the heights above, rapid-firing Hotchkiss guns were fired at the encampment. As the men, women and children fled, some into the ravine next to the camp, they were cut down in a cross-fire. Those not suffering that fate were chased by the soldiers and butchered.\textsuperscript{139}

As Blades, recounts, “…The massacre effectively ended the Ghost Dance movement and was the last large encounter of the Indian Wars…”.\textsuperscript{140} In so doing, Natives became aware of the extent the new government system would go to in order to get its way. This will be a major turning point for all Indigenous people as this new reality will seep deep into their souls, genetically altering a once, free and happy people, as reflected in the 2012 quote of Lakota, White Plume while reflecting on another suicide on the Rez, this time a young, 15 year old Lakota female named Dusti Rose Jumping Eagle, who strangled herself in 2011\textsuperscript{141}:

> The whole Sioux Nation was wounded at that last terrible massacre, and we’ve been suffering ever since. It’s true we have our own ways of healing ourselves from the genocidal wound, but there is just so much historical trauma, so much pain, so much death,\textsuperscript{142}

Up to this point, I have shared with the reader relevant historical events that have impacted the Lakota Nation in a multitude of negative ways. My rationale for doing so is to inform the reader of the events that have led-up to the diachronizational, side-effects consequential of the type of brutalization and the great losses that “America’s Natives” of all historical backgrounds living in the US will undergo due to the process of white colonization.

\textsuperscript{139} \textbf{Source:} Partnerships with Native Americans (PWNA), History & Culture, WOUNDED KNEE – 1890. No author named. (2019). Website Source: http://www.nativepartnership.org/site/PageServer?pagename=PWNA_Native_History_woundedknee

\textsuperscript{140} \textbf{Source:} Partnerships with Native Americans (PWNA), History & Culture, WOUNDED KNEE – 1890. No author named. (2019). Website Source: http://www.nativepartnership.org/site/PageServer?pagename=PWNA_Native_History_woundedknee

\textsuperscript{141} \textbf{Source:} National Geographic, Fuller, A. (2012). “In the shadow of wounded knee: after 150 years of broke, promises, the Oglala Lakota people of the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota are nurturing their tribal customs, language, and beliefs. A rare, intimate portrait shows their resilience in the face of hardship,” 00279358, , Vol. 222, Issue 2.

\textsuperscript{142} IBID
As such, Backed by a new “democratic” system of governing that applies only to Whites, the continent once called Turtle Island, home of the free and brave Natives, will irrevocably change. It will never, ever, return to that which it once was, and great nations will suffer for this enormous toll. This early colonial history is hoped that the reader can necessary to know in order to better appreciate the current data reflective of the status of Natives in the US today. With a heavy heart, it is expected that the reader will make the connections between what has happened, and what is happening to the Indigenous people of this continent.


Getches, Wilkinson, Williams, Jr., (1998) explain that “Indian policy, in essence, revised the old assumptions about the Indians doomed fate that had animated the founder’s original Indian policy. The Indian had no choice but to adopt to the civilized ways of the white man. United States Indian policy was, therefore, to oversee this civilizing process, as humanely and as cheaply as possible…,” (p: 144). Furthermore, as described in “The Report of the Board of Indian Commissioners,” published November 23rd, 1869, and reprinted from the documents of United States Indian Policy, as explained by Getches, Wilkinson & et al, (1998), “the history of the government connections with the Indians is a shameful record of broken treaties and unfilled promises” (1998: 150).

Furthermore, as Getches, Wilkinson, Williams, Jr., (1998) explain, these were deliberate attempts and attacks intended for the decimation of the US Native, as Bryan Deans echoes repeatedly. As contended by Wilkinson, Williams, Jr., (1998), as “Paradoxical as it may seem, the white man has been the chief obstacle in the way of Indian civilization” (150). The following statements are presented by means of the analysis of legal scholars, specific to US
…The policy of collecting the Indian tribes on small reservations contiguous to each other, and within the limits of large reservation, eventually to become a State of the Union with the small reservations will probably be the best that can be devised. Many tribes may thus be collected in the present Indian territory…

…The treaty system should be abandoned, and as soon as any just method can be devised to accomplish it, existing treaties should be abrogated. The legal status of the uncivilized Indians should be that of wards of the government; the duty of the latter being to protect them, to educate them in industry, the arts of civilization, and the principles of Christianity; elevate them to the rights of citizenship, and to sustain and clothe them until they can support themselves…

…The payment of money annuities to the Indians should be abandoned, for the reason that such payments encouraged idleness and vice, to the injury of those whom it is intended to benefit…

…Schools should be established, and teachers employed by the government to introduce the English language in every tribe…

…It is believed that many of the difficulties with Indians occur from misunderstandings as to the meaning and intention of either party…

…paid teachers employed [in Boarding Schools] should be nominated by some religious body having a mission nearest to the location of the school…

…The establishment of Christian missions should be encouraged, and their schools fostered…

…the pupil should at least receive the rations in clothing they would get if remaining with their families…
...The religion of our blessed savior is believed to be the most effective agent for the civilization of any period…,

Above Statement Source:

At this point of the dissertation work, vital points should be made specific to the Native experience, accordingly. Based on my readings, especially the work on *US Federal Indian Law* by Getches, Wilkinson & et al, (1998), and other similar law books, US colonial history demonstrates that six major tactics will be used, specific, to the treatment of the Indigenous peoples of the continent now called “the Americas”.

Commencing with the early history of first contact, Portuguese/Spanish, Europeans, and, later, “White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestants,” specifically, those from Great Britain, will set afire the process of diachronization; thus, disturbing the universe in ways that can never be recaptured. By destabilizing the Indigenous. Natives *will be*, ultimately, controlled by Wašiču by means of the establishment of the US Government, followed by its institutions. As such, it will incorporate the following methodologies in order to do so:

1.) By the Bringing of Disease
2.) By Massacres
3.) By use of the “Papal Bulls,”
4.) by use of the “Doctrine of Discovery” / 
5.) by promoting Euro-American Concepts of Capitalism/Christianity protected by the ideologies promoted in “Manifest Destiny”
6.) By the establishment of the US Government followed by Deliberate Legislation Designed to Disempower, Immobilize, Marginalize, then Control Natives
7.) By the Forceful Taking of Native Lands by Any/All Means Mentioned in the Above
8.) By Continued Control of Natives on US Reservations by means of Continued Legislation that challenges Basic Human Rights such as Water, Air-Quality, Freedom, etc…
4.6 Part III: Pine Ridge Today, Demographical Background for Today’s Lakota

Introduction:

To begin the data analysis, the first component of DRM, I want to be very clear about the following. The resulting data analysis is NOT offered as a means to objectify the community of Pine Ridge. To the contrary, instead, the data analysis is offered as a “scientific” means to connect, and better understand, the diachronizational effects on the Pine Ridge community by directly linking it to the early US colonization Native experience.

Demographic Layering

The demographic layering approach applied to this section follows as such:

- At the micro-meso-level (district/community): data from Re-Member has been applied and considered
- At the meso-level (state): data from Black Hills Knowledge Network has been applied and considered
- At the macro-level: data from the US Census has been incorporated into this section, as well

All data sets are listed in the Appendix and have been applied to the following data analysis and are applicable to the Pine Ridge community, alone.

In understanding Pine Ridge as it is today, to begin with, “more than 5.1 million people in the US identify as fully or partially Native American or Alaska Native,” of those, “more than half do not live on reservations,” according to Strickland, (2016). At the same time, when comparing data at the global-level, it is worth noting that American Indians living on reservations located across the United States do not fare any better than Indigenous peoples
living in many Less Developed Countries (LDC’s),\textsuperscript{143} in spite of being situated in the present-day US, a country considered to be “the richest,” pre-Trump.

Without a doubt, this fact is deliberate and a direct consequence of White, Euro-American colonization, as has already been discussed throughout this work. To substantiate this fact, one only need to visit the statistics representative of US Native communities going back to the arrival of the Whites, as we will be doing. US Natives, like US marginalized populations, are, repeatedly, over-represented as holding the most challenged socio-economic-statuses (SES), with Native Americans ranking as the economically poorest of the poor in the US, contributing to an undisputable fact that immense poverty contributes to an endless feeling of hopelessness, as is permeated throughout US reservation after reservation. Although, from a social-theory lens, it is recognized that these types of “feelings of hopelessness” are, directly, tied to Native populations living in, now, Western socio-cultural communities wherein materialism is critical to one’s “self-worth”. “In 2014, more than 52 percent of the residents of Oglala Lakota lived below the poverty line,” according to Strickland (2016). From meso-to-macro-levels, Natives living on US Rez’s have experienced deep-seated anxiety respective to their well-being within all contexts.

Strickland (2016) shares the story of Donald who, “After years of pleading with the local tribal government - which administers the reservation on a semi-autonomous basis - and county authorities for running water and electricity,” Donald resigned himself to spending his remaining years without either. “I eventually gave up,” he recalls (Strickland, 2016).”They just say they can’t help me. It’s a waste of time,” according to Strickland’s article (2016). This

\textsuperscript{143}Less-developed countries (LDC) are “low-income countries that face significant structural challenges to sustainable development. The United Nations’s list of LDCs currently comprises 47 countries,” as explained by Investopedia, Direct URL Link: https://www.investopedia.com/terms/l/ldc.asp.
sense of hopelessness is reflective of a community comprised of people who have tried over and over to “fix things,” but at some point they feel that they must give-up because it becomes clear to them that the cause is hopeless.

Again, low socio-economic statuses, repeatedly, demonstrate via data analysis that a sense of “hopelessness” is a commonality amongst such populations, specific to communities in Western regions of the world. Within non-Westernized societies, these types of phenomenon play themselves out differently in terms of socio-cultural influences. For example, a summer in Yucatan working with youth is quite different than one working with US Native youth. The desire for committing suicide is not as common in Indigneous youth living outside of Western colonial spaces. For Indigneous youth living within colonial spaces, what this suggests is that being financially poor implies despair, “but there are tribes/cultures in third-world countries who have been observed to be happy even though “poor” in absolute terms,”as Dr. Lawerence Lesser points out in a personal communication with me.

In short, Indigenous people throughout the world have been, consistently, overwhelmed by socio-cultural, psycho-emotional, physical, political, environmental and spiritual inequities, beginning with the entry of White Europeans into their geo-spaces. This fact is no different for the Indigenous peoples of the world, as in the case of the members of US Native population. For US Natives, as WASP continue to arrive en masse, beginning their entry into what is now called the “American” continent, then, followed by other White Europeans; with each arrival of immigrants, the level of economic-security decreases for Natives,

144 Spiritual inequity for Natives goes back to the arrival of Christopher Columbus, Hernan Cortes, the arrival of Catholic priests, and extend to the period of ghost dances, boarding schools, etc…wherein Christianity is “forced upon” the Indigenous of the continent now called “America.”
grounding Natives into some of the lowest poverty-levels within the US. Consequently, Native peoples existence will be irrevocably altered, in short, *diachronized*.

As the Wašiču continue to enter, the process of forced-colonization crescendos. In the meantime, the US Government begins institutionalizing their laws, and military. Early US leaders, from presidents to politicians, will implement disturbing policies and anti-Native initiatives, deliberately, not just to marginalize US Natives, but to isolate and contain them by means of the US reservation system, backed by US militarization. Aside of this early and contentious history, US policies have been successful, to a significant degree, in that they have devastated and divided the Indigenous peoples of this continent to an unquantifiable degree, serving as testimony to just how far-reaching the byproducts of colonization will serve as the root causes to the type of historical and economic trauma the Indigenous of the US have undergone as a collective demographic.¹⁴⁵

To be clear, modern-day Natives are burdened endlessly with the consequences of colonial history as white man’s laws and militaristic efforts have, finally, “subdued the Natives.” Furthermore, the creation of US treaties will end-up contributing to the brutal taking of Native lands “legally,” precisely, because Natives will, ultimately, have no other recourse but to relinquish them. Finally, Natives will be, and continue to be undermined by US institutionalization and religiosity which, in the end, will steal, even, Native spirituality. Still, US Natives will persevere as is there tendency, although it will be an uphill battle in which the stakes are beyond high.

*Socio-historical Implications of Indigenous Poverty in the US*

¹⁴⁵ Substantiating what has already been discussed in chapters 1-3 of this dissertation, Leone (Ed.), (1998), explains that on the North American continent, “by 1500, more than three hundred distinct [Native] societies existed…” (pg.14). Furthermore, “Historian Jason Silverman writes in *The peopling of America: A synoptic History*, that each group ‘constituted a separate and distinct cultural entity with its own name, language, traditions, and government...’ ” (Leone, (Ed.), 1998, pg. 14).
Subsequently, current US Native Americans are further challenged as an entire demographical group within all demographical categorizations for a multitude of significant reasons. This fact is attributed to a type of “dysfunctionalism” inherited from the US colonial experience, respective to Whites. These types of policies/legislative manipulations, i.e., the establishment of unethical institutionalized policies intended to decimate Natives by, unilaterally, taking their lands; placing Natives on reservations by force, violence, and legislation; through racist political maneuverings; by incorporating, historically, marginalizing policies against Natives; blatant, de facto discrimination; by instituting reversed-xenophobia, etc…, all of which have resulted, precisely, because of colonization. With the arrival of the Wašiću, post-traumatic stress disorders/syndrome, as well as other psychological disorders will manifest amongst this particular population demographic as a direct consequence of historical, economic, linguistic, cultural, spiritual trauma. Oh, the effort that has been undertaken!!


Recognizing that socio-historical trauma, in relation to body-mind-spirit-environment, impacts the well-being of an individual; moreover, the collective, i.e., is the meeting point of the individual with their community members—in short—their extended family which is the nexus
of tribal existence; current Pine Ridge statistics exemplify the degree of damage received by the community as a direct, and indirect, aspect of colonization.

Again, emphasis is on the fact that this type of forced-upon historical trauma is experienced by Indigenous peoples from throughout continents, as located from throughout the world (Rossatto, Valles & et al, 2019). These types of “socio-historical” traumatic effects are targeted against the Indigenous people by the colonizer, as already discussed sufficiently. To this point, in relation to the data, I am arguing that this fact must be made clear when reviewing the data. In short, colonization has impacted US Native Americans to the point of dysfunctionalism, specifically because of their diachronization.

Accordingly, as presented in Derezotes; collective health, welfare, the psychodynamic, biological, and the environmental aspects of life are all direct consequences of socio-historical trauma (2014, pg. 5). As to whether these factors serve humans negatively or positively, clearly, this is dependent on what side of history one is on. In colonized lands/territories, it is the members of the status quo, and their progeny, who will receive the positive benefits, which extends itself from the best lands and natural resources, to the legal rights required by white’s and protected under White man’ law, all others receive scraps, fodder. The Danger of Minimizing, or Negating, Socio-Historical Trauma in Data Analysis

Aaron Huey, the renowned National Geographic photographer who spent time on the Pine Ridge Reservation in 2010,146 discusses this aspect of colonization as he explains to his TED audience the concepts behind the Lakota word “Wašićču,” which roughly translates to non-Indian, or, “the one who takes the best meat for himself.” 147 Another Lakota definition for

---

147 Definition Source: Patricia Hammond, Bryan Deans
the term is “the one who takes the fat” from the tiyospaye. “There’s always someone who takes the best meat, the best fruit, the best drink, etc…,” as Bryan Deans reminds me. For the generous Lakota, this is an example of really bad manners. The Lakota, in spite of the type of challenges they have experienced at the micro-meso- and macro-levels, tend to be more conscious, culturally, of the practice of generosity, which interestingly, is something I have experienced first-hand on the Rez, whether in the US or in tribal communities outside of the US.

Huey’s work with the Lakota people is multi-layered but started off back in 2005 when he was working on a National Geographic project addressing poverty in the US. “I literally found Pine Ridge because it was just another poverty statistic, but when I got there, I got taken in so deep, so fast,” he explains during an interview on National Public Radio (NPR). As he prolonged his stay on the Rez, he found himself embroiled in the turmoil that the Lakota people live under on a daily basis which is consequent of vast poverty, rampant disease, violence, institutionalized racism, etc…, which all contribute, again, to an overwhelming feeling of hopelessness for the Lakota.

Huey’s work, initially, was supposed to center on his renowned series of beautifully captured and unforgettable photography, ironically, detailing on film/disc memorable photos depicting poverty in the US. His photographic work has been well received for its insightfulness, sensitivity, and for centering on the US Native experience. As a consequence of his work on Pine Ridge, Huey will point out that the US colonial history of the Americas has severely damaged Native existence in ways that cannot ever be recaptured, aside of in glimpses of powerful photography, similar to the content message of his photography in

that respect. As such, you can never take the same picture twice. That is the essence of
diachronization. Huey comes to understand the impetuses behind Lakota diachronization under
the calamitous and unjust US legal system which, clearly, has been created by the colonizer,
initially, in order to completely devastate Native communities throughout the US.

Although Huey’s primary story-line/theme for his photography was intended to
document poverty on film; in the end, his work became the impetus for a popular, seven-year,
*National Geographic* documentary about the Oglala Lakota of the *Pine Ridge Indian
Reservation*. Through Huey’s important work, a White, counter-social movement, which
resonates fiercely with the Lakota people’s already established one, will take place, bringing
together Native with non-Native in firmly standing against the colonizer, and colonization, in
short, the Wašíču and its “power” practices. This bi-cultural, bi-racial “convergence” centers on
the *Ȟe Sápa* (the Lakota sacred site, *the Black Mountains* located in South Dakota). Moreover,
Huey’s movement in tandem with an already Native one, establishes a collective mantra
between Natives and non-Natives alike, which centers on the powerful message that “they are
NOT for sale!!”

Huey’s work is important because it brings acknowledgment from the
descendants of the Wašíču, and offers some hope, regarding the sacred *Black Hills*. The Lakota
prefer the use of the original name, *Ȟe Sápa* (*The Black Mountains*), centering on the motto
that “they are NOT for sale!!” The tenacious history behind The *Ȟe Sápa* battle goes back to
the *Fort Laramie Treaties of 1851 and 1868*. Accordingly, under the terms of the *FLT of 1868*
treaty agreement, the *Ȟe Sápa*/Black Hills are ensured to the Lakota by the early US
Government. Lakota oral history explains that the *Ȟe Sápa* is the sacred home space of the
ancestors and the place of Lakota origins, similar to the Emergence histories of the Hopi, Pueblo, Navajo, and other Native tribes, the Lakota “emerge” from the sacred Ŵe Sápa.

Similar to the revered, oral histories of the Hopi Nation, the Anasazi of the Southwest, the Acoma Nation, and the Pueblo people, many Indigenous oral histories explain this commonality, emergence from the underground. For the latter mentioned Indigenous peoples, their emergence begins from within the Sípapu, a whole in the Earth located in what is now called the Four Corners/Grand Canyon region of the Southwest, United States. For the Lakota it is the Ŵe Sápa. Likewise, Mexico traditionalists emphasize that the entire Southwestern region of the current US is a sacred place to these same early Indigenous peoples. One only needs to live, or travel, within these regions to recognize how unique they remain as they are distinctive; culturally, linguistically, and, even, in terms of spirituality—in spite of being, now, a part of the US.

Interestingly, Aztecs/Mexica and other central Mexica/n tribes refer to this region as Aztlan. In the same way, for the Lakota the Ŵe Sápa is the place of origins for the Lakota people. Sacred; therefore, they are beyond hallowed to the Tiyospaye. Lakota oral history explains that this is the region from where the Ancestors first emerge from, way before they were called “The Dakotas.” Up to this point, the Lakota people do not exist above ground. Understandably, the Ŵe Sápa are precious, priceless, and irreplaceable to the peoples of the Lakota Nation. Huey gets it.

The Socio-cultural, Psychological Ramifications of the Stealing of the Ŵe Sápa

Soon after the formation of the FLT 1868 the controversies begin, centering on this fact, that the sacred Ŵe Sápa belong to the Lakota, even after colonization. Moreover, by means of FLT 1868, the Ŵe Sápa have been ensured to the Lakota Nation for “perpetuity,” and
the region in which they are seated are to be non-White zones in which no Whites are supposed to enter these sacred Native lands. At least, on paper, that is. When rumors start surfacing that there might be gold in “dem Black Hills,” which at this point, in typical White fashion, early colonizers begin to move-in to this region, and how?

Under the FLT 1868, the treaty makes clear that these lands are, specifically, delineated and decreed as being part of the land allotted to the Lakota Nation. To re-emphasize, the Ėşe Sápa is that sacred place from which the Lakota emerge from and where they first enter into the surface of the Earth. Up to that point, they resided undergrown. That’s just how important they are to the Lakota peoples, as Bryan Deans, Patricia Hammond, and others have explained to me repeatedly, and, Huey. In this respect, they are like a mother, that sacred place of origins and birth.

For the Oglala Lakota Sioux, the Black Hills is the center of their existence, the center of their spiritual world, “their axis mundi,” as Alexander Fuller explains in his 2012 National Geographic issue. The article in which some of Huey’s pictures are published in. Like Huey, Fuller (2012) argues that, “The 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty guaranteed the Sioux possession of the hills, but after gold was discovered there in 1874, prospectors swarmed in, and the U.S. government quickly seized the land.

The Sioux refused to accept the legitimacy of the seizure and fought the takeover for more than a century. Reminiscent of earlier US Federal Indian Law, as Fuller (2012) explains, “On June 30, 1980, in United States v. Sioux Nation of Indians, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld an award of $17.5 million for the value of the land in 1877, along with 103 years’

149 Source: National Geographic, Fuller, Alexander. In the shadow of wounded knee: after 150 years of broke, promises, the Oglala Lakota people of the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota are nurturing their tribal customs, language, and beliefs. A rare, intimate portrait shows their resilience in the face of hardship. (August 2012). 00279358, Vol. 222.
150 IBID
worth of interest, together totaling $106 million. But the Sioux rejected the payment, insisting that the Black Hills would never be for sale.”\textsuperscript{151} The great irony is that the Lakota are the poorest of all tribes, and yet the richest. Consequently, they will not take the money, ever.

Huey, a White man, acknowledges this early history and chronicles the multitude of injustices committed against the Lakota by the colonizers/US government in his \textit{TED Talk} titled “The Lakota of \textit{Pine Ridge}\textsuperscript{152}. Similar to my approach for this work, Huey and Fuller (2012) contend that \textit{US Federal Indian Law} is complicit in displacing and dismantling the Lakota Nation.

Huey’s and Fuller’s work within \textit{Pine Ridge} sets-off a social justice movement that will spill over to other social and economic injustices and is best exemplified in Huey’s quote, “My success is not measured in money. I have no financial security. I have no savings account. I measure my success by asking myself if I’m telling a story that the world needs to hear, if I am educating people”\textsuperscript{153} (in Fuller, 2012). Furthermore, Huey reflects on the fact that “The statistics describing \textit{Pine Ridge} are staggering.” In sharing the following data, it is hoped that the reader will now be better prepared to recognize the connections between the diachronizational aspects that have manifested inter-tribally, specific to the Lakota people of the \textit{Great Sioux Nation}.

\textsuperscript{151} \textit{IBID}
\textsuperscript{152} See: \textit{TED} Talk titled “The Lakota of \textit{Pine Ridge}”, \url{https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T-WO7qU1SSE}.
\textsuperscript{153} Quote Source: \textit{TED}, Ideas Worth Talking, located at \textit{TED} Website address: \url{https://www.ted.com/speakers/aaron_huey}.
4.7 Part IV, Pine Ridge Data Analysis Overview

Figure 4.13: American Indians and Alaska Natives

“Almost Every Historical atrocity has a geographically symbolic core, a place whose name conjures up the trauma of a whole people: Auschwitz, Robben Island, Nanjing. For the Oglala Lakota of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation that place is a site near Wounded Knee Creek, 16 miles northeast of the town of Pine Ridge.”

-Alexander Fuller (2012)

Echoes from the Past, Pine Ridge Today

All Natives struggle as the Wašiču moves into their geo-spaces. That is an intentional and unfortunate circumstance. In the US, as demonstrated in the above map and as I have mentioned, repeatedly; with the arrival of the Wašiču to the continent, now referred to as
“the Americas”, Natives will be taken advantage of, displaced, and, in some ways, their ancient lifestyle destroyed. For the Lakota, this includes a concerted effort by the Wašíču to obliterate the buffalo, of which is a sacred creature and a primary staple to their diet. Hence, a period of diachronization begins. For the Natives of the continent, this means having to start all over again; moreover in foreign spaces, within foreign economies, with foreign peoples, etc….

As the newly formed US government consolidated Native lands, tribes were forced to the west as White colonizers took over, once, Native lands in the east; hence, the majority of remaining Native tribes are located in the West, as demonstrated in the above map. Often times, these lands belonged to other tribes, as in the case of the Navajo and the Utes; the Pueblo people and the Navajo; the Hopi and the Navajo, etc.. creating epic challenges in the, sacred, Southwest region referred to as “the Four Corners”154. This, frequently, ignited warfare between tribes—as if the warring with the Wašíču has not been enough.

Warring, for Natives, adds another layer to their potential economic viability, which is another Wašíču-centered, highly-favored, methodology applied to Natives. Conquer, divide, create war amongst the “newly acquired peoples”, and ignite the racial wars! No one gets rich off of warring, with the exception of those who created the wars. As we know, the US has amassed a long, long list in this regard155 (Also See: Means, 1995). These are important

154 “Four Corners” is located in the four corner area between the states of Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, and Colorado. Considered a sacred Native space to many continental Natives, there are oral histories that refer to it as “the beginning” place. Accordingly, the Hopi people cite it is the place of “emergence”, similar to the Paha Sapa, (Black Hills) of the Lakota. The Azteca people of Central America refer to it as “Aztlán”, the home site, the place of where they begin. The Hopi, the Azteca, and other tribal peoples teach that all Natives’ emerged from the “Sipapu”, the place of emergence. As they emerge, they begin a period of migration. As they migrate across the continent, Native tribes are seeded, as such.

155 The US is ranked second in this regard, with the first ranking belonging to Uganda, the third to Rwanda, the fourth to Great Britain. What must be taken into the equation is that the US is less than 250 years old as a sovereignty, accordingly. From: The Independent, News, World, Withnall, A.. ( 2015). “The nine most warmongering countries in the world revealed, Japan’s moves to rewrite its pacifist constitution have sparked large protests in the country – but just how unusual is it for a country to not be involved in overseas conflict?” (Monday 31 August 2015 07:47). @adamwithnall. Direct URL Link: https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/nine-most-warmongering-countries-world-revealed-10478988.html.
matters to consider regarding *Native Economic Hardship (NEH)*,\(^{156}\) which is a term I coined that describes the deliberate attempt by colonizers to economically obliterate Natives economically, debilitating their resources to the point of dependency on the federal government. In so doing, the Wašiču is able to marginalize and control Native population groups in other important ways, e.g. voting, education attainment, etc…, according to Valles.

The other matter to consider is that the larger the Native population settlement, the more economically challenged a community/geo-space will be, as they are, after all, clustered together purposefully. Again, this is another “intentional” on the part of the Wašiču, and other colonizers. As Strickland explains in his 2016 *Guardian* article titled “Life on the Pine Ridge Native American Reservation,” the US Government will establish the *Pine Ridge Indian Reservation* in 1889, calling it *Camp 334*. Initially, *Camp 334* will house “indigenous prisoners of war” as white colonizers move westward during this period of White expansion, which is facilitated under the new Wašiču government system.

**Resistance & Resilience on Pine Ridge**

Located in South Dakota, the *Great Sioux Nation* encompasses more than 2.8 million acres,\(^{157}\) and holds some of the most economically-challenged Native populations. It’s worth noting, once again, that 1.7 million acres are held in trust by the United States government, according to *ReMember*. Furthermore, it has been set-up in a way that Natives cannot use the land as a bank lien, making it challenging to produce crops without seedling, water, purchase farming equipment, etc… In this way, as well as in other central ones, the need for Wašiču money is forced upon the Native.

\(^{156}\) *Native Economic Hardship (NEH)* *Definition*: the deliberate attempt by colonizers to economically obliterate Natives economically, debilitating their resources to the point of dependency on the federal government. In so doing, the Wašiču is able to marginalize and control Native population groups in other important ways, e.g. voting, education attainment, etc…, according to Valles.

\(^{157}\) *Source*: Strickland, (2016).
In addition, much of the land is *beyond difficult* to harvest, as was intended by the Wašiču. Sadly, this is a commonality amongst US Natives. The Hopi of the Southwest, essentially, plant corn in a desert. The *Great Creator* sees that a crop will be harvested, in spite of the environmental and climatic challenges they experience. The Lakota experience similar challenges on *Pine Ridge*. Still, out of all the 3,142 US counties, the ones located on *Pine Ridge* are amongst the poorest, as Kristof (2012) discusses and the data substantiates, leading Kristof to reflect on the following:

*Pine Ridge* is a poster child of American poverty and of the failures of the reservation system for American Indians in the West. The latest *Census Bureau* data show that Shannon County here had the lowest per capita income in the entire United States in 2010. Not far behind in that *Census Bureau* list of poorest counties are several found largely inside other Sioux reservations in South Dakota: Rosebud, Cheyenne River and Crow Creek.158

As Kristof further explains, *Pine Ridge* is “In the national number line of inequality, people here represent the ‘other 1 percent,’ the bottom of the national heap” (2012). What, repeatedly, fails to be, appropriately, acknowledged by researchers, academics, historians, and journalists, is the extent of the facts/history behind the phenomenon of poverty on *Pine Ridge*, which is bundled, neatly, with issues such as the use/abuse of alcohol, or, how it was used, nefariously, introduced to Natives by the Wašiču in order to undermine Natives, economically, historically, and politically, amongst other variables.

Early on, during the US colonial period, alcohol was implemented as a tool by the Wašiču to get the few Natives who showed-up to a treaty signing, to sign-away their birthrights, as documented in countless journal entries from that time (Rossatto, Valles, & et al, 2020; Saiz & DeMaio, 2019; Danforth, 2015; Harjo, 2014; Derezotes, 2014; Pevar, 2012;  

---

Kristof (2012) does clarify that although alcohol “is arguably the central modern issue; but the real issues are way more systemic, way more historic,”159 as Huey, Bryan Deans and others acknowledge.

Huey’s important work is discussed in In The National Geographic (NG) article titled “In the Shadow of Wounded Knee…,”160 which is written by Fuller (2012). In Fuller’s (2012) NG’s piece, Huey presents his controversial art, while Fuller discusses “the lingering psychic effects of the 1890 massacre. As she explains, “There’s that, and the series of broken treaties that have left the Oglala Lakota with a fraction of their original sacred land.”161 The NG piece contends that in spite of these significant, historically, debilitating factors, still, “There is light.” More important, Huey explains that through his work and time on Pine Ridge, life there centers on resistance both from within the Rez, and from outside of it, as explained in the NG article’s (2012) following excerpt:

The story of the Oglala Lakota still hinges on a choice — the same choice faced by chiefs like Crazy Horse a hundred years ago: assimilate or resist. ‘And a lot of what this National Geographic piece went into was: What does a contemporary resistance look

---


like?” Aude Chesnais, PhD, an OLCERI Board Member, touches on this too, the extent of resistance demonstrated by the brave and perseverant Lakota in her 2017 work undertaken on the Pine Ridge Reservation, titled Wolakota: the face of ReZilience in “post”-colonial America. Chesnais refers to this as “ReZilience” (Footnote:), which she defines as, “tribal members resistance to colonization observed in places like Pine Ridge since the beginning of the Reservation era” (Chesnais 2010; Haaken 2088; Kurkiala 2002; Ostler 2009; Pickering 2004). Furthermore, as Chesnais’ (2017) explains:

…the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation has been continuously labeled as problematic; first; as “the Indian problem,” as shown by early federal efforts to get rid of the “wild” Indians (Ross, 1998); secondly, because of tribal members’ resistance to colonization observed in places like Pine Ridge since the beginning of the Reservation era (5) (Chesnais 2010; Haaken 2088; Kurkiala 2002; Ostler 2009; Pickering 2004).

As Chesnais (2017) further explains:

These structural occurrences have located Pine Ridge in a dichotomist definition, bouncing back and forth between the Noble Savage and another neocolonial versions of the “wild Indian”; the poor, dependent and victimized Indian (Ross, 1998). With such a ranking, this reservation would rank high in the top list of examples of development failures within the western hemisphere, especially since it is nested within the territory of the United States of America. Subsequently, it also does not appear as a model of resilient territories. Yet, Pine Ridge is full of people who developed a capacity to cope with the everyday risks they face locally while

162 Source: National Geographic Magazine, Fuller, A. & A. Huey. (2012). “In the Shadow of Wounded Knee, After 150 years of broken promises, the Oglala Lakota people of the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota are nurturing their tribal customs, language, and beliefs. A rare, intimate portrait shows their resilience in the face of hardship.” NGM Website URL Link: https://www.nationalgeographic.com/magazine/2012/08/pine-ridge/


implementing highly creative and innovative ideas (Pickering-Sherman, 2000; Chesnais, 2010). Those are people who talk with passion about their culture and dream of a time when their nation will truly be self-sufficient…” (From Chesnais’, 2017: 4)

As contended by Chesnais (2017), despite the countless challenges the Lakota have undergone as a community of Natives, “creative sustainable projects with unique features actually emerge in response to local stress. Yet, by western definitions, these projects are not visible and do not qualify as resilient.” 165 In her work, Chesnais refers to this counter-approach to oppression and marginalization on behalf of the Lakota people of Pine Ridge as “Wolakota”,166 to live in a good way, as previously discussed in an earlier chapter. OLCERI advocates, and through their work on the Rez, demonstrates this form of “ReZilience”. Afterall, they were the last tribe to go down.

Like Huey, I contend that critical to resistance is the awareness, and understanding, of how US Federal Law has been an essential aspect of Native oppression and marginalization. This undesired “legacy” is “legitimately”, “a ‘la de’ jure”, directed against US Natives, and must now be counter-challenged in the US Courts. Similarly, Huey promotes awareness of the matter, as he makes this very clear when he emphasizes to the Wašiču and their descendants, ‘I want people that see this story to think about our history,’ he says, ‘and think about how we get what we have…” 167 I, too, want the same.

---

166 **For furthers on this, see:** Wolakota: the face of ReZilience in” post”-colonial America
167 **Source:** *National Geographic Magazine*, Fuller, A. & A. Huey. (2012). "In the Shadow of Wounded Knee, After 150 years of broken promises, the Oglala Lakota people of the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota are nurturing their tribal customs, language, and beliefs. A rare, intimate portrait shows their resilience in the face of hardship.” NGM Website URL Link: https://www.nationalgeographic.com/magazine/2012/08/pine-ridge/
Chesnais, who describes herself as a “social scientist, political ecologist, data scientist, decolonial scholar, systemic thinker, teacher and lifetime learner,” explains how organizations like OLCERI, Re-member, Rebel Earth, Engineers without Borders, Tiyospaye Winyan Makas, The Coordinating Committee of International Voluntary Service (CCIVS), Come to Life, Grow Permaculture, etc…, all organizations OLCERI collaborates with, serve as forms of Wolakota. Each of these organizations feature, and adhere to, aspects of sustainable social change, whether through advocating and teaching permaculture, environmentalism, or social justice. Each group is invested in the future and recognizes the importance, and urgency, of bringing positive change to an ever-changing world in which dire environmental danger lurks near. Such work also focuses on sustainable and renewable energies, whether in regard to harvesting or natural energy production that does not harm Mother Earth, which is especially important “in Lakota country”. In a place in which “80 percent of people are unemployed,” according to Strickland (2016),168 certainly, this is critical, and a necessary, place to do such work.

As Chesnais (2017) explains, “Reservations are historically defined territories embedded in colonial power dynamics that create socio-economic vulnerability and multi-dimensional hardships in tribal members’ everyday life. What they face remains perceived and defined primarily by an etic/outsider perspective, which hinders expressions of local resilience.”169 US Natives recognize this reality, which is a confounding state-of-existence,

psychologically, emotionally, and in every other way possible; yet, Natives go to war on behalf of the US, placing aside this abhorrent and unjust history.

Chesnais’ (2017) concepts surrounding Wolakota and “ReZilience” are helpful to researchers in the field of diachronization. It facilitates the analyzing of the type of complexities and centuries old Native struggles, as found in this brave “New World”. For the Indigenous of the continent, this does not consist of, only, having to adapt to profound socio-cultural/ economic changes, but to Indigenous life in all its totality. Does that help us to better understand why the type of statistics are found throughout Rez’s located throughout the Americas? Only, if this aspect of US, North, South, Central, Latin American history knows about it, acknowledges it, researches it, publishes on it, and then, teaches it in public school, and, especially, in teacher preparation programs so that they, too, can fully understand real American history and, then, enlighten their students with this important part of American history not discussed in public school classrooms today (Rossatto, Valles, & et al, 2020). But why do it? Why go back to it? Let it stay where it is at, quiet and in the margins of Americana, only shown in Western films which, historically, makes them the bad guys.

My response to this is, so that we do not repeat that history ever again. Like the Holocaust, it must be taught so that it is NEVER repeated. If the US did not laud itself as the “land of the free, the home of the brave,” etc…, --or—if it did not promote itself as a pillar of democracy, and, pre-Trump, the country other countries came to when their rights were being threatened or their lands were being stolen, then the matter would most certainly be a different one. Trump’s America is, certainly, a new America and I cannot determine, at this point, if Trump’s America stays, or not. If it stays, then these types of histories will be crushed so that they can be repeated. Then, and only then, all is lost. To be clear, Trump is not the problem,
specifically; he has become “the messiah” for racist and xenophobes in the modern age. These people are the progeny of those white European ancestors whose arrival required “Othering” and the continuation of Western European ‘isms”. It is their progeny that proudly marches with Nazi flags at the hem of their protests, instead of US flags.

What follows, henceforth, is our challenge to the “colonial framework and discourse” that Chesnais’ (2017) advocates for throughout her work. OLDERI’s work on Pine Ridge centers its organizational objectives with this in mind, Chesnais is, after all on the Board of Directors. In recognizing the reality of the following types of data, meaning, witnessing them, learning more about them, challenging the phenomenon behind the stats, etc…, one recognizes, too, that it will not be easy. But then again, for the diachronized Native, nothing ever is since the arrival of the Wašíču. Trump’s new world model. As data is shared with my reader, my intent is to continue to emphasize the historical and legal impacts on US Natives so that the “Numbers/data” aren’t just that, but, instead, important pieces to a phenomenon ignited ferociously not too long ago with the arrival of the Wašíču to the continent. This approach is necessary and long overdue.

---

Strickland (2016) clarifies that although, “More than 5.1 million people in the US identify as fully or partially Native American or Alaska Native,” of those, “the Pine Ridge population size consists, approximately, of 18,834 individuals,” at the time of the 2010 U.S. Census period. Recognizing that this number is referring to the entire Rez, which is comprised of the nine districts as discussed in an earlier chapter of this work (Strickland, 2016),

---

171 **Map Source:** Daily Kos, Blades, M. (2018). For the Lakota, December 1890 was disastrous: Sitting Bull was shot; 300 were killed at Wounded Knee. Saturday December 29, 2018 - 9:00 AM MST. Website Access: [https://www.dailykos.com/stories/2018/12/29/1820334/-For-the-Lakota-December-1890-was-disastrous-Sitting-Bull-was-shot-300-were-killed-at-Wounded-Knee](https://www.dailykos.com/stories/2018/12/29/1820334/-For-the-Lakota-December-1890-was-disastrous-Sitting-Bull-was-shot-300-were-killed-at-Wounded-Knee). Also, see: Map of the Great Sioux Reservation, adapted from *Handbook of North American Indians: Plains*, vol. 13, Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution.


what has been made clear by many sources is that the Pine Ridge population is in a flux dependent on job availability. Deans explains that many of the available jobs are in Rapid City, and Re-Member substantiates this claim as well.

In terms of race/genetic ancestry, Pine Ridge is comprised of 96 -98% Native Americans (see above graph), this first recognition will assist us in relation to the upcoming discussion on the economy. Re-Member acknowledges that the population of the reservation is constantly in-flux and that this is dependent on the availability of resources, e.g., access to food, transportation, jobs, and utilities, etc… Like their nomadic-like ancestors, sometimes people leave the Rez for the lack of resources, in most cases, returning to the Rez. Some of the challenges captured in the data rest on that fact.

For accurate statistics, as reported by Siddons (2018), the following important data is offered:

- 18,834 individuals were recorded as living on the Pine Ridge Reservation during the 2010 U.S. Census, (substantiating Strickland, 2016)
- The vast majority (16,906) identified as American Indian, at 96%
- The South Dakota Department of Tribal Relations reports a total tribal enrollment of 38,332, with 19,639 living on the reservation
- The Department of the Interior reports a “Service Area population” for the Oglala Sioux Tribe of Pine Ridge Reservation of 32,152
- Background Information on Project: “Warrior/Brave—In’a/Hunk’chola/ Maiden Program

Pine Ridge, Population Narrative

In centering the data to the OLCERI collaborative, there are specific areas of interest for our work together. From the perspective of promoting traditional Lakota ways of

---

174 Source: Roll Call, POLICY, “The Never-Ending Crisis at the Indian Health Service, As the chronically under-funded agency struggles, American Indians are getting sicker and dying sooner.” Siddons, A. (March 5, 2018 at 5:04am). https://www.rollcall.com/2018/03/05/the-never-ending-crisis-at-the-indian-health-service/

175 Data Source: Roll Call, POLICY, “The Never-Ending Crisis at the Indian Health Service, As the chronically under-funded agency struggles, American Indians are getting sicker and dying sooner.” Siddons, A. (March 5, 2018 at 5:04am). https://www.rollcall.com/2018/03/05/the-never-ending-crisis-at-the-indian-health-service/
which OLCERI is founded on, e.g., service leadership; concepts of Wicozani, meaning to “live in harmony”; the core tenets behind 7/7/300; and, Wolakota, meaning, the concepts behind “living in a good/healthy way”; and in order to reconnect the generations, i.e., grandmother/mother/daughter; grandfather/uncle/father/son to the traditional Lakota ways, language, culture, and spirituality, amongst other self-sustainability projects.

For this particular project, our research collaborative (OLCERI) is concentrated on creating a “Warrior/Brave—In’a/Hunk’chola/ Maiden Program” program on the Pine Ridge Rez, based on the long-standing, and highly respected, Mother/Daughter-Father/Son Program housed at the University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) under the leadership of Dr. Josefina Villamil Tinajero, the program’s director. It is worth noting that both Dr. Larry Lesser and myself have worked with this highly acclaimed program. For furthers on this read Lawerence Lesser’s, (2009), excellent article titled, “Social Justice, Gender Equity, and Service Learning in Statistics Education: Lessons Learned from the DOE-funded Project AcE (ACtion for Equity),”176 which was a grant-funded, program tied to the hip to the MD/FS Program, a project I served on as the program coordinator. Both Project AcE and the MD/FS Program promoted and advocated gender equity in education and in the workplace.

Consequently, OLCERI has recruited Dr. Josefina Villamil Tinajero into the organization as an external member. Dr. Tinajero sits on the OLCERI Advisory Board as a consultant for our highly anticipated start-up program, “Warrior/Brave—In’a/Hunk’chola/ Maiden Program” on the Pine Ridge Rez, which is based on Dr. Tinajero’s highly acclaimed

176 For Furthers on the Project AcE Program and our work, see Lesser, 2009: Direct URL Link: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Lawrence_Lesser/publication/267552059_Social_Justice_Gender_Equity_and_Service_Learning_in_Statistics_Education_Lessons_Learned_from_the_DOE-funded_Project_ACE_ACtion_for_Equity/links/5492c9a20cf2302e1d07414c/Social_Justice_Gender_Equity_and_Service_Learning_in_Statistics_Education-Lessons-Learned-from-the-DOE-funded-Project-ACE-ACtion-for-Equity.pdf.
and decades-old, successful program, the *Mother/Daughter—Father/Son Program* which is housed at the *University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP)*.\textsuperscript{177}

Pre-COVID19, (the global pandemic that has altered, irrevocably, current human existence as found throughout the planet—to the degree that OLCERI’s yearly *Convergence* event was cancelled), schooling at all levels served as a highly-sought after venue for establishing programs such as Dr. Tinajero’s *MD/FS Program* and *Project AcE*. Since the world has “gone COVID”, schooling is now taught “online” by means of computer technology, and even impacts education in other pertinent ways, for example, my doctoral defense, which I will defend “online.” It is important to note that this fact has delayed the start-up of the “*Warrior/Brave—In’a/Hunk’chola/ Maiden Program*” on the *Pine Ridge Rez*. Still, there is great excitement and high expectations that a similar program, but distinctive to the needs of *Pine Ridge*, e.g., communal demographic distinctiveness, culture, language, etc… might be a way to address some of the issues on the Rez, specifically those dealing with issues of poverty, socio-cultural phenomenon, and some of the heartbreaking phenomenon that take place on the *Rez*.

“*Warrior/Brave—In’a/Hunk’chola/ Maiden Program*” on the *Pine Ridge Rez*

As presented on the *UTEP* Website, “In 1986, the *Mother-Daughter (MD) Program* was developed at the University of Texas at El Paso with the express purpose of empowering young Hispanic women.”\textsuperscript{178} Recognizing the demographic anomalies of that time,\textsuperscript{179} especially so for Hispanic females, the creation, development, and evolutionary growth

\textsuperscript{177} For further See: *The University of Texas at El Paso’s, Mother-Daughter/Father-Son Program*. Direct Website URL: https://utep.galaxydigital.com/agency/detail/?agency_id=46235

\textsuperscript{178} Source: IBID

\textsuperscript{179} Mother-Daughter/Father-Son Program Promo Video: *UTEP Mother Daughter Program 1995 Video*, Direct URL: https://youtu.be/7ypZnP9iXZE
of the MD Program facilitated “This rapidly growing segment of our nation’s population,” which was documented as experiencing continuous challenges respective to “chronic academic under achievement leading to low-paying jobs in the work force.”

As the UTEP Website explains, “Concerned individuals from UTEP, the YWCA, El Paso’s school districts and the El Paso community at large saw only one clear path — education,” and what follows are amazing changes in the El Paso community such as girls and moms/grandmothers attending events at the university in which they are exposed to current Hispanic female leaders who inspire and elevate the MD participants in ways that the research indicates work. Furthermore, moms end up going back to school, graduating, then moving on to college; then, earning higher degrees, leading to higher salaries and more stable economic home bases—while serving as mentors to their children, as well. This approach has been setting a positive cycle in El Paso, with sons and daughters following suit.

Conferring to the UTEP Website, “The organizers’ long-term goal was to create the possibility of a more equitable representation of Hispanic women in professional careers through higher education.” The program became immensely popular, so much so, that in 1992, under the prompting of Dr. Tinajero, the “Father-Son Program” (F/S) was developed. The MD/FS Program is unique in a multitude of ways, for example, it acknowledges, respects, and promotes the culture and language distinctiveness to this particular community demographic. Furthermore, “The approach is very different from other educational retention and leadership programs in three important ways,” according to the UTEP Website:

1. Fifth and Sixth-grade girls and boys, rather than high school students, are the focus of the program’s primary efforts

180 Source: IBID
181 For furthers See: The University of Texas at El Paso’s, Mother-Daughter/Father-Son Program. Direct Website URL: https://utep.galaxydigital.com/agency/detail/?agency_id=46235
182 Quote Source: IBID
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2. Mothers and fathers are considered an integral part of the program and must participate with their daughters and sons.

3. The students and parents learn about their many life options by seeing success firsthand in successful Hispanic university students and career men and women from every walk of life who participate in the program as role models.

As discussed and promoted by the MD/FS Program, “Setting goals is essential to success,” as well as building mentor relationships between public school youth and undergraduate students, and community leader and university professors, who also benefit from the program in distinct ways. At one point in the program, when Dr. Tinajero served as Dean of the College of Education, Dr. Tinajero and the MD/FS, Project AcE program coordinators, in conjunction with the honor society programs at UTEP’s College of Education, created a layered approach to mentoring, which had a “domino-like” effect, with each level overlapping each other.

Nevertheless, “The Mother-Daughter/Father-Son Program works hard to impart the habit of goal-setting to its participants,” and recognizes that youth require guidance, mentoring, and steadfast interaction between themselves, their schools, the university, and the community. This is a part of the reason a similar approach on Pine Ridge is exciting to consider, although there are significant differences between these two communities. Also, essential to the MD/FS Program are the activities it organizes for their youth. These used to be year round activities, with teachers/professors involved and invested in the program, much as Dr. Lesser was when he served as one of our gender-equity specialist. The activities are important because
they center around the youth, girls and boys, and their parents. The off-campus activities, in general, focus on “four broad goals,” as described on the UTEP Website183:

1. Building the students’ self-esteem, encouraging them to complete their high school education and raising their expectations of attending college;

2. Orienting the students to higher education and professional careers;

3. Improving the quality of preparation for higher education by providing academic and life-skills training;

4. Increasing parental commitment to higher education by involving the mothers and fathers as well as the daughters and sons in the educational decision-making process184

At one point of the program, at least, “150 mother-daughter/father-son teams” met on a Saturday, each month. This was done for an entire academic school year, beginning “while the students are in the fifth or sixth grade.” Events surrounded activities “planned around four important areas of development—academic, personal, career, and community life.”185 The main events, which were held at UTEP, were as follows:

1.) Parent Orientation,

2.) Campus Open House and Tour,

3.) Career Day,

4.) Leadership Conference and Summer Camp

Other activities were planned by “school campus coordinators’, who earned a small stipend for their time, but, in general, often times, even they volunteered their services when stipend monies were not readily available. All these events were, intentionally, year round

183 For furthers See: The University of Texas at El Paso’s, Mother-Daughter/Father-Son Program. Direct Website URL: https://utep.galaxydigital.com/agency/detail/?agency_id=46235
184 Source: IBID
185 For furthers See: The University of Texas at El Paso’s, Mother-Daughter/Father-Son Program. Direct Website URL: https://utep.galaxydigital.com/agency/detail/?agency_id=46235
events. The premise being, “if you build it, they’ll come…” We wanted the girls and boys to feel comfortable in a university scene, and around Ph D’s. We wanted them to understand that they, too, were heading that way. In so many ways, the program was a success. I am convinced that the program can be replicated on Pine Ridge, especially now that OLCERI has Dr. Tinajero serving on the OLCERI Advisory Board. The OLCERI collaborative recognizes the potential impact on the community with the inception of such an initiative.

Moreover, in order to promote, teach, facilitate, as a community, the knowledge-base and implementation of self-sustainability and its’ philosophy and core tenets, as well as to acquire the necessary skills and practices required for planting, harvesting, producing nutritious food inner-communally, as well as building the necessary infrastructure on the Rez; Native youth, are key to doing so, whether at university or in public school. With all this in consideration, the subsequent sections will focus on the specific demographics tied to this specific form of human interaction in education and research, as our intent is to establish a “Warrior/Brave—In’a/Hunk’chola/ Maiden Program” on the Pine Ridge Rez, while moving forward with the building of our OLCERI center and the continued promotion of perma-culture on the Rez.

Work with OLCERI will concentrate on the nexus of the collaborative resting on building a physical structure for the community in which inter-generational activities will be housed in, referred to as The OLCERI Cultural Center in relevance to this collaborative. With this in mind, it is important to emphasize that 42.4% of the population on Pine Ridge was identified as being younger than 20 years of age, according to the 2010 U.S. Census. By comparison, the state of South Dakota’s average for this demographic is 27.8%. Likewise, the median age on Pine Ridge is 25.4 years; 24.6 for men, and 26 for women. More important, only
19.8% of the population was identified as being older than 50 years old, meaning that Pine Ridge is in danger of losing one of its’ most important resources, the elders. The South Dakota average for this demographic is 33.8% \(^{186}\) Likewise, CityData.com for Pine Ridge offers the following disturbing data, as demonstrated in the stats and following bar graph:\(^{187}\)

- 49.7% of Pine Ridge, SD residents had an income below the poverty level in 2017, which was 73.8% greater than the poverty level of 13.0% across the entire state of South Dakota
- Considering residents not living in families, 43.6% of high school graduates and 100.0% of non-high school graduates live in poverty
- The poverty rate was 51.8% among disabled males and 37.7% among disabled females
- The renting rate among poor residents was 83.0%. For comparison, it was 51.5% among residents with income above the poverty level\(^ {188}\)
- The highest age bracket for “very poor residents in Pine Ridge, SD is 15 years of age, followed by 18-24 years of age; followed by youth of younger age ranges
- In all categorizations, when compared to the state of South Dakota, the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation surpasses the state levels respective to classification for “very poor residents”
- Moreover, there is a consistent concern for the low members respective to the demographic group representative of Native elders

---

\(^{186}\) Data Source: Roll Call, POLICY, “The Never-Ending Crisis at the Indian Health Service, As the chronically under-funded agency struggles, American Indians are getting sicker and dying sooner.” Siddons, A. (March 5, 2018 at 5:04am). https://www.rollcall.com/2018/03/05/the-never-ending-crisis-at-the-indian-health-service/.


\(^{188}\) IBID
Secondary Data Source: “The Pine Ridge Community, South Dakota” Provided by the “City of Pine Ridge”

Pine Ridge Demographics

Human Data

- Population Data for 2010: 3,308.
- Population change since 2000: +4.3%
- Males: 1,707 (51.6%)
- Females: 1,601 (48.4%)
- Median resident age: 24.0 years

Economic Data

- Estimated median household income in 2017: $33,784 (it was $21,089 in 2000)
- Pine Ridge: $33,784
- SD: $56,521 Estimated per capita income in 2017: $10,229 (it was $6,067 in 2000)
- Pine Ridge CDP income, earnings, and wages
- data Estimated median house or condo value in 2017: $40,152 (it was $17,800 in 2000)
- Pine Ridge: $40,152 SD: $167,600
- Mean prices in 2017:
  - All housing units: $29,724;
  - Detached houses: $43,555;
  - Mobile homes: $20,764

---


● Median gross rent in 2017: $536.
● March 2019 cost of living index in Pine Ridge: 74.2 (low, U.S. average is 100) Pine Ridge, SD residents, houses, and apartments details
● Percentage of residents living in poverty in 2017: 49.7%

Tertiary Data Sources: The Sioux Hope Foundation film Oglala Sioux of Pine Ridge Reservation by Jacek Kropinski (2015)191

Other data for 2017 states that Pine Ridge, South Dakota consisted of “a median household income of $37,031,” according to the Sioux Hope Foundation’s film titled, The Oglala Sioux of Pine Ridge Reservation, by Jacek Kropinski.192 The Sioux Hope Foundation’s data, as presented in the 2015 film, cites the following data for the Pine Ridge community as follows:

● Between the period of 2016 and 2017, Pine Ridge experienced a 4.37% increase in growth.
● The median household income grew from $29,881 to $37,031, a 23.9% increase

The population of Pine Ridge, SD is:
● 92.6% American Indian & Alaska Native Alone
● 3.84% White Alone, and 2.78% Hispanic or Latino
● N/A% of the people in Pine Ridge, SD speak a non-English language,
● 100% are U.S. citizens
● The median property value in Pine Ridge, SD is $9,999
● Homeownership rate is 36.9%

Other Pertinent Data to Consider

In short, the highest age-demographic for Pine Ridge consists of a younger aged population, with limiting representation of individuals over the age of fifty. On a personal level,

Bryan Deans had explained to me in private conversations that fact. As he looked me straight into the eyes, he stated, “I am the last of my kind…” Deans further explained to me that because of the levels of drug abuse/addiction, alcoholism, and Diabetes associated with alcoholism, as well as the rampant suicide levels experienced on Pine Ridge, clearly, it was beyond difficult to maintain a healthy, “or living”, older population demographic on the Rez. This aspect of life on the Pine Ridge Rez is indicative of other US Native communities.

Aside of the oil pipelines, bad water, and mining that have taken place, as well as the further polluting and destroying of Mother Earth, over and above, impacting the physical, psychological, and biological well-being of Pine Ridge Natives, there are other significant factors to consider that impact the viability of the Lakota Nation in ways not seen, or experienced, throughout the Western world. These factors lay at the micro-level and impact personal well-being, in particular, within the development of youth as educators, social theorists, psychologists, etc… have maintained since the late nineteenth century.

Although it could be argued that poverty is an important factor as to why this might be so, it is not enough. Other pertinent data to consider are the suicide rates; the alcoholism that takes place on the Rez, which by the way is already a depressant factor to an already compromised, and vulnerable, young individual who might be experiencing fatal feelings of hopelessness. Similarly, drug addiction, in conjunction with an, already, immense sense of hopelessness, facilitated by a lack of parenting/positive parental relationships at home, etc…, all this and more, are contributing to phenomenon required to consider regarding the type of disturbing data we see on the Rez.

Of all the data I have studied, this one area is heart breaking and must be addressed in a more forceful way. Engaging students in education, educational activities,
getting them to see their future in a more positive way, as well as connecting youth to “grown-ups”, mentors, professors/teachers, educational opportunities, trips, monies, internships, etc., and with each other in ways that might not be happening currently, especially so in a post-COVID 19 world, might be one way to consider addressing the following issues.

**Life Expectancy on the Rez**

“The whole Sioux Nation was wounded at that last terrible massacre, and we’ve been suffering ever since. It’s true we have our own ways of healing ourselves from the genocidal wound, but there is just so much historical trauma, so much pain, so much death,”

--White Plume

One of the most disturbing aspects respective to the age demographics for US Natives is the limited life expectancy rates attributed to life on the Rez. On Pine Ridge, not only are our elders not living longer, healthy lives, but more disturbing is the story the data tells respective to young adults. When we correlate life expectancy with the largest population group on Pine Ridge, their youth, the data begins to paint a very bleak picture from within, respective of this alarming phenomenon. Within personal conversations with US Natives from differing US tribes of which I have been privy to, from Mescalero Apache, to Navajo, to Lakota Sioux, heartbreakingly, the deepest concern is directed toward suicide on the Rez, which is rampant amongst Natives, especially within the youth population. As a research-advocate, I cannot express to my reader just how devastatingly and excruciatingly painful this fact is to me, and, in so many ways.

Deans, other Natives and non-Natives, see the OLCERI’s mission as a means to reckon with this aspect of US Native life. Deans has explained to me that living on US Reservations forces a sense of hopelessness for all. As such, OLCERI’s program centers on
providing self-fulfilling, hard work, that, eventually leads to a sense of purpose and self-sustainability that other Native programs do not. Likewise, a “Warrior/Brave—In’a/Hunk’chola/Maiden Program” program on the Pine Ridge Rez could also, potentially, serve as a venue to counter the type of suicide rates often found on US Reservations.

In reviewing the phenomenon of suicide on the Rez, I have already shared enough information with the reader to allow some understanding of the impact of colonization on tribal nations. Even after time’s slowing passing do these legacies continue for US Natives. Dangerously mixed with some of the lowest poverty rates in the US, as well as recognizing the types of addiction (alcohol and drugs) problems encountered on the Rez, and, of course, what these addictions do to the family is beyond obvious. What we know about suicides on the Rez

![Figure 4.16: U.S. Racial Composition](image)

begins with knowledge of what the data tells us, that “American Indian/Alaska Natives (AI/AN) have the highest rates of suicide of any racial/ethnic group in the United States.” Moreover, as it currently stands, the US Native population, demographically-speaking, continues to diminish as a “whole”, as substantiated in the data above. As such, US Natives, as of 2016, represent only 0.2% of the entire US population, making the high suicide rates, for youth in particular, beyond alarming.

In 2015, “Nine people ages 12 to 24 have committed suicide there since December,” as reported by The New York Times. In one of too many tragic cases, Santana Janis, a 12-year-old Lakota female, took her life by hanging herself in what is described as “a small unheated building” located next to the “derelict two-bedroom trailer,” she lived in with her grandfather, Earl Tall; a “home” shared with “as many as a dozen siblings and cousins.” Santana’s grandfather reported to the Times that a few days before Christmas, she was already talking about ending her, way too young life. Six weeks later, Santana, did just that. Young, sweet, and active, she had been displaying dark moods, as reported by family members to the extent that grandpa, Earl Tall, reached out to Santana’s other grandfather who made her promise him that she wouldn’t do it. Other, heart breaking, similar incidence were to follow, as reported by Bosman for the Times:

Two teenagers hanged themselves in December. In the next three months, seven more young people were found dead, including Alanie Martin, 14, who was known for her love of basketball, cheerleading and traditional Indian hand games. When Santana killed herself in February, she followed the recent suicide of a boy who attended her school, Wounded Knee, named for the 1890 massacre that occurred where the
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reservation stands today.

Many more youths on the reservation have tried, but failed, to kill themselves in the past several months: At least 103 attempts by people ages 12 to 24 occurred from December to March, according to the federal Indian Health Service.\(^\text{197}\)

Under the leadership of the 2015 Oglala Sioux Tribal Council president, John Yellow Bird Steele, declared a state of emergency on the Rez. In response, the Indian Health Services “deployed additional counselors, but many people here say it is not nearly enough:

There are only six mental health professionals on the entire reservation, which has a population of 16,000 to 40,000 tribal members based on varying government and tribal estimates,” according to Bosman’s 2015 article. In response to the outbreak, John Yellow Bird Steele, was reported as saying, “It is devastating,… “I don’t know if they were cyberbullied, or if they had living conditions they didn’t want to put up with, or they were sexually abused. Were they hungry? I don’t know.”

According to John Two Bulls, “a pastor who works with youth on the reservation,” as the Times article reports, among bullying, quasi-tribal/urban legends dealing with a mythical figure referred to as “Slim Man,” who urges youth to end their way too young lives, might play a factor in the outbreaks. John Two Bulls explains that upon being tipped off about a group suicide effort arranged outside of the Rez, he was able to get there before anyone else did. He met with youth who explained to him that “they were tired of the lives they had at home, no food, with parents all intoxicated, and some were being abused, mentally or sexually.”

Similarly, Ted Hamilton, the superintendent of the Red Cloud Indian School, a Jesuit school on the reservation, as reported by Bosman (2015) says “suicide is an issue that

schools grapple with constantly.” Furthermore, a similar message is echoed harkening back to arguments made throughout this dissertation, as shared by Superintendent Hamilton of the Pine Ridge School Districts, “To be Lakota in this world is a challenge because they want to maintain their own culture, but they’re being told their culture is not successful,” Mr. Hamilton said. Furthermore, “Children on Indian reservations,” he added, “have extraordinary challenges: the legacy of oppression and forced removals, the lack of jobs and economic opportunity, and the high levels of drug and alcohol use around them…”198

The rash of suicides on the Rez is nothing new, sadly. In 2017, according to work by Amanda Cordova and Mary Cate Carroll’s (2019) article titled, Guest Post: Teen suicide epidemic on Pine Ridge Reservation,” estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey substantiates previous referenced data about life on Pine Ridge:

- 44% of individuals live below the poverty line
- The unemployment rate is nearly 70%, more than 17 times higher than the national rate
- Pine Ridge has alarmingly low life expectancy — men are expected to live to 48 and women to 52
- Local estimates suggest that alcoholism affects up to two-thirds of adults on Pine Ridge reservation
- Nearly one-fourth of babies born have fetal alcohol syndrome
- This toxic mix of poverty, unemployment and poor health most likely has contributed to a suicide crisis among Native American teens

As Cordova & Carroll (2019) report, “According to Friends of Pine Ridge Reservation, the teenage suicide rate is 150% higher than the national average, leading to another state of emergency in 2014 after 14 youths killed themselves.200
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In 2012, according to Cordova & Carroll (2019), the *Pine Ridge* community has received several grants to address this most tragic of issues; yet, “it is one of very few resources on the reservation and it alone cannot reach all youth and teens.”\(^{201}\) Cordova, who is a social worker cites similar acknowledged issues surrounding the phenomenon,\(^ {202}\) for example:

- *Pine Ridge’s* per capita income is $9,334, according to the census bureau. This level of poverty makes it difficult for families to meet basic needs.
- In a 2017 governmental report on suicide prevention, the *Centers for Disease Control* stated, “strengthening household financial security and stabilizing housing can reduce suicide risk.”
- It is not uncommon for *Pine Ridge* families to have trouble heating their homes in the winter. Lack of such basic needs makes it difficult for *Pine Ridge* teens to focus on their future.
- Native American high school graduation rates are at 65% versus the 75% national rate
- Only 33% of Native American teens go on to earn a four-year degree, according to *US Census* data\(^ {203}\)

Still, beginning in 2003, the data makes clear that suicide rates for this community continue to increase, according to the *National Violent Death Reporting System (NVDRS)*. As reported by the *National Violent Death Reporting System (NVDRS)*, “18 states showed AI/AN suicide decedents were younger and had higher odds of living in a non-metropolitan area than did non-Hispanic whites who died by suicide.” Moreover, “Suicide and non-suicide deaths of friends and family, as well as alcohol use preceding death were associated with AI/AN decedents more often than non-Hispanic white decedents.”\(^ {204}\)

The study’s authors argue that the high prevalence rates of suicide for this particular population is a result of the type of disparities forced upon US Natives and call for

---

\(^{201}\) According to Cordova & Carroll (2019), “In 2012, the U.S federal government began a round of 23 youth-suicide prevention grants which totaled $500,000 per year for three years. However, only 43 of the 566 federally recognized tribes received these grants, according to the *Lakota Law Project*, a non-profit which focuses on Native American rights…”

\(^{202}\) *Data Source:* Cordova & Carroll (2019).
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\(^{204}\) *Source:* *National Violent Death Reporting System (NVDRS)*
“focused, yet comprehensive, suicide prevention and intervention efforts” that are structured around “culturally relevant, evidence-based strategies at the individual, interpersonal, and community levels.”

Also, as the data substantiates according to the National Violent Death Reporting System (NVDRS): The suicide rate among AI/AN has been increasing since 2003. In 2015, AI/AN suicide rates in the 18 states participating in the National Violent Death Reporting System (NVDRS) were 21.5 per 100,000, more than 3.5 times higher than those among racial/ethnic groups with the lowest rates:

- Across multiple demographics, incident characteristics, and circumstances, AI/AN descendants were significantly different from white descendants
- More than one third (35.7%) of AI/AN descendants were aged 10–24 years (versus 11.1% of whites)
- Compared with whites, AI/AN descendants had 6.6 times the odds of living in a nonmetropolitan area, 2.1 times the odds of a positive alcohol toxicology result, and 2.4 times the odds of a suicide of a friend or family member affecting their death

In terms of promoting Wolakota, “healthy living,” anti-suicide strategies, and in a concerted effort to building a stronger community, hosting open conversations and bringing in elders to youth events is critical. Likewise, OLCERI recognizes the importance of promoting a sense of self-sufficiency as key to the seven tenets, as previously discussed, beginning with youth. Similarly, ReMember substantiates these bleak aspects of living on US Reservations in the data they share specific to Pine Ridge, as well. ReMember’s approach to the serious issues that impact the Pine Ridge community are positive, constructive, and inclusive, similar to those

---
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206 According to the National Violent Death Reporting System (NVDRS) study “completed suicides across all ages of AI/AN, NVDRS data collected from 2003 to 2014 were analyzed by comparing differences in suicide characteristics and circumstances between AI/AN and white decedents. Group differences were assessed using chi-squared tests and logistic regression.”
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of OLCERI’s. Nevertheless, ReMember’s organizations’ data analysis refers to the Pine Ridge Reservation community as the “Lowest and Last.”²⁰⁸

As such, “The Pine Ridge Reservation is home to the lowest life expectancy, and a number of the poorest communities” in the entire United States as countless other data sets infer. Both go hand in hand. One cannot see the doctor, buy medicine, buy nutritious food, etc…, when one does not have the means to do so. For youth, all the socio-cultural events Western youth “supposedly” are privileged enough to do does not apply to Native youth. The disturbing aspect to this rests in the fact that television is one of the few outlets lower SES-communities participate in. All we have to do is backtrack to better understand, and appreciate, how this worked itself off by juxtaposing colonization with diachronization.

In the instances in which Native communities, both in the US and globally, have come together in an attempt to reckon with, and address, the unethical and unjust Euro-American-centrist, capitalistic-centered, economic, and political policies and practices aimed at them; Native communities are, quickly, cornered, controlled, and punished by the Wašíču-backed military/policing forces, federal agencies, and through institutionalized racism and bigotry, which seeps out of the Wašíču “justice system” like a stinky, toxic ooze. All one need do is look at history in order to substantiate that fact.

In the US, we can reference the Wounded Knee Standoff²⁰⁹ of the 1970’s. Within these types of considerations, the linkage between Native diachronization makes perfect sense, correlating with the type of statistics that have been shared throughout this work.

---
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²⁰⁹ Wounded Knee Standoff (1973), community members and American Indian Movement (AIM) activist on Pine Ridge came together to challenge their treatment by the US Federal Government, the tribal council, in particular, and the corrupt tribal president of the time, Dick Wilson. The event, which lasted 71 days, basically, became an armed standoff involving the Feds, leading to a shoot-out, several deaths, as well as the arrests, acquittals, and conviction of Leonard Peltier, who received two consecutive life sentences.
Clearly, the historical and legislative data offered throughout this work allows for correlations to be argued academically centering on the fact that US brutality has left a long and lasting bloody fingerprint on US Natives. And, it is deliberate and constant. The demographical data serves as proof of that dereliction of justice has negatively and overwhelmingly impacted Natives, generation after generation.

Just as tragic and recognized within the Pine Ridge community is the legacy of the “Dakota 38 of 1862,” a lamentable tragedy, from all sides, in which 38 Dakota men were, “hanged under order of President Abraham Lincoln. The hangings and convictions of the Dakota 38 resulted from the aftermath of the U.S.-Dakota War of 1862 in southwest Minnesota,” according to Vincent Schilling (2017). Schilling’s 2017 article on the Indian Country Today Website titled, “The Traumatic True History and Name List of the Dakota 38”,\(^ {210}\) explains that “In addition to the 38 men hanged the day after Christmas, there were terrible injustices committed against 265 others in the form of military convictions and inhuman injustices to more than 3,000 Dakota people who were held captive, then forced to march west out of Minnesota.”\(^ {211}\) Moreover, the trial was bogus, not surprisingly, as well as in English, a language the accused did not speak or understand.

As Schilling (2017) explains, the convictions were a result of invasion, broken treaties, and Natives pushing back; hence, “The conflict erupted when treaties restricted the lands of the Dakota people to an area that could no longer sustain them. Promised compensations were slow or non-existent and the Dakota people feared starvation heading into


\(^{211}\) Ibid
a brutal Minnesota winter,” with a Wašíču stating openly “let them [Natives] eat grass”,
according to Schilling (2017). Furthermore, “As skirmishes and interactions between whites
and Native peoples heightened, on August 17, 1862, four young Dakota hunters were credited
with killing five settlers,” resulting in the calling together of a war council and the decision
made to go to war with the Wašíču.

Schilling explains that there was great apprehension as a consequence of many
factors, one primary one was the recognition that now Natives were losing just about everything
as a consequence of the Wašíču’s power, and, of course, Whites were now on the continent in
greater numbers than Natives. Still, the warriors of that time recognized this new reality and,
even then, opted to go to war with the Wašíču. According to Means, an Oglala Lakota Sioux
historian and US marine:

The warrior culture was disappearing simply because by the late 1800s, there
was literally no one left to fight. The whole warrior culture of protecting and providing became
irrelevant up through World War I. That was a transitional time for Native Americans, because
an entire generation of people who remembered having autonomy and freedom were dying off.
Instead, you now had individuals who had only ever known reservation life. Then here comes
World War I and a tremendous opportunity for Native Americans to provide for themselves
again and revitalize that warrior tradition.212

The U.S.-Dakota War of 1862, or, the “Lincoln Legacy”

To this day, this disastrous history serves as a constant reminder to Natives of
what happens when you go-up against the Wašíču. It is beyond lamentable, and it is tragically,

ironic that so many Native youth have opted for hanging themselves as their way out of so many, unnecessary things. One could argue that low socio-economic status contributes to a multitude of socio-cultural phenomenon; however, what needs to be recognized is that the phenomenon that plagues colonized Native communities from throughout the world are not phenomenon specifically related to living in poverty. Instead, it is the haunting of an unjust history, an enormous loss of ways, culture, language, tiyospaye, and spirituality that lends itself to the high-levels of suicide that take place within the community. *Moreover, it is about the taking away of one’s way of being.* For example, for the Lakota, buffalo were critical to their existence, and, as expected by the Waȟáŋ, they too are annihilated at the hands of the White man. For the Lakota, they await the return of the buffalo.

As Means\textsuperscript{213} reflects upon when asked if US Natives have been exploited by the Waȟáŋ, specific to the dichotomy of their existence in the make-up of US American history, in particular, when Natives choose to join the US military, Means responds as follows\textsuperscript{214}:

> Whether consciously or unconsciously. Native Americans have this weird place in American culture where they’re part of America’s past in becoming the great nation. But at the same time, they’re still here. That’s why Native Americans have been relegated and confined within these boxes.

> When you think of an American Indian you think of *Dances with Wolves.* You don’t think of somebody wearing a suit or a tie. It’s cultural exploitation, but at the same time, because Native Americans have been forced into this horrible economic and cultural position on reservations, the U.S. and the military exploit that by


providing the military as an option out of poverty and hopelessness….

…The U.S. government has forgotten Native Americans as a whole. It’s part of the entire cultural push where natives are great as long as they’re only seen in a certain context. This is why the Dakota Access Pipeline resistance is interesting, because they broke out of that confine.

Having, already, shared significant history specific to the US Native experience throughout this dissertation, Means additional and brilliant cultural reflections explains what the recurring message has been out of this US-Native relationship in the following: 215

Native Americans are supposed to be people of the past. They’re supposed to be exotic, but mostly, what they’re supposed to be is quiet. When they raise their voice and make noise, the United States gets very uncomfortable. Abandoning Native Americans has been the M.O. of the U.S. since reservations were created as temporary reserves.

Means offers the reader, and viewers of the PBS film titled, A Warrior Tradition (which can be accessed through the PBS website), a unique US Native perspectives from an, educated, inward looking, diachronized perspective. As a former, US military man who is also a Native professor of history at a US college, such perspectives are rare, yet critical to Native cultural well-being and “true” US history. Moreover, they, unfortunately for themselves, must serve as mentors and facilitators for other Natives. Indeed, the US Native experience is a complicated one, and one that requires continuous exploration, while, at the same time, recognizing their exploitation, which must be recognized by the US Federal Government.

As such, the US Federal Government, its institutions, its politicians and the policies they mandate against the US Native cannot continue as it is, which has continued a long

history of taking advantage of this extremely, dichotomous, one-sided relationship. As I have mentioned throughout this work, when attending any type of US Native event, whether a sacred ceremony that I might have been invited to attend, or a Native US rodeo or *Pow Wow*, or at a multi-cultural event, *they* are always there, men like Means and McDonald etc…honorable Natives who have proudly served the US military and show-up to such events wearing their Veteran’s caps, vests, and, yes, even flying the US Flag.
When return to that history of old, the colonial invasion, to add insult to injury, aside of the impact of the Dakota diaspora that resulted as a consequence of the arrival and expansion of White colonizers to the continent, the other disturbing aspect of this history

\[\text{Map Source: Minnesota Historical Society’s U.S.-Dakota War Website, Direct URL Link: https://www.usdakotawar.org/history/aftermath}\]
surrounding the *Dakota 38* and the *US-Dakota War of 1862* is cited by the *Minnesota Historical Society’s U.S.-Dakota War website* wherein *they* describe the execution and the aftermath following the hangings, as Schilling (2017) references in his work:

After dangling from the scaffold for a half hour, the men’s bodies were cut down and hauled to a shallow mass grave on a sandbar between Mankato’s main street and the Minnesota River. Before morning, most of the bodies had been dug up and taken by physicians for use as medical cadavers. In the end, “The *U.S.-Dakota War of 1862* encompassed 37 days of fighting. The aftermath of the war fatality estimates included 77 American soldiers, 29 citizen-soldiers, 358 settlers and 29 Dakota warriors, as Schilling (2017) explains. I would suggest that the war continues, and the lives taken are those same ones which I have discussed throughout this section. Tragically, the history of US colonization has underwritten, to this day, the viability, well-being, and positive growth of Native descendants. *So just how severe is the matter?*

*Native History’s Impact on Suicides*

What must be reiterated here in relation to Derezotes’ (2016) work is the insurmountable effects of repeated traumatic events on a collective/people, not only at the micro-level, but at the communal-level as well, as in the case of US Natives and in the history of the *Dakota 38*, amongst other similar histories. It continues to be a vital aspect of US domestic and economic policy directly aimed against Natives. Through Huey’s work and his photo presentations of life on the Reservation, it is not difficult to understand how the colonizer’s deeds have manifested into the type of Native phenomenon found on the Rez,
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wherein “unemployment is 89 percent. The youth suicide rate is 10 times that of the nation,” and the Rez “is plagued with violence and poverty….” As the US Center for Disease Control (CDC) has documented, “American Indian/Alaska Natives (AI/AN) have the highest rates of suicide of any racial/ethnic group in the United States. The rates of suicide in this population have been increasing since 2003,”

Furthermore, as the CDC 2013-2014 report titled, “Analysis of National Violent Death Reporting System data from 18 states explains, “AI/AN suicide descendants were younger and had higher odds of living in a non-metropolitan area than did non-Hispanic whites who died by suicide.” Suicide and “no suicide deaths” of friends and family, as well as alcohol-use preceding death were associated with AI/AN descendants more often than non-Hispanic white decedents.” Aside of the exorbitant rates of alcoholism on Pine Ridge, which contribute negatively to any society economically, psychologically, socio-culturally, anyhow; US Native history is sorrowful enough to drive people to excessively, drink alcohol and take drugs in order to seek an escape, in short, to escape that reality, their reality…

Then, there is the matter of addiction as a means to a “cheap, instantaneous” climaxing to escapism, quite possibly, leading up to suicide in individuals who are already predisposed to addiction, as the data inferred. Bearing in mind that some youth already have been exposed to Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders (FASDs), which can cause brain damage and impacts a child’s growth. This domino effect, without a doubt, contributes to the high incidence

---
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rates of suicides on US Rez’s. These types of disturbing and documented data collections offer non-Natives opportunities to consider the relationship between colonization and its outcoming factors on the colonized, in particular, the Lakota people of Pine Ridge. Furthermore, it allows researchers, Indigenous/Critical theorists, social justice activists, and educators the data to begin next steps. As OLCERI contends, perhaps, returning to Lakota ways, learning to become self-sustainable, and reconnecting to community via communal/educational initiatives might be an approach to extend Native life expectancy rates?

A Matter Dear to OLCERI: Native Life Expectancy Rates

Figure 4.18: Life Expectancy Data

Using the data available on the Our World in Data Organization Website, the “Life Expectancy Map” created above applies global data sets collected by Our World in Data. What is clear, in terms of historical trends respective to longevity throughout the world, is that, overall, life expectancy rates the world over have dramatically increased—with the exception of US Natives living on reservations. The data shared, so far, substantiates, that study after study,

---

that US Native population is in continued decline in a multitude of ways with the most concerning one being possible extinction.

As further elaborated upon by ReMember data,224 “The average life expectancy on Pine Ridge is 66.81 years, but in general the stat for men is at about 50 years of age, which is considered one of the lowest life expectancy rates in the United States. Accordingly, “Other statistics, attributed to the Pine Ridge Hospital, cite an average life expectancy for men of just 47 years. Women fare slightly better, with an average life expectancy of 55 years,” according to data provided by ReMember.225

Additional factors that may contribute to the life expectancy rates on the Pine Ridge Reservation center on many of the issues already presented, in particular, that the fact that the Reservation has the “lowest per capita income ($8,768) in the country and ranks as the “poorest” county in the nation,” according to ReMember226 plays a significant role in the type of statistics we see for longevity. Consequently, the “Oglala Lakota County ranked last in the state of South Dakota for quality of life and health behaviors,” as ReMember’s 227 data makes clear.

At the same time, it is necessary to point out that not all US Native peoples live on a reservation. However, when research data, demographics, is applied to Native Americans living on US reservations, as a “demographic community collective”, researchers cannot help but to focus on the inequities in life that US Natives continue to face throughout US Indian Reservations, to this day. Pine Ridge is, perhaps, the harbinger of this reality, serving to warn the world that we must do better. As contended, “The struggle of the Sioux on the 17
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reservations scattered from Montana through the Dakotas to Minnesota is written in abysmal statistics,” according to Streshensky’s 2011 article in The Atlantic titled, “Saying No to $1 Billion, Why the impoverished Sioux Nation won’t take federal money.” Streshensky explains that:

- More than 80 percent of residents of the Oglala Sioux Pine Ridge Reservation are unemployed (Streshensky, 2011)
- Rape is pandemic (Streshensky, 2011)
- According to Oglala President John Yellow Bird Steele, almost half of Oglala Sioux over 40 have diabetes (Streshensky, 2011)
- In the Western Hemisphere, few countries have shorter life expectancies (for men it is 48; for women, 52)”

Additionally, Kristof’s (2012) New York Time Op-Ed contends:

- Tuberculosis runs at eight times the national rate (Kristof, 2012)
- As many as two-thirds of adults may be alcoholics (Kristof, 2012)
- One-quarter of children are born with fetal alcohol spectrum disorders (Kristof, 2012)
- Life expectancy is somewhere around the high 40s — shorter than the average for sub-Saharan Africa (Kristof, 2012)
- Less than 10% of children graduate from high school (Kristof, 2012)

All dismal statistics, for sure, but necessary to discuss so that they can be conquered. Kristof’s (2012) interview with Robert Brave Heart, who oversees the Red Cloud Indian School located on Pine Ridge, leads Kristof to make the following suggestions:

- First, address the alcohol/addiction problem more forcefully
- A second is that reservations are often structured in ways that discourage private investment. Tribal lands often aren’t deeded to individuals but are common property, and tribal law means that outside investors can’t rely on uniform commercial codes and may have no reliable recourse if they are cheated
- “Third, the arid lands here just can’t support many people. Rural areas throughout the great plains states, including those with overwhelmingly white populations, are losing inhabitants and are also among the poorest in the country,”

that can be addressed through agri-technology and by taking creative approaches to farming, much as OLCERI advocates)

Other suggestions offered in this work, which expand on Brave Heart’s and Kristof’s (2012) suggestions are:

- Have youth go to school and finish, moving on to college in order to get the necessary work skills required for economic viability
- Teach community members how to “work” possessing unique work skills that will encourage business investors to invest in reservation economies
- Teach good work habits
- Recognize that Native youth experience unique family crises that interferes with schooling and work, find non-traditional ways to address these
- Establish dependable physical/psychological/and emotional services to all, ensuring that such services are easily accessible, reliable, and professionally staffed. All this information re-directs us back to the type of health services available on the Rez.

*US Native Healthcare and Well-Being (Pre-COVID 19)*
A Look at American Indian Health Over Two Decades
See how American Indians compare to others in the U.S. across six health indicators over 20 years, according to the most recent data reported by Indian Health Service.

Overall mortality rates
per 100K people

Heart disease death rates
per 100K people

Tuberculosis death rates
per 100K people

Alzheimer’s disease death rates
per 100K people

Asthma death rates
per 100K people

Diabetes death rates
per 100K people

Source: Indian Health Service

Figure 4.19: American Indian Health Services Statistics

Source: Roll Call, POLICY. The Never-Ending Crisis at the Indian Health Service. As the chronically under-funded agency struggles, American Indians are getting sicker and dying sooner. Siddons, A. (March 5, 2018 at 5:04am). https://www.rollcall.com/2018/03/05/the-never-ending-crisis-at-the-indian-health-service/.
“Just look at those Charts!!”

Indian Health Services (IHS) and the Ineptitude of US Federal Government Native Policies

The Indian Health Service (IHS) is an operating division within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. IHS is responsible for providing direct medical and public health services to members of federally-recognized Native American Tribes and Alaska Native people. The IHS was founded in 1955 and has an annual budget of 5.9 billion USD, according to data for 2017. It’s Child Operating Division is connected to the Health Human Services (HSS) agencies. The Operating Division (OD) executive is Michael D. Weahkee, MHA, MBA, Acting Director.

The White House asked the US Congress to provide about $3.8 billion in special one-time funding for the health service’s facility maintenance and construction projects. For fiscal 2019, the administration is proposing an overall budget increase from around $5 billion to $5.4 billion, with most of that extra money going toward general health services, opioid abuse and diabetes.

Tantamount to note, “Health care for American Indians remains plagued by seemingly intractable problems: underfunding, quality deficiencies, a lack of agency leadership and inattention in Washington. A leading House appropriator is calling on his colleagues to break the historical paralysis and move aggressively to improve IHS, but it’s unclear how much

---

230 IBID
231 Source: Roll Call, POLICY, The Never-Ending Crisis at the Indian Health Service. As the chronically under-funded agency struggles, American Indians are getting sicker and dying sooner. Siddons, A. (March 5, 2018 at 5:04am). https://www.rollcall.com/2018/03/05/the-never-ending-crisis-at-the-indian-health-service/.
232 IBID
233 IBID
234 IBID
Congress can do to improve care…,” according to Siddons (2018). IHS, under “The Trump administration, has pledged to make tribal health care systems more effective,” but it remains to be seen, and too many Indigenous Research Methodologists and academics remain highly skeptical that anything will be done. Indicators for such a view can be inferred by referencing the following data:

- During one of his confirmation hearings, new Health and Human Services Secretary Alex Azar told senators the administration would welcome opportunities to improve the $5 billion Indian Health Service, which provides care for 2.2 million American Indians. “It’s unacceptable for us to not be providing high-quality service,” Azar said.
- After calling for a $300 million cut for the Indian Health Service in the president’s inaugural budget proposal for 2018, the administration reversed course a year later, aided by a two-year budget deal with more generous spending caps.
- The White House asked Congress to provide about $3.8 billion in special one-time funding for the health service’s facility maintenance and construction projects.
- For fiscal 2019, the administration is proposing an overall budget increase from around $5 billion to $5.4 billion, with most of that extra money going toward general health services, opioid abuse and diabetes.

Furthermore, as cited by Siddons (2018), the legislators over-seeing the IHS are “mostly from states with a large population of American Indians…, who, in general, tend to be Democrats, and Trump has been very clear about his policies, which are designed to work against such states, and, one would presume, demographic group. Still, the enormous extent of the IHS ineptitude amazes and shocks, even the novice researcher. Although these legislators
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“uniformly agree that the agency has serious problems,” it seems that under the current Trump administration, concerns will remain on deaf ears and empty minds. The IHS is, without a doubt, “a mess,” as documented in the following quotes (Siddons, 2018)²³⁹:

- Lisa Murkowski, the Alaska Republican who oversees funding for IHS on the Senate Appropriations Committee, said that its hospitals are “severely troubled,” and that she’s been “singularly unimpressed” with its leaders
- Markwayne Mullin, the Oklahoma Republican who put Weaver’s name before the administration and is leading a House task force to examine IHS, calls the system “a mess”
- “The funding is low. There’s no standing operating procedures. There’s a lot of areas that can be improved on,” said Mullin, a member of the Cherokee Nation, who along with Cole is just one of two members of Congress who is a member of a tribe [at the time]. (Weaver, the former nominee to lead IHS, is one of Mullin’s constituents, and after a meeting last February, Mullin floated Weaver’s name to the administration.)
- The House Energy and Commerce Committee has launched a task force to examine the service, which is being led by Mullin and California Democrat Raul Ruiz
- While the task force has held 25 meetings since it was launched in May 2017, its members are still in a fact-finding mode to better understand the issues facing the agency, according to a committee spokeswoman
- Other legislators are pitching more concrete proposals. Some think that IHS needs direct hire authority, more competitive pay scales and expanded loan repayment programs. [End of Quoted Material]

- Republican bills in the US Senate and US House could, hypothetically, do that and more; however, under a Trump administration and a McConnell led-Senate this is highly unprobeable. It is not in their administrations benefit to address Native issues

To reiterate, the consistent failures of the IHS impacts Natives irretrievably and in disturbing ways not fully appreciated by non-Natives. Although US government committees in both chambers have held hearings on the bill, the matter continues to be “up in the air”. No resolutions, no next-steps…. Moreover, it’s unclear whether they will find room on the
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legislative calendar, especially so, under the current Trump administration, and Republican-led Senate, a political party that has, historically, defended segregation. IHS data demonstrates further the ways in which Natives continue to be affected by US “Institutions” created by the colonizer in distinct ways that Whites are not. What follows is a case study that helps to illustrate the matter further, emphasizing the ways in which the IHS leaves lasting repercussions on the Rez.

A Case Study: The Long-Term Communal Impact of Consistent Indian Health Services (IHS) Failures on Pine Ridge

In one of the most despicable accountings respective to the repeated failures of the IHS, after twenty-one years of serving as the IHS pediatric doctor on the Pine Ridge Rez, Dr. Stanley Patrick Weber was “tipped off” by IHS officials when the Inspector Generals (IG’s) office opened-up an investigation addressing allegations for sexual crimes committed against children. The following Sunday, Weber resigned, twenty-one years too late, leaving a tragic trail of victims, according to Weaver, Frosch, & Johnson’s (2019) piece titled, “A Pedophile Doctor Drew Suspicions for 21 Years. No One Stopped Him.” 240 This is worth repeating, Everyone suspected, no one did anything …

Weaver, Frosch, & Johnson (2019) explain in their Frontline piece that “The IHS, which provides medical care for 2.6 million Native Americans, has struggled to address the scandal for more than a year, since a report produced by The Wall Street Journal and FRONTLINE revealed the agency had missed warning signs, then, “tried to silence whistleblowers and moved the pedophile doctor from one agency hospital to another despite

The really pathetic part to all this is that whites and Natives both suspected, and IHS insulated Weber.242

According to the article, the IG’s investigation “also found that the agency tolerated a number of problem doctors because it was desperate for medical staff, and that managers there believed they might face retaliation if they followed up on suspicions of abuse.”243 What is clear about this particular federal agency is that, aside of the blatant negligence and dangerous environment created and sustained by the IHS, the agency is, repeatedly, seeped in dangerous cover-ups, unethical behaviors which demand continuous oversight, leading to the analysis that the Wašíču’s institutions have not changed that much after all, especially when it comes to US Natives. Forget treaties!

What type of desperation would cause an agency to tolerate a pedophile pediatrician?!? Furthermore, why did it take so long to do anything about it? At the time, Elaine Yellow Horse served as a tribal prosecutor and was prompted into investigating the matter when she “decided to look into the case after an unrelated sex-crimes case reminded her of allegations she had heard years earlier…” Yellow Horse was able to identify “a potential victim of Mr. Weber’s—the inmate who had participated in the assault on him—and her boss contacted federal agents, according to tribal investigative records,” as reported in the article.244
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Weber had been assaulted in his home by three young Native males when they knocked on his door and he cracked it open a bit. It was at the point that the three assailants attacked him, beating him in the face to the point that he went to the hospital. He refused to have an investigation to the matter opened. The authorities, at the time, were not sure why this was the case until the assailants were caught and said that they had attacked Weber because of what he did to one of them, and because of what he was doing to other children. What happened next will, eventually, lead to the arrest and indictment of Dr. Weber, pedophile pediatrician, as described in the following:

Mr. Weber was indicted in 2017 and 2018 for sexually assaulting six patients in Montana and South Dakota [both Native Reservations]. Court documents and interviews with former patients show that Mr. Weber plied teen boys with money, alcohol and sometimes opioids, and coerced them into oral and anal sex with him in hospital exam rooms and at his government housing unit.245

It is necessary to emphasize that throughout the investigation, the IHS, a’ la Trump, blocked the investigation and access to it, even at the Congressional level, as discussed in the following:

…the health department permitted about a dozen congressional staffers to view a heavily redacted version of the report at the HHS offices, but the group was barred from taking any notes and limited to about two hours to review a 127-page document.

The report, compiled by IHS contractor Integritas Creative Solutions, “put it in the strongest terms that there were mismanagement failures, there was whistleblower retaliation and they missed numerous red flags,” said the person who reviewed the report.

The person recounted one incident described in the report where Weber inflated his own credentials to get permission to counsel at-risk youth, a ploy for him to

be alone with them. Weber was allowed access to the young people even after someone else, whose name was redacted, flagged concerns about his lack of qualifications. [End of Quoted Material]

To this day, the IHS has “said it cannot release the report because it considers the results a medical review, which it claims is confidential under a 2010 federal law,” angering victims, Native communities, researchers, and family members, as well as “tribal officials and now some members of Congress…” 247 Is there no recourse for US Natives?

Injustices on the Rez, A Trickle Down Effect

The picture of this, once, happy adorable male youth is, indeed, the young man in the side image. The young man who has tattooed his face, neck, body, and now seems to look at the world through sad eyes, and not the happy ones he once had, has lived a life of crime and unhappiness. In his testimony, he shared with the jury that at the time of this first betrayal, he was just eleven years of age when he went to see Weber. Moreover, his father had just committed suicide, when the pervert molested him. “It’s in my mind every day. I got molested. I got—I was a little boy,” testified Joe Four Horns, now a convicted bank robber.
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Other victims both from the *Blackfeet Reservation* and *Pine Ridge* testified about the extent of Weber’s depravity, his uncontrollable desires that will lead to the ruin of young, helpless children, males, in particular. In a life that is already burdened in the ways discussed throughout this work, these individuals have now become further burdened with needless psychological trauma of the worst kind. Children as young as eight years of age, and countless others, were sexually molested by this monster. A 32 year old victim-survivor testified that the first time he was molested was when “the doctor had inserted a finger into his anus in an *IHS* Source: *Frontline*. A Pedophile Doctor Drew Suspicions for 21 Years. No One Stopped Him. FEBRUARY 8, 2019. Weaver, C., Frosch, D. & Gabe Johnson. Website Source: https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/article/patrick-stanley-weber-sexual-abuse-pine-ridge-blackfeetreservation/ Please Note: Image provided is an open source article on the matter.
exam room when he was about 8 years old. The doctor used two fingers on his next visit, and later, his penis,” according to the testimony documented in the article.

This, once, eight year old victim, now 32, reported in an interview that “he learned years later he wasn’t Weber’s sole victim. Others in his circle of friends were also assaulted and, sometimes, when they got really drunk, they swapped stories about it at drunken gatherings,” he said. Not surprisingly, he also said “the incidents ruined his life.” How could they not? Tragically, he is just one of many such victims both on Pine Ridge and on the Blackfeet Reservation, and, probably, on every US Reservation. In a vulnerable world already fractured by countless inequities, where is the oversight? Where is the accountability? Where is justice? Apparently, off the Rez. Twenty Years. Countless children….

Oversight, Accountability? The IHS Investigation

The IHS provides medical care for “2.3 million Native Americans, many of whom have no other access to health care,” according to Weaver & Frosch (2020). Getting non-Native doctors, nurses, healthcare workers to work on the Rez is beyond problematic. No one seems to want to do it, and why should they? It doesn’t pay well, and then, you end-up living in one of the lowest SES communities in the US. Natives, in general, don’t have those types of skills, and when they do obtain them, in general, they move to the big cities, or to Rapid City, in the case of Pine Ridge. Weaver & Frosch (2020) explain that because IHS consistently, struggled to recruit credentialed “medical staff and experienced leaders, especially at remote reservations, officials said they gave second chances to doctors who likely would have struggled

to find work elsewhere—this includes some with histories of drug problems, criminal convictions and violence.” This is how Weber managed to slither his way on to the Rez.

Furthermore, what was discovered by the NYT Journal and the FRONTLINE investigation was first-hand knowledge of how the system works when government institutions attempt to hide and keep silent about the type of nefarious events that take place underneath its radar, and, throughout their agency.250 In fact, what will be discovered as a consequence of the investigation is that Ronald Keats, the regional IHS administrator overseeing the investigation, will also be arrested for possession of child pornography. Keats had been storing “sexually explicit images of children on a compact disc found in an elevator of his government office building,” according to the investigation. Although Keats will, in the end, be convicted in 2012 of possessing child pornography, he, too, will have played a significant role in the cover-ups; as such, making him complicit. It should not come as any surprise that the IHS attempted to bury both investigations.

As further reported by means of the NYT Journal and FRONTLINE investigation, the IHS refused to disclose the report on the investigations. Citing a law meant to protect medical reviews, the IHS claims it can’t disclose the report because it “identifies the officials” who oversaw the investigation, according to Weaver & Frosch (2020). Who then is responsible, and accountable, to the countless children whose lives have been forever, and tragically, altered by the despicable acts committed against them by a pervert? Who then is responsible for the mishandling of a government “pediatrician”—a doctor who is supposed to work with children, but in the end, abuses them for decades? Bob McSwain, a former director of the IHS agency, is

quoted as saying, “It’s fair to say that because of the absolute need to fill positions, we don’t really get the best of the best…There’s a strange tolerance level that, ‘Oh, OK, the guy’s a womanizer, the guy’s this, the guy’s that, but he comes in to see patients,’ “251 according to Weaver & Frosch (2020). So, then, this is the state of matters on the Rez, as delivered from within those same institutions provided to Natives by the US Government as a consequence of treaties. Twenty years. Countless children….

In the end, White man’s “just-us” will convict Weber of these heinous crimes, sentencing him to five lifetimes of prison.252 Weaver, 2020, will report that just “Days later, court records revealed another IHS doctor had been indicted on charges of sexually abusing adult women at a different South Dakota government hospital, ratcheting up pressure on the agency to publicly address abuse at its facilities,” Weaver (2020). When will this stop? Will it even stop?

OLCERI could serve as a venue in which a safe place is recognized by youth. Under the watchful eyes of Native community leaders, grandmothers and grandfathers, moms and dad, college mentors, as well as many other well-intentioned folks; we can work together to protect kids and not allow harm to come to them not from outside the Rez, or inside the Rez. However; we must be, forever, vigilant. Native Americans know what to do to a “bad man” when they are aware of them.

In the case of Weber, people, administrators, agency heads, all, suspected, but they managed to let it go. Aside of the tragic outcomes; and there are many, some of which we
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are not aware of; what, really, can be learned from such a set of terrible events? The community must be ever vigilant and create the type of infrastructure, internally, to provide a safe and stable venue for the community to go to, immediately, whenever such events are suspected. In this way, “bad men” can be eliminated from the Rez.

Furthermore, safe zones must be created in which caring adults and youth support each other in ways currently lacking on the Rez. Oversight and stringent policy’s must be established that mandate reporting of crimes against youth, even when they are not fully substantiated. Additionally, serious repercussions must be established and fully enforced so that any potential culprits will be weary of messing with Native youth. This mandate must apply to both Natives and non-Natives. Adults MUST report and children MUST be made to feel that their lives matter and that there are serious penalties for those who dare mess with them.

Although this type of rigorous approach should apply to crimes committed against ALL children, it is critical to emphasize the historical implications tied to Native existence and the lack of justice provided to Natives throughout the world, but in particular to the Indigenous of the US due to the repeated, and seemingly continuous, injustices that have been deliberately targeted against US Natives. Clearly, it isn’t just non-Natives who dare commit such atrocities against youth. Still, the community MUST take a firm, and united, stand.
The Pine Ridge Reservation is the most impoverished of all the US reservations according to multiple institutions/sources already discussed throughout this dissertation. The above heat map titled, USDA’s, “Persistent Poverty Map”, substantiates the fact that the lowest economic statuses in the US are located within the counties found within The Great Sioux Nation. Much like Native American reservations across the United States, Pine Ridge is disconnected from the state’s (South Dakota) economic lifelines making it a very large land
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mass lacking in economic development, understandably. Kristof, (2012), explains that “Poverty in the United States, including in the reservations, is so entrenched because it is often part of a toxic brew of alcohol or drug dependencies, dysfunctional families and educational failures. It self-replicates generation after generation…,” which is something I fully concur with, as does Bryan Deans. These particular phenomenon lends itself abundantly to our work, and this is why the work OLCERI is undertaking is so important. The ways in which the type of poverty Kristof (2012) references is best appreciated in the following conversation he had with a Pine Ridge Native at the time of the publication of his 2012 article:

What’s a man or woman to do?” asked Ben, a young man here who said he started drinking at age 12. “I felt helpless. I felt worthless, and I wanted a drink to get rid of my pain. But then you get more pain. I did a lot of things to get money to drink,” he added regretfully. “These included beating people up as a debt collector for beer stores just outside the reservation and driving girls to those stores where they exchanged sex for alcohol,” he said (From: Kristof, 2012).

“Ben” explains to Kristof (2012) that he resorted to criminal behaviors in order to pay for his “alcohol and drug habits.” He went against Lakota ways, as taught by the ancestors and passed throughout the generations. Ben, eventually, goes to jail and serves time. He was on probation at the time he talked to Kristof in the 2012 article. There are a lot of Ben’s on US Rez’s everywhere, in spite of the fact that many Natives follow the ways of the ancestors. The Native teachings don’t ever go away, but they do subside, little by little, especially so with the younger generations, and that’s where OLCERI’s work comes in, reconnecting youth with the traditional Lakota ways, assisting Ben to become a warrior, once again. That can only be done when elders are there to facilitate the process, and to inspire. There’s hope for the “Native Ben’s” of the world and it is reflected in his personal request to Kristof (2012) at the time of his
interview, which was that his family name not be used in the story, “for fear of getting in more trouble,” probably with his grandmother, presuming he is still Blessed enough to have her.

**US Natives & The Most Vulnerable**

![Bar Graphs](https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/article/patrick-stanley-weber-sexual-abuse-pine-ridge-blackfeet-reservation/)

As viewed in the bar graphs above, a comparative data analysis is offered in which the two Rez’s data, *Blackfeet* and *Pine Ridge*, tell another story of what life on Rez’s is like for Natives. To note, these are the two Rez’s in which Weber was assigned to by the *IHS* to work at. Moreover, he was assigned to work with children as their pediatrician, and, instead, Weber becomes the root-cause of many of the downturns his victim’s lives will take as a consequence of his depravity. The fact that Weber was able to get away with it for so long can
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be tied to the data. For example, in terms of poverty levels, for 2017, Pine Ridge ranks at 50%; whereas, the Blackfeet Reservation ranks at 36%, with the national-level sitting at 15%, once again, substantiating that high-levels of poverty accommodate events that would not happen elsewhere wherein the SES-statues rank higher.

Logically, high-levels of poverty, also, tie in to high-levels of unemployment, as the data substantiates. For 2017, unemployment at the national level ranked at 7 %, whereas on the Blackfeet Rez, that number sits at 10% of people who do not have any type of work; whereas, on Pine Ridge that number sits at 20% of people who do not have any type of work for the entire reservation, i.e., covering the nine districts. It should be noted, in regard to the data, it is unclear as to what age demographic the age brackets are set, as it is not completely clear.

Aside of poverty and unemployment-levels for 2017, which tie in together in assisting us to understand the areas of discussion already covered, are the percentages for alcoholism. On US Rez’s, the ubiquitous nature of the illness impacts the previous two categories in ways that can only be appreciated by people who have had alcoholic family members. Still, the linkages as to how alcohol impacts work, how work impacts economics at the micro and meso-levels, etc. is not too difficult to establish, nor understand. Nevertheless, alcoholism rates for 2014 at the national level stand at 3% per every 100,000; 21% for the Blackfeet Reservation; and, 26% for the Pine Ridge Reservation, according to the above data graph.

Understandably, these three latter categories, poverty levels; unemployment levels; and alcoholism rates all contribute negatively to shorter life expectancy rates for US Natives. According to the bar graphs, life expectancy ages at the national-level for 2014 are at 79 years of age; whereas, on the Blackfeet Rez, that age is 74 years; while Pine Ridge’s sits at
67 years of age on these data sets. In general, other data cites 50 years if age for Pine Ridge. Still, data set after data set, Pine Ridge holds the lowest life expectancy rates throughout the US, data which is echoed throughout the other data sets.

To further elucidate the matter of extreme poverty as found on Pine Ridge, in a 2014 US Census study on the Rez, data results substantiate that “52 % of Pine Ridge residents living within the three largest counties on Pine Ridge lived below the poverty line” (Strickland, 2016). What the data further substantiates, as discussed by Strickland, 2016, is that “Against this backdrop of poverty and joblessness, public health has suffered,” not surprisingly as they are all tied together, poverty, environmentalism, and individual well-being.

Other data offered by Re-Member points out that, “Approximately 85% of Lakota families are affected by alcoholism, recognizing that this does not mean that 85% of the Pine Ridge community is comprised of alcoholics. To be clear, approximately close to a quarter of the entire Pine Ridge Reservation is comprised of alcoholics, which impacts the entire Pine Ridge community at the 85 percentile. Re-Member, which is an OLCERI partner, is actually located on Pine Ridge and has a better understanding of the phenomenon because of that fact. Because of this particular, troubling, societal factor, alcoholism, “A quarter of children are born with fetal alcohol syndrome or similar conditions, according to Re-member”. This fact further attributes to the lowest life expectancy rates in the US, which Re-member cites at “48 years” of age for men and “52 years of age” for women.
Although these numbers differ slightly from others already shared, what is beyond clear, as it is repeated data set after data set, is that *Pine Ridge* holds the lowest life expectancy age, and is “the second-lowest in the western hemisphere, behind only the Caribbean country Haiti,” according to (Strickland, 2016). As if this were not enough, in addition:

- 49.7% of Pine Ridge, SD residents had an income below the poverty level in 2017, which was 73.8% greater than the poverty level of 13.0% across the entire state of South Dakota.
- Considering residents not living in families, 43.6% of high school graduates and 100.0% of non-high school graduates live in poverty.
- The poverty rate was 51.8% among disabled males and 37.7% among disabled females.
- The renting rate among poor residents was 83.0%. For comparison, it was 51.5% among residents with income above the poverty level.\(^{259}\)

As you can see, the numbers differ but tell a similar story. Additional data provided by *ReMember*\(^ {260}\), explains that labor force and income issues center on the fact that there is an “89% unemployment,” that is, if we go back to the 2005 *Department of the Interior* report on unemployment. As explained via the *ReMember* data report, out of “a labor force of 29,539” within the extended *Pine Ridge* tribal community, (“not specifically the reservation”), just 3,131 were employed, according to the data. The issue is so exacerbating that “*The Department of the Interior* has since ceased producing estimates of ‘unemployment,’” according to *ReMember*.\(^ {261}\)

\(^{259}\) **Source:** [City Data](http://www.city-data.com/poverty/poverty-Pine-Ridge-South-Dakota.html)  
\(^{260}\) Ibid  
\(^{261}\) **Source:** [Re-Member » Facts about the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation](https://www.re-member.org/pine-ridge-reservation.aspx)
Breaking down the **ReMember** data on the *Pine Ridge* poverty rate, “Per capita income for American Indians living on *Pine Ridge* is $7,773.” Additionally, the average “per capita” “for all reservations is $10,543, whereas, The United States average is $27,599,” that is, according to the **ReMember** data. Median household income at the time of their data analysis was “$26,721 for American Indians living on *Pine Ridge Reservation...*,” with The United States average being at $53,482. **ReMember** explains that “The officially reported poverty rate for American Indians living on *Pine Ridge* is 53.75%, whereas, the United States average is 15.6%.

Accordingly, “Many assessments, drawing from sources other than *U.S. Census* data and other meso and macro-level government tabulations place the actual poverty rate in excess of 80% of the reservation’s population, with two of the five ‘poorest communities in America,’ located on the *Pine Ridge Reservation,*” which would be the community of Allen, ranking as first, and Wounded Knee ranking as fourth poorest,” according to **ReMember**. No matter the source, the data, clearly, substantiates the economic situation on US Rez’s today. It is not new information. To the contrary, “everyone seems to get it” and in so doing, they easily brush it away as if that information were a piece of trash. In so doing, all the other conundrums of being Native in the US also are swept away.

**High Poverty Rates and Other Factors to Consider**

- The *Pine Ridge Reservation* is home to the lowest life expectancy, and a number of the poorest communities in the United States
- The average life expectancy on *Pine Ridge* is 66.81 years, the lowest in the United States

---
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Other statistics, attributed to the *Pine Ridge Hospital*, cite an average life expectancy for men of just 47 years. Women fare slightly better, with an average life expectancy of 55 years.

There are 3,143 counties in the United States. *Oglala Lakota County*, contained entirely within the boundaries of the *Pine Ridge Reservation*, has the lowest per capita income ($8,768) in the country, and ranks as the “poorest” county in the nation. *Oglala Lakota County* ranked last in the state of *South Dakota* for quality of life and health behaviors.

There are several additional factors as to why poverty is rampant on the US Rez. The most important one centers on the understanding that Native traditionalist, in general, dislike the concepts behind capitalism as it goes against their epistemology, ontology, ethic, and micro-meso-level recognition of what is really important. Native youth are different. Unless lead by elders, they have tasted the ways of the Wašiču; for example, it is easier to buy a tent at the local *Walmart* then it is to make a teepee, a real-life discussion I once had with a Mescalero Apache who, repeatedly, lamented the enormity of the loss of “Native culture and traditional ways” in their community (Rossatto, Valles, et al, 2020). Whereas, *Mexica* from El Paso, who are trying to re-connect to the ways of the Ancestors, make it a point to learn how to build a teepee, the old way. These types of Native Cultural Variations (NCV’s) should be considered when doing any kind of work with Native communities. Cultural diversity is important to recognize.

Natives, as a global demographic do not, directly, contribute to the destruction of the planet willingly, especially for profit, unlike the Wašiču. An excellent example of this is best exemplified by a “gentleman” who approached *OLCERI* about assisting the organization in innovative ways. He was retired from NASA, held several degrees in the *Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)* fields, and held patents in technology designed for resurrecting Mother Earth after she had been ravaged by mining, devastated by deforestation,
etc…, in short, interfered with by the Wašíču. After having “read-up” on the history of the Lakota and studied countless satellite images of the Rez that looked into the belly of Mother Earth, he had approached Bryan Deans and Aaron Bernal-Hoffman, one of OLCERI’s Board of Directors about assisting us. He was later referred to me by Bryan for a number of private reasons, which I will not discuss here.

After having had several conversations with him, what he wanted came down to a question he asked me in one of our phone calls, “Does Pine Ridge know what it is sitting on?” Arguing that Pine Ridge need not be poor, and struggling, if only they began the process of pulling out all the ores from within the belly of the reservation site. Using a problematic analogy surrounding a beautiful, young, woman who is penniless and hungry, he asked me, “what should she do?” A la’ Wašíču, he argued that she was hungry and penniless because she chose to be so. After having listened to this disturbing analogy, patiently; I dared, but decided to go against asking him, “Yeah? make her your daughter,” or mother, for that matter. Instead, in my best “professional” voice, I responded, “we thank you for your interest and willingness to work with OLCERI, but your plan goes against the Lakota ways and teachings.” In fact, his “innovative” ideas were the complete opposite of what OLCERI stands for.

The offense of what he suggested is so great to Lakota teachings, and from a multitude of intellectual levels, as well. This inadequate analogy offered, only, to help put the Wašíču worldview into a better perspective. Moreover, this is not “innovative” thinking, as this is something the Wašíču has been doing to the Ḣe Sápa since their arrival, and to the continent, for that matter. From carving their presidents faces into her, to making her a popular, US tourist venue, there is no innovation in this. What he promoted as “innovative” were the technologies to be used after her proposed ravaging, which, for Natives, is the equivalent of saying, “let your
daughter be used, then you can “clean her up”. Eventually, he became exasperated with my responses, although I tried to explain to him that I am not Lakota in genetic heredity, but Lakota in “understanding,” as a direct consequence of my work with OL Cer I. Eventually, I, finally, handed him back to Bryan and Aaron, recognizing that this was another instance of how the Wašiću worldview works, as opposed to that of the Native worldview. I also concluded that there might be some patriarchal-rooted issues there, as well.

In the Wašiću way of understanding “economic success”, it should be pointed out that Pine Ridge holds over a billion US dollars in accounts with the US Treasury Department, but the Lakota will not touch it as it is the initial money awarded to The Great Sioux Nation as a consequence of US-v-Sioux Nation of Indians, referencing, again, Streshensky’s work (2011). For further background information on this, Streshensky, (2011), explains that “…More than 30 years ago, the Federal Indian Claims Commission awarded the Sioux what amounted to $102 million for the taking of the Black Hills.”

As already clarified, traditional Sioux aren’t interested in the money, what they want is their sacred land returned to them, especially the ųe Sāpa. Consequently, “the money has lingered in trust accounts, accumulating interest,” accordingly, according to Streshensky, (2011). It is beyond ironic that on the behalf of some of the poorest Native peoples located in the entire USA that about $1 billion dollars, plus interest, waits untouched in accounts, supposedly, being held “in trust” by the U.S. Department of the Treasury, referring back to Streshensky’s work (2011).

267 For Furthers See: Supreme Court of the US, 1980. 448 US 371, 100S.Ct 271,65 L.Ed2d 844
Streshensky’s (2011) article introduces us to Mario Gonzalez, who is of mixed Native heritage, *Oglala Sioux* and *Mexica*, and assists non-Natives in appreciating the types of economic dilemmas encountered on US reservations. Gonzalez served as a tribal attorney on behalf of *The Great Sioux Nation* in *US -v-Sioux Nation of Indians*, and explains the implications of the matter, from a Native perspective, one that is offered by others as well:

Some *Sioux* want to take the money now,” Gonzalez says. “We tell them, ‘Our grandfathers and great-grandparents spilled a lot of blood so future generations could have a homeland that included the *Black Hills*. If the tribes accept the settlement,’ he adds, “and the money is all gone three years from now, that’s when the *Sioux* will become a defeated people. That’s when you will see them walking around in shame with their heads hanging.”

--Mario Gonzalez, Lakota Attorney  
(Cited From: Streshensky, 2011)

Although Russell Means (1995) will have critiqued Gonzalez in an earlier reference in this work, the latter example is just one of many similar examples of Native standpoints on “getting rich” at the cost of abusing Mother Earth. For traditional Natives, such “get-rich-quick” schemes are beyond offensive. They are dangerous to the tiyospaye.

“For decades, Lakota activists have raised alarms about the risks uranium mining poses to their communities,” as Friedlet (2020) discusses in her 2020 *Mother Jones* article titled, “Get the Hell Off”: The Indigenous Fight to Stop a Uranium Mine in the Black Hills, Can the Lakota win a “paper war” to save their sacred sites?”. This Wašíču obsession fixated on the exploitation and extraction of Mother Earth, and Natives, as mentioned previously, has a long

---

history going back to the arrival of the Wašíču to the continent. Their love and obsession with “economic development” when applied to Natives, in general refers to land stealing/leasing; extraction of uranium, gold, silver; gaming, as in gambling; mass gaming as in extinction level obliterations of living creatures; oil/frack mining; and the mass production of timber, all done at the cost of Mother Earth.

As discussed in Friedlet (2020), “In 1962, radioactive material seeped from a broken dam into the Cheyenne River, upstream from Pine Ridge,” although mining had ceased by 1973, not surprisingly, the Pine Ridge Reservation “continues to grapple with epidemic levels of birth defects, cancer, and kidney disease,” as “clean-up” is avoided. It should not be too difficult putting the pieces together.

Today, as all our data substantiates, Pine Ridge has the lowest life expectancy rates of any US county. Friedlet (2020) acknowledges how these types of troubling events impact Natives in a multitude of ways and links it to how “The rampant health issues help explain why reservation leaders took swift action to stem the spread of coronavirus before they even confirmed their first case,” but even then, it cannot compete with the US Federal government.

The second explanation offered as to why Pine Ridge has been consistently and deliberately, economically-disadvantaged in the ways that it has is because that is, exactly, what the Wašíču wanted—to immobilize them in every possible way. From the US Congress, to countless US presidents and the myriad of US Institutions, all have worked, in tandem, to keep

---

270 **Source:** Mother Jones, Friedlet, D. & D.W. Frazier, (2020). “Get the Hell Off”: The Indigenous Fight to Stop a Uranium Mine in the Black Hills, Can the Lakota win a “paper war” to save their sacred sites?” MARCH/APRIL 2020 ISSUE. Direct URL Link: https://www.motherjones.com/politics/2020/05/the-black-hills-are-not-for-sale/

271 **Source:** Mother Jones, Friedlet, D. & D.W. Frazier, (2020). “Get the Hell Off”: The Indigenous Fight to Stop a Uranium Mine in the Black Hills, Can the Lakota win a “paper war” to save their sacred sites?” MARCH/APRIL 2020 ISSUE. Direct URL Link: https://www.motherjones.com/politics/2020/05/the-black-hills-are-not-for-sale/.
that fact in check. Yes, *Pine Ridge* is plagued by an 80 to 90% unemployment rate within a community that is already at a median individual income of $4,000 a year, as *Re-Member’s* data\(^{272}\) indicates in their 2007 statistical analysis; hence, making the *Pine Ridge Indian Reservation* one of the “most impoverished” of all US reservations,\(^{272}\) but there exist specific histories and reasons for this (Strickland, 2016).

**Education**

For *Pine Ridge* Natives who continue to live on US reservations, *Re Member’s* data clarifies the issue of education attainment. Within the *Pine Ridge Reservation*, “The school drop-out rate is over 70\%, with only 28.7\% of the that population, as a whole, having attained a high school diploma, GED or alternative.\(^{273}\) As to higher education attainment surpassing high school graduation status or accreditation, a dismal 0.7\% of the *Pine Ridge* Native population reports having attained a bachelor’s degree or higher.\(^{274}\) Without a doubt, education advancement is key to creating positive, overall, changes within all racial demographic populations, in general. However, in the instances of US Native populations, what must be understood is the enormity of the White, colonial experience and how it is perceived as unwelcoming to US Natives, especially so within US institutions of learning (Tuhiwai-Smith, 1999; Rossatto, Valles, & et al, 2020). Honestly, can you blame them?

Critical race theorists, such as I, and other social-justice-grounded academics, could easily argue that American slavery is just as problematic in terms of the ramifications associated with “collective and micro-level” historical trauma, i.e., all of the heavy baggage it carries, specific to descendants of Africans attending an Euro-Ameri-centrist academy. What

\(^{272}\) **Data Source:** ReMember, Facts About Pine Ridge,” Direct Website URL: [https://www.re-member.org/pine-ridge-reservation.aspx](https://www.re-member.org/pine-ridge-reservation.aspx)

\(^{273}\) **Source:** Copyright © 2020. Re-Member, Inc. A registered 501(c)(3) Nonprofit Organization. All rights reserved. Electronic Source: ReMember, [https://www.re-member.org/pine-ridge-reservation.aspx](https://www.re-member.org/pine-ridge-reservation.aspx)

\(^{274}\) IBID.
has happened in that regard is that mostly “Black” schools, referred to 1890 colleges, have been established and modified in order to address the needs of their school’s particular racial demographic. I would defend the argument that the US Native experience has had lasting implications of a differing type on Natives, precisely because of the pre-diachronical history of Natives; however, up until the 1970’s there has been no clear policies established to encourage the facilitation of Native-centered schools, or schooling. Pre-Civil Rights (1964), US Natives were entrapped in their colonial history as a consequence of Wašiću policy. Often times, it seems that we forget or brush aside, the fact that Natives are the original peoples of this continent—going back to the very beginning of human time. Academies and public schools have stepped away from that particular history. Furthermore, there are no “1890” colleges for Natives, especially when we consider that they were NOT recognized as US citizens until 1924, and even then, still, rejected as such in Native country.

Moreover, “traditional, US Natives” do not subscribe to the Wašiću’s academy, or their White narrative that posits its “scientific” understanding of Native peoples specific to their interpretation of European history, making the education of the Wašiću beyond problematic for Natives to absorb. For example, the “American” continent, is said to have been vacant, pre-Siberian passage, according to the Wašiću’s accounting of history. Natives will tell you that their oral history is very clear about this. They have always been here, to the point that they emerge from within the continent and not Siberia. According to European history, Indigenous peoples originated in Siberia and cross over to the continent now called “America” by means of a “Siberian passage”, millennia ago. To the contrary, Native traditionalist will tell you that they, and all the ancestors before them, have been a vital aspect of this place, going back even to the formation of the cosmos.
Another similar example is the arrival of the horse to the continent,\textsuperscript{275} which is best appreciated in the work by Dr. Yvette Running Horse Collins, a Lakota/Nakota/Cheyenne scholar out of the University of Alaska, Fairbanks’, Indigenous Studies Program, and, also, an \textit{OLCERI} collaborator. Accordingly, even before the Spanish conquest and their ravenous entry into the continent, Native peoples rode freely throughout the continent, and on horses.\textsuperscript{276} Additionally, because the entire American public school education system is embedded in whiteness and the Wašíču agenda of protecting the status quo as it currently sits, this fact is beyond problematic for traditional Natives who are knowledgeable about their history, as taught to them by their ancestors.

Even the Mormon faith contend with this aspect of Native history,\textsuperscript{277} that horses were on the continent before the arrival of the Wašíču, which is a facet of Mormon history that derives directly out of \textit{The Book of Mormon}. Not so within the academy. Again, this helps us to understand why certain universities are desirable to Natives, while others are not. In general, sought after “Native-serving” colleges/universities consist of institutions that acknowledge,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{275} There is some debate about horses on the continent, pre-Columbus, especially in light of work by Dr. Yvette Running Horse Collins whose dissertation produces fossil evidence, historical documents, and oral histories substantiating that the horse was on the continent now called America way before the arrival of Europeans. There are even fossil records, which were discovered by paleontology pioneer Joseph Leidy in the 1830s. Furthermore, there are countless cave paintings also presented by Running Horse Collins. For Further See: \textit{Indian Country Today}, News, ”Yes world, there were horses in Native culture before the settlers came.” \textit{Indian Country Today}. Johnston, L. J. (07/03/2019). Direct URL Link: https://indiancountrytoday.com/news/yes-world-there-were-horses-in-native-culture-before-the-settlers-came-JGqPrqLmZk-3ka-IBqNWjQ
\item \textsuperscript{276} For Further See: \textit{Indian Country Today}, News, ”Yes world, there were horses in Native culture before the settlers came.” \textit{Indian Country Today}. Johnston, L. J. (07/03/2019). Direct URL Link: https://indiancountrytoday.com/news/yes-world-there-were-horses-in-native-culture-before-the-settlers-came-JGqPrqLmZk-3ka-IBqNWjQ
\item \textsuperscript{277} For Further See: Baylor Young University Studies, Journal 54:3, ”Hard” Evidence of Ancient American Horses. Johnson, D.. Direct URL Link: https://byustudies.byu.edu/content/hard-evidence-ancient-american-horses
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
respect, and teach from an Indigenous perspective (Rossatto, Valles & et al; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, and et al). There are too many people in power, currently, who are attempting to continue to keep this part of real history out of schools, and other institutions, reinforcing the idea that, “Ignorance, allied with power, is the most ferocious enemy justice can have” 278 Such people do so by attempting to de-fund, ostracize, essentially, punish such work, as we have witnessed, repeatedly happen under the current administration. 279

Just as problematic are the faulty ideals taught at public schools distinctive to US nationalism and the educational institutions/ academy’s concepts behind the pursuit of “life, liberty, and happiness.” Happiness? What’s that for US Natives? Afterall, it should be evident by now that this is not the case for US Natives, overwhelmingly. In fact, it will not be until this one grand irony is addressed—how long does it take for the Indigenous peoples of the continent, the original inhabitants of the continent, to acquire citizenship, and the supposed rights inherited thereof? This is beyond problematic to teach and soak up if you are familiar with the US Native experience; especially so, when youth are taught in public school that the US government operates under a government system called a “democratic system of government” and promotes national holidays like Columbus Day.

As already mentioned, Natives will not be acknowledged as US citizens until 1924, and only because they enlist into US wars, winning countless medals for their bravery in
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battle. Ironically, “Native Americans serve in the military at a higher percentage than any other ethnicity”, (David Goldman/AP), according to Simkins (2019). Simkins (2019) explains that since “Since 9/11, nearly 19 percent of Native Americans have served in the armed forces, compared to an average of 14 percent of all other ethnicities.” Furthermore:

Among the 573 federally recognized tribes — each with their own cultures, traditions, belief systems, and stances on war — military service remains remarkably consistent. No matter the conflict, American Indian men and women continue to risk their lives for the very government that once tried to eradicate their way of life. (Simkins, 2019).

At the same time, it is worth considering how this works itself out in terms of racism, as Simkins (2019) asks the reader to consider. He explains that “The U.S. has a history of celebrating native achievements only when it benefits the country — for example, punishing the Navajo for speaking their native language only to capitalize on it when it could be of use…,” in some ways, creating, or contributing to a “sense” or “a feeling” of being “used or abandoned among native veterans once they leave the military,” a question he puts to his Native interviewee, Jeff Means, who is a member of the Oglala Sioux Tribe and a Marine Corps veteran. Means, at the time of publication, taught history at the University of Wyoming and responds as follows:

Native Americans are supposed to be people of the past. They’re supposed to be exotic, but mostly, what they’re supposed to be is quiet. When they raise their voice and make noise, the United States gets very uncomfortable. Abandoning Native Americans has been the M.O. of the U.S. since reservations were created as temporary reserves.

Just how democratic has the US Federal Government, its institutions, its laws, politicians, and policies been to Natives? In what ways have the latter encompassed Indigeneity? Despite housing a political, sacred document that mandates that all citizens of that place have inalienable rights, rights that only the Creator can give and take away, (although the Fifteenth Amendment won’t be passed until the 1870’s), Natives will not be granted U.S. citizenship rights, including the right to vote, until the passing of the Snyder Act of 1924, (For Furthers See: 43 Stat. 253, enacted June 2, 1924)\(^{281}\). Even then, there will be resistance to application of the law, especially in areas referred to as “Indian country.” Up to this point, Native Americans could not enjoy the rights, or privileges, granted to Others.

*Why isn’t that taught in public school?*

In another example of why US Natives struggle to complete White man’s schooling or university, the late Russell Charles Means (November 10, 1939 – October 22, 2012), who was an Oglala Lakota Sioux, forcibly lamented this fact throughout his life. An American Indian Movement (AIM) activist, actor, and environmentalist, Means is best known for his activism and his excellent acting skills and movie portrayals of Natives.

In a series of audio recordings (1991) calling for racial solidarity in Denver, Colorado at a rally to stop the celebration of the Columbus Day Parade, Means demanded that it was high-time to “Correct the History Books,” in his speech titled “Columbus Must Die”.\(^{282}\) In the speech, Means describes the US as one of the most violent, if not the violentest of countries, and explains how that violence has been used against Natives. Means demands that after 500
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\(^{281}\) Note: AKA, known as the Indian Citizenship Act of 1924.

\(^{282}\) For YouTube Video Recording see: Time To Correct The History Books: Elder Russell Means "Columbus Must Die" Speech, Philamayaye/ Many Blessings & Thanks / Chi Migwetch!.... *For best resolution, set your You-Tube player to 720p. License: Creative Commons Attribution license (reuse allowed).
years of European influence and domination, “Columbus has to die”. “It is unacceptable that the legacy of Columbus keeps my people from sitting at the table of the international family of nations when all the rest of the sacred colors of the human race are there, black, brown, yellow, white, we are missing….” (Means, 1995: 519-22). Echoing Means, this is unacceptable!!

The “Columbus legacy”, which is taught in US public, community, and university, includes aspects of American history that are, continuously, negated and “brushed under the rug”, meaning that we just don’t want to go there. Paradoxically, Columbus has been celebrated and held to the highest of Euro-American standards for over five hundred years, in spite of the genocide, oppression, and violence he commits against Natives and slave populations. He’ll even have a holiday named after him! With his arrival to Turtle Island, Columbus will bring European diseases such as:

1. Smallpox
2. Measles
3. Influenza
4. Bubonic plague
5. Diphtheria
6. Typhus
7. Cholera
8. Scarlet fever
9. Chicken pox
10. Yellow fever
11. Malaria
12. Lyme disease
13. Q-fever (bacterial disease carried by cattle, sheep, and goats)
14. Leishmania (parasitic disease)
15. Whooping cough
16. African sleeping sickness (parasitic disease)
17. Filaria (parasitic disease)
18. Dengue
19. Septicemic plague (one of the three main forms of the plague)
20. Schistosomiasis (parasitic disease)
21. Anthrax

22. Botulism
23. Tetanus
24. Toxoplasmosis
25. Taeniasis (tape worms)
26. Staphylococci
27. Streptococci
28. Mycotic diseases (fungal diseases)
29. Syphilis
30. Legionellosis (bacterial disease)

Alongside the biological diseases come the White, European spiritual diseases highly, typical of Europeans which consist of pride, greed, wrath, envy, lust, gluttony, and sloth, hypocritically, a.k.a. Christianity’s infamous, “Seven Deadly Sins”. Although Columbus will bring Christianity to Turtle Island with his arrival in 1492, he will proceed to brutally force it upon the Indigenous of that time. In so doing, clearly, he fails to practice the teachings of the Christ. Representing Christianity on behalf of the King and Queen of Spain, he will commit un-Christian acts against Natives of that time and place. It will not be until Father Bartolomé de la Casas shares his concern with the Queen and King, who were devout Catholics, but even then it will take time culminating in countless deaths, tortures, and the like against Natives of that time. Furthermore, as Dani Anthony, Ph. D. discusses in her historical review of de la Casas

He elaborated his views on slavery and the rights of indigenous peoples in numerous tracts including the extremely popular Short Account of the Destruction of the Indies, which was published during his lifetime (c. 1484–1566). Through his actions and writings, Las Casas became an important figure in the development of ideas of what we would


now call human rights….However, after Las Casas’ participation in the violent and destructive Spanish invasion of Cuba in 1513, he began to view European interference in native affairs as illegal and amoral.

As educators, researchers, academics, and social justice advocates, we should be able to easily make the connections between these types of damaging histories and the alarming demographics tied to US Native communities of our time. As such, they must be linked to the diachronizational and historical trauma of US Indigenous peoples, and, the role they have played inside Native communities consequent of these Euro-American “historical unmentionables”.

Natives from within the continent now referred to as “America” have undergone rampant and brutal colonization, a history which is not discussed in schooling in the ways it needs to be. Just as important, where are the in-class teachings of the attempted genocide of the Indigenous peoples of the continent? It does not stop there. Recognition and acknowledgement of the real “American experience,” of which countless television documentaries and books are, too often, written about from a White nationalistic perspective. That needs to change. This history must reflect the brutal taking of Native lands, language, and the indispensable, socio-cultural, spiritual, aspects of the Indigenous people of the continent, as well as those Indigenous people outside of the continent. A democratic system of education must identify them as factors that continue to marginalize and disenfranchise Natives, everywhere.
Though his [de la Casas] petitions began in May of 1515, they would continue until his death in 1566 as he cajoled, shamed, and begged the Spanish crown to end its practices of violent invasion and enslavement. The Spanish government in return treated de la Casas’ pleas with ambivalence, in part because indigenous enslavement was so profitable. As Antony points out, although de la Casas will advocate to the King and Queen of Spain on behalf of the Indigenous people of that time, he, like other Spanish Catholics of that time will remain ignored. It does not behoove the Spanish crown, the Catholic Church, or the conquistadores of
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**Image Source:** Depiction of Spanish atrocities committed in the conquest of Cuba in Las Casas’s "Brevisima relación de la destrucción de las Indias". The print was made by two Flemish artists who had fled the Southern Netherlands because of their Protestant faith: Joos van Winghe was the designer and Theodor de Bry the engraver. Image background Information source: Joos van Winghe - Peace Palace Library. Image titles: “Hanging, burning and clubbing of Indians by Spanish soldiers.” Folio 1. Public Domain, File: Bartolomé de las Casas Regionum 355385740 MG 8829 A3-f1.tif, Created: 1 January 1664. Direct Source: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bartolomé_de_las_Casas#/media/File:Bartolomé_de_las_Casas_Regionum_355385740_MG_8829_A3-f1.tif](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bartolomé_de_las_Casas#/media/File:Bartolomé_de_las_Casas_Regionum_355385740_MG_8829_A3-f1.tif)
that time to pay attention to human rights. *A’ la’* Wašiču, the profit margin is too rich..., so it
should not be too surprising that after claiming the land on behalf of the Queen and King of
Spain via a Papal Bull, one of the first questions Columbus’ asks the Natives, fresh off the ship,
is if they have gold, and if so, where is it?

In October of 1492, he’ll write Queen Isabella explaining, “Your Highnesses so
cmdand, they [the Indians] can be carried off to Castile or held captive in the island itself,
since with 50 men they would be all kept in subjection and forced to do whatever may be
wished,”287 according to Bigelow, Miner & Peterson, (1991:78). Consequently, it does not take
long for Columbus to begin the Euro-Ameri process of colonization, beginning with the filthy
diseases he brings to the Natives of that time, such as syphilis, gonorrhea, greed, avarice... Why
don’t they teach that in public school?

As Means heatedly explains, and rightly so, Columbus is the first trans-Atlantic
slave trader in the Americas, and the US has the gall and audacity to celebrate him?? “You
cannot be more off course, then that...,” Means shouts out fiercely.288 How can this disturbing
reality have been embraced so ignorantly? I suggest to the reader that it is deliberate, and it is
achieved through traditionalist schooling methodologies, which center on whiteness and white
privilege by intentionally teaching it to non-whites. In a type of “this is ours, and it is not
yours,” strategy students of color subliminally come to understand their marginalized roles in
US society, while they participate it in as cultural, linguistic, and racial anomalies. In Means
(1995) frustration, made very clear about Columbus;289 the first “American” slave trader; an

Columbus: Teaching about the 500th anniversary of Columbus's arrival in America. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools in collaboration with
the Network of Educators on Central America.
289 IBID
annihilator of Indigenous peoples, Indigenous ways, etc…, and, yet, he continues to be taught in White man’s schools, curriculum, as he continues to be celebrated in the West. “Where are our allies, the Catholics, the Mormons, etc…why don’t they say no more Columbus day [?],” Means’ laments (1995: 519-22).

Introduction: Some Implications from the Data

In sharing some of the important, arguments/examples previously offered to the reader as to why Native youth have a difficult time with White, US, nationalistic-fed education today, it is vital to, also, recognize how those examples tie into the other phenomenon; e.g., low-SES- statuses; rampant alcoholism within the family, or drug abuse; micro-level, abuses (psychological, emotional, sexual, etc…,) such as feelings of humiliation/shame, and/or anger about what is being taught at school, especially so, if curriculum reflects WASP ideals. There are so many other, significant, variables as well, some already touched upon throughout this work. One such variable is specific to youth, depression and attributes to the type of suicide rates previously discussed.

To better understand where additional challenges might be respective to getting youth to school; moreover, getting them out of high school successfully and into to college so that he can finish and earn a decent living, the following data assists us in recognizing the role of gender and age in relation to education, and its attainment.

Economic Profile for Poverty Impacting Pine Ridge Youth

According to the US Census Bureau, QuickFacts for the Oglala Lakota County, South Dakota, Data features for the Pine Ridge community in comparison to the entire state of South Dakota, according to QuickFacts: Oglala Lakota County, South Dakota, are as follows:
Residents with income below the poverty level in 2017

- for Pine Ridge 49.7%,
- for the entire state of South Dakota that would be 13%.

Residents with income below 50% of the poverty level in 2017

- Pine Ridge at 31.9% as compared to the whole state of South Dakota, which was at 6.1%.

The poverty rate among disabled men / males in 2017

- For Pine Ridge: 52%;
- for South Dakota it’s 16.2%, a substantial difference;
- The disability rate among poor males is 16.3% for Pine Ridge, and 13.4% for South Dakota;
- The poverty rate among disabled females for Pine Ridge is 38%; for South Dakota it’s 21%.

Among female residents who are not classified as poor:

- For Pine Ridge it’s 8.2% whereas in South Dakota it’s 24.8%.

The renting rate among poor and not poor residents comparative living below the poverty level

- On Pine Ridge: 83% for residents of Pine Ridge, and for those living above the poverty level, that number is 52%.

Children under the age of five, living in “rented” spaces

- On Pine Ridge: 54.2%.

Breakdown by age for Lower SES “poor” male residents on Pine Ridge SD:

- For male children five years of age, it’s 64.4%;
- For male children 6 to 11 years, it’s 46.2%;
- For male children 12 to 14 it’s, 67.1%;
- For male children of 15 years, it’s 36%;
- For male children of 16 to 17 years, it’s 54.2%;
- For male youth from 18 to 24 years of age, it’s 76%;
- For males from the age bracket of 25 to 34 years, it’s 60%;
- For young men at the age of 35 to 44 years, it’s at 39%;
- For men from the ages of 45 to 54: 13.7%;
- For men aged 55 to 64, it’s 41.6%;
- Whereas men of 65 to 74 years of age is 81%.

---

290 Data Source: QuickFacts: Oglala Lakota County, South Dakota, Direct URL Link: https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/oglalalakotacountysouthdakota/PST045219
291 Ibid
292 Ibid
293 Data Source: QuickFacts: Oglala Lakota County, South Dakota, Direct URL Link: https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/oglalalakotacountysouthdakota/PST045219
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For men 75 years & older, 0%

**Males: Most Economically Vulnerable Age Demographic on Pine Ridge**

According to this dataset, areas of extreme economic vulnerability is best represented in males 65-74 years of age, bearing in mind that this is demographically a small population set; followed by youth ranging from 18-24 years of age. The next economically vulnerable population on Pine Ridge, specific to sex, are children 12-14 years of age; followed by children, five years and below; followed by males ranging from 25-34 years of age; then, followed by young males from the age of 16-17 years of age. When we consider the previous data already shared respective to a very low demographic number for adults over the age of 50; then, we consider the addiction rates experienced on the Rez, the argument could be made that they tie together and impact education attainment rates, consequently.

When you breakdown the age for lower SES, “poor” females residents living on Pine Ridge you have the following statistics:

- Girls under five years of age: 63.7%
- Girls at five years: 0%
- Girls from 6 to 11 years of age: 55%
- Girls from 12 to 14 years: 32.6%
- Young females at 15 years of age: 49%
- Young women at 16 to 17 years of age: 48.4%
- For females 18 to 24 years of age: 68%
- For young women 25 to 34 years of age: 35%
- For women 35 to 44 years of age: 39.3%
- For women 45 to 54 years of age: 49.4%;
- For women 55 to 64 years of age: 55%
- For women from 65 to 74 years of age: 13.6%
- And, no females over the age of 75: 0%
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**Data Source**: QuickFacts: Oglala Lakota County, South Dakota, Direct URL Link: [https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/oglalalakotacountysouthdakota/PST045219](https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/oglalalakotacountysouthdakota/PST045219)
Females: Most Economically Vulnerable Age Demographic on Pine Ridge

According to this data set, the most economically vulnerable age Demographic on Pine Ridge for females are females ages 18 to 24; followed by girls under the age of five; then, followed by women in the age bracket covering 55-64 years of age. Although the data sets do not fully match, the story is very similar, older folks and younger children are, continuously, the most economically vulnerable on Pine Ridge. In this particular data set, what needs to be considered is that on Pine Ridge, like in other Native communities, often times, grandmothers care for the children, especially the one ones. A significant reason why this might be the case is tied to the type of addiction problems found on US reservations.

Breakdown by age for lower SES “very poor” residents in South Dakota (For Both Sexes)

- Girls and boys under the age of 5: 36%
- Girls and boys five years of age: 35.4%
- Girls and boys 6-11 years of age: 22.4%
- Girls and boys from the age brackets of 12 to 14: 35.7%
- For youth 15 years of age: 64.7%
- For youth 16 to 17 years of age: 27.5%
- For young folks ages 18 to 24: 42.8%
- For the ages of 25 to 34: 12.5%
- For the ages of 35 to 44: 15.4%, whereas;
- For the ages of 45 to 54 : 25.8
- For the ages of 55 to 64: 2.9%
- and then for 65 to 74 years of age: 0
- and for 75 years of age and over: 0

If we pay attention to the largest grouping in this breakdown, in terms of age for “very poor”, meaning, living below the poverty-level for residents on Pine Ridge”, the most vulnerable age demographic is would be, boys and girls, in the age bracket of 15 years of age; followed, by young male and females in the age bracket covering 18-24. Again, when we correlate these numbers with the other phenomenon, e.g., addiction/alcoholism; suicide rates, etc…, a clearer picture is presented to the researcher, lending itself to recognize the specific age
brackets that concentration should be pivoted towards. When Deans and I have discussed this matter, he states that psychological/addiction issues are probably the second most major issues on the *Pine Ridge* Rez today, following environmental ones, such as water/ agriculture production/mining issues, etc... Those impact all humans, living creatures, and Mother Earth, herself.

*The breakdown of “Poor” Residents Living on Pine Ridge*

At the core of the problem with accessing education attainment for Native youth, evidently, the data sets tell a similar story, but they do not match. What is clear is that poverty rates must be considered in any attempts to understand the matter of life on *Pine Ridge*, as well as death, specifically, suicide. Still, data for economic vulnerability for US Native youth communities, in general, sits at the 50 percentile. It is not uncommon to find repeated poverty stats for Native born residents across the US. For *Pine Ridge*, those who are living below the poverty level ranks at approximately 48%; whereas, those living above the poverty level is 52.3%. Consequently, children living below the poverty level for *Pine Ridge* in comparison to the entire state of South Dakota is as follows:

- For youth living on the reservation: 52.7% of children who are living below the poverty level, compared to the state of South Dakota, which sits at 16.3%
- When considering the poverty rate among high school graduates who are not in a family you’re looking at *Pine Ridge* at about 44%; whereas, for the state of South Dakota it’s 20.2%

Data results covering the micro-meso, the meso, and the macro-levels helps researchers in understanding the types of living circumstances and the type of challenges the Lakota people continue to experience, and, in so doing, such knowledge facilitates better pertinent information specific to next-step initiatives, bearing in mind that when we begin to
examine the data, it is beyond necessary to understand the implications of the data specific to human viability, a matter of which I have touched upon abundantly.

As researchers, academics, educators, this information needs to be tied to the US Native, bearing in mind the impact on US Natives explicit to the US-Native colonial experience. Hence, programs such as the Warrior/Brave- In’a/Hunk’chola/ Maiden Program, based on Dr. Tinajero’s Mother/Daughter-Father/Son Program, could be an advantageous first-step, with some serious considerations taken into mind, of course. This particular approach could serve a multitude of purposes, such as:

1) Working directly with Native colleges, public schools on reservations, and the appropriate community leaders
2) By creating an intersecting space, this allows and facilitates the introducing of parents/guardians and youth to the program and to others as a consequence of the program and the events, such programs, under the correct/appropriate leadership, can serve as a “third space” in which all come to “the table” in order to work together, establish viable, healthy relationships, etc…for the behoovement of the youth, and the community.
3) Appropriately designed programs such as this, prompts a “safe place for youth, one in which they will be mentored, encouraged, safe-guarded, internally, while setting a path to high school completion, college/university, etc… in order to facilitate their futures in healthy ways.
4) Such programs can bring in external third parties that can open up doors previously perceived as inaccessible, for example, NASA, National Science Foundation, etc, as well as offer other important Opportunities specific to the community
5) Culture and language are brought into the activities intentionally, with the recognition that they are vital to the youth and that they are aspects of them that are important, and should be honored…

“Opening Doors”: Higher Education on the Rez

In 1968, the Navajo Community College, now called Diné College, was the first US Native tribal college ever established, meaning that after US Citizenship in 1924, it will take another forty-four years to establish an educational institution for higher learning for US Natives!!  Imagine that, forty-four years, when it took almost one hundred and fifty years to be recognized as a citizen of that same place, and then being awarded the right to vote?!!?
Although these “privileges” will, always, be met with some type of resistance or other, at the least, the US Native is, finally, a citizen of the government system that now controls the continent Natives originate from.

Nevertheless, Diné College is located in Tsaile, Arizona, and will be accredited in 1979. As it currently stands, in the short time it has been established, it has undertaken some impressive programs of study such as, The Center for Diné Studies, whose goal is to apply Navajo Sá’qah Naaghái Bik’eh Hózhóón principles to advance quality student learning through Nitsáhákees (Thinking), Nahat’á (Planning), Iiná (Living) and Siihasin (Assurance), according to the colleges “Educational Philosophy” webpage.297 In an exciting and productive manner, the college offers students the opportunity, and, now, a place to study the Navajo language, Navajo history, and Navajo culture in preparation for further studies of the Euro-American kind. It also serves as a viable place for employment, internships, and academic expansion as it is designed with a multi-cultural and technological global view.

At the same time, the college has established “The Uranium Education Program” (UEP) on the Shiprock (Arizona) campus, which impresses me, tremendously, because of the fact that the program is designed for the betterment and protection of the community, as opposed to a place to study how to extract uranium from the region for Wašíču profit. As such, it then becomes a college in which communal empowerment is facilitated, then let loose in with every graduate from the program.

---

297 Direct Source: Diné College, Educational Philosophy page, Direct URL Link: https://www.dinecollege.edu/about_dc/educational-philosophy/.
The UEP serves as a center for Navajo community scholars to study radiation and the environmental impact it has on its community, as well as, studying the type of health issues that arise, directly, from the aftermath of uranium extraction, e.g., mining, milling, working at the mines, etc…. all significant to the operations on the Navajo Nation, which houses a uranium mine. The college also offers its students an opportunity, and a place, to study, participate further, and even become experts in this highly sought after, and well-paid, field of science. At the same time, the college can place students as graduates in a global arena in which they now have the credentials to become serious and highly-respected environmental leaders circumventing real-life issues specific to environmental degradation, which has transpired on US Reservations at the profit of the Wašíču, but at the cost of the community.

Indeed, there are other important socio-cultural, as well as social justice underpinnings to the work they will do, and lead in, all relevant to Native existence and Native regeneration, while serving as a means of tribal protection from within the Rez. I share all this because such programs not only offer tribal Natives a viable way out of the poverty cycle, but a worthwhile method to protect the tribal community from within, as well.

To further facilitate the US Native educational experience, in 1973, the American Indian Higher Education Consortium will be established, specializing in the realm of promoting and facilitating Native education. This one endeavor accommodates US Natives in

---

298 For Further See: Diné College, URANIUM EDUCATION PROGRAM, Environmental & Public Health Research Support. Direct URL Link: https://www.dinecollege.edu/about_dc/uranium-education-program/

299 According to the AIHEC Website: [Begin Direct Quote] “In 1973, the first six American Indian tribally controlled colleges established the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC) to provide a support network as they worked to influence federal policies on American Indian higher education. Today, AIHEC has grown to 37 Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs) in the United States. Each of these institutions was created and chartered by its own tribal government or the federal government for a specific purpose: to provide higher education opportunities to American Indians through programs that are locally and culturally based, holistic, and supportive. Through AIHEC, our colleges continue to work together to influence policy and build programs in all facets of higher education. They receive technical assistance in key areas; network with one another, federal agencies, other institutions, and potential partners; mentor new institutions; and plan new initiatives to address evolving areas of need. [End of Direct Quote]. All hyper-links removed.

Direct URL Link: http://www.aihec.org/who-we-are/index.htm
establishing institutions of higher learning in which language revitalization initiatives are
lodged. When we re-visit the US Native experience regarding education attainment, it’s not
until 1994 that the U.S. Congress passes legislation that recognizes tribal colleges as land-grant
colleges,\footnote{Significance of Land Grant Colleges, according to Wikipedia: [Begin Direct Quote]
“A land-grant university (also called land-grant college or land-grant institution) is an institution of higher education in the United States
designated by a state to receive the benefits of the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890.
Signed by Abraham Lincoln, the first Morrill Act began to fund educational institutions by granting federally controlled land to the states for
them to sell, to raise funds, to establish and endow "land-grant" colleges. The mission of these institutions as set forth in the 1862 Act is to focus
on the teaching of practical agriculture, science, military science, and engineering (though "without excluding... classical studies") as a response
to the industrial revolution and changing social class. This mission was in contrast to the historic practice of higher education to focus on
a liberal arts curriculum. A 1994 expansion gave land-grant status to several tribal colleges and universities.
Ultimately, most land-grant colleges became large public universities that today offer a full spectrum of educational opportunities. However,
some land-grant colleges are private schools, including Cornell University, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Tuskegee
University.” [End of Direct Quote]. All hyper-links removed.
Direct URL Link: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Land_grant_university
Reference: Chesnais, 2017.} in so doing, unique opportunities for Native communities specific to funding, issues
of federalism, and taxation concerning the creation and establishment of institutions of higher
learning are facilitated. In so doing, US Native tribes have viable means to create the
appropriate Native spaces for higher education attainment. Forget casinos, this is a much
healthier approach, tribally-speaking.

When education systems are created specific to the needs of Natives, they will
not just thrive but grow in exciting and healthy ways, allowing Natives the means to address
their particular community’s needs because they are now prepared to do so. Bearing in mind,
that Native peoples across the world come from “ReZilient”\footnote{Reference: Chesnais, 2017.} people, and have resilient life
experiences, which have been passed to them, generation after generation, this fairly new
opportunity is just barely taking off in the US.

Still, there’s no doubt that education really is the place to create the much needed
change for Natives and their struggling communities. Nevertheless, it must be reemphasized
that a successful institution of higher learning for US Natives must be a culturally and
linguistically appropriate for each tribal community. It is in this way that the US Native experience will begin to change. A significant aspect to that wholistic change is political activism, which is now, for Natives, beyond necessary to obtain in light of the type of environmental policies the current US political regime is establishing, many of which are detrimental to Native existence, especially so, on the Rez.

*Higher Education on Pine Ridge*

Educators and academics, as well as social justice advocates and critical theorists should be able to reach a consensus on the importance of education in the lives of Native peoples, but this can only be achieved when American Nationalism is put to the side in order to facilitate our intellectual capacity and understanding of the real American history. It is one in which US Natives are centered in, and not marginalized, or negated. The connections made between diachronization and, consistently, damaging demographical data, specific to Natives in the US, serves as a clear and constant racial/ethnic distinction that continues to impact democracy in very negative ways. Additionally, they serve as a testament to the power and lasting legacy of the White colonial experience. Nevertheless, the way out of this is through education attainment, even so, with the knowledge of the type of issues Natives currently contend with. In a just government system, colleges and universities from throughout the US would be harkening to this information and, then, applying it to their institutions, curriculum, and program designs.

To address the issues surrounding these types of demographics, specific to US Natives, research and researchers must recognize the effects of diachronization on Natives, and then present that history to the academic and educational systems of the nation, and, then, to the world. Some of the continued impediments that continue to disenfranchise Natives must also be
recognized, addressed, and remedied, especially those impediments that continue to serve as colonial reinforcements (Rossatto, Valles & et al, 2020). US education systems serve as an excellent example of this type of colonial reinforcement, even at the university level, wherein, Indigenous knowledge systems and histories fail to be a vital and vibrant aspect of the current curriculum and pedagogy taught at US educational institutions (Rossatto, Valles, & et al, 2020). Within such a context, it is not difficult to better understand why US Native demographic data tells the type of stories it does specific to US Natives.

The Oglala Lakota College

In 1971 the Oglala Lakota College (OLC) was established on Pine Ridge. This is the same college that Uncle Wilmer taught at and Bryan Deans has attended, as discussed in an earlier chapter of this dissertation. By means of the US land grant policies, originally OLC served as a community, it now offers four-year degrees. As discussed on their website, “Since the creation of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, Oglala leaders have pressed the federal government to meet the educational obligations it promised in treaties and agreements,” but failed to. In this way, intentionally blocked Native education systems were inaccessible to Natives, and that has been a major aspect of the problem. The other matter is one of curriculum and program designs. As already argued, these are areas that must be, without a doubt, overseen by the same, respective tribal community, whether in Arizona or in South Dakota.

The OLC Website explains that “With the advent of efforts to extend tribal sovereignty by American Indians throughout the United States came a recognition by Lakotas that control of education is also the control of its destiny.” It will not be until 1971, it is at

302 Oglala Lakota College Website: “History of Oglala Lakota College” (2017): http://www.olc.edu/about/history.htm

303 IBID
this point that the Oglala Sioux Tribal Council will begin the process of push-back and by
means of tribal sovereignty, and legal guidance, the Pine Ridge community will “charter” the
Lakota Higher Education Center (LHEC). The center will, eventually lead to the community
college, and then the four-year program. During its early, non-accredited years, the LHEC will
enter into agreements with the Black Hills State College, the University of South Dakota, and
the University of Colorado in order to “‘borrow’ their accreditation for various associate degree
programs,” as the OLC website\(^{304}\) explains. In essence, the tribe circumvents accreditation in
the beginning of its formation period. As explained on the website, “Students were taught on
the reservation by faculty chosen by the college, but approved by the state institutions, who
taught the same courses as offered in South Dakota’s colleges,” no doubt, “it was a complicated
system, but it met the needs of students.”\(^{305}\)

As the college continued its progression, it will not be until 1974 that OLC
awards the first, ever, associate degrees in 1974, recalling that OLC first starts off as a
community college. It is at that point that the LHEC’s name will be changed to the Oglala
Sioux Community College (OSCC) in 1978. As the OLC website explains, in 1979, the OSCC,
then, comes up for candidacy for accreditation. Serving the nine Pine Ridge districts at the
time, in 1980, they begin the process of centralizing the OSCC.

In 1983, the OSCC is accredited for the following degrees: a Bachelor’s degree
in Elementary Education, and, Associate Degrees in Education, Human Services, General
Studies, Nursing, Lakota Studies, Business and Vocation fields.\(^{306}\) “In subsequent accreditations


\(^{305}\) IBID

by North Central in 1987, 1992, and 1994, the college has expanded its bachelor’s degrees in *Lakota Studies*, Human Services, and Applied Sciences, and a Master’s Degree in *Tribal Leadership,*” according to the OLC Website. In 1983, the college will change their name again to the *Oglala Lakota College, (OLC)*, now reflecting “its status as a four year degree granting institution” and in order to replace “the word *Sioux* with *Lakota,*” which is the “proper word to describe our people is *Lakota,*” as discussed on the Website.

According to the OLC Website, The current administrative structure for the college centers on a 13 member Board of Trustees, “with membership coming from nine reservation districts, one designee from the *Oglala Tribal Council*, one designee from the *OST President*, one *Council of Elders*, and a student representative,” as explained. In March of 1998, as reported by the OLC Website, the “NCA granted continuing accreditation for all existing degrees, the Master’s degree in *Lakota Leadership /Management*, and an added Master’s Degree emphasis in Educational Administration.” At the same time, the NCA removed distance and site limitations.

Post-COVID 19, like many other institutions across the planet, OLC has gone online. As they explain, the OLC continues “to assume a vital role in the development of the reservation’s resources, its people, and the land,” and in so doing they are reinvigorating the Pine Ridge community in exciting ways. As it currently, stands, the college offers accredited degree programs and certificates in the following areas:

---

307 *North Central Association of Colleges* (NCA) is the accreditation entity.

308 See: *Oglala Lakota College Website: “History of Oglala Lakota College”* (2017): [http://www.olc.edu/about/history.htm](http://www.olc.edu/about/history.htm).

309 Content Source: *Oglala Lakota College Website: “History of Oglala Lakota College”* (2017): [http://www.olc.edu/about/history.htm](http://www.olc.edu/about/history.htm).

310 According to the OLC Website, “The most recent comprehensive visit took place in March 2003, by the Higher Learning Commission, a commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools,” 230 South LaSalle Street, Suite 7-500, Chicago, Il 60604-1413, telephone number 312-263-0456 or 800-621-7440, FAX 312-263-7462.
The programs in Elementary Education and in Nursing are fully approved by the State of South Dakota.

Graduates of the elementary education program are certified by the *South Dakota Division of Education*.

Graduates of the nursing program are permitted to sit for the *National Council Licensing Examination (NCLEX)* to become Registered Nurses.

Bachelor of Social Work was accredited by the *Council on Social Work Education* in Spring of 2010.

Among other courses offered are the “Aboriginal Restorative Justice” program.

### Other Public/Private Schools on Pine Ridge

Recognizing the importance of culture and language, US Native schools have taken the lead and are establishing educational programs unique to their tribal community. In many instances, these schools are an intricate part of the tribal community and are overseen by Natives, e.g., educational councils, administrations, etc., as this is appropriate to revitalizing the Native educational experience. Program designs are specific to the tribe and the geo-space of the tribe. Within the nine districts of the *Pine Ridge* community the following schools (in alphabetical order):

- **American Horse School (K-8)**
- **Batesland Elementary School (preK-8th)**
- **Crazy Horse School (K-12th)**
- **Lakota Waldorf School**
- **Little Wound School**
- **Longman Day School (aka: Isnawica Owayawa)**
- **Porcupine School**
- **Red Shirt School**
- **Rockyford Elementary School**
- **Wolf Creek Elementary School**
- **Wounded Knee District School**
- **Little Wound High School**
- **Shannon County Virtual High School**
- **Pine Ridge School (K-12)**

Head Start Program Housed out of the *Oglala Lakota College*

*Additional schools include:*

- **Red Cloud Indian School**
On the Rez, the private schools are highly-sought after and have been shown to be successful in getting students into higher education. As a community initiative, language patriotism is key to the varying educational program designs, as Tinajero\(^\text{112}\) and other leaders in the field of native language promotion contend. As Grunewald explains that, “After children complete a language immersion program, they need ongoing support, such as opportunities to speak the language at community gatherings or attend a language immersion program during the elementary grades.”\(^\text{113}\) Collier, Thomas & Tinajero’s (2006) work contends that academic achievement results have, indeed, shown that students who receive transitional bilingual classes achieve at a level higher than students who receive English-only instruction, where less than half the gap is closed.

This is the rich canvas in which OLCERI will attempt to connect all levels of education with the much anticipated “Warrior/Brave—In’a/Hunk’chola/ Maiden Program”. Pre-COVID 19, this is wherein our work was headed. The countless issues surrounding next steps in education, respective to the virus, is still up in the air for many educational institutions, both public/private and higher learning. For work on a reservation, there are additional concerns that can only be addressed from within the tribe, so often times, such initiatives must

---

\(^{111}\) For specifics on Native language immersion programs see, Grunewald, (2016), an economist, who argues that learning their “Indigenous languages from a very young age may prepare Native American children for success in school and life, with benefits spilling over to their families and communities.” **For Furthers See:** “Early childhood Native language immersion develops minds, revitalizes cultures”. (2016). Direct URL Link: https://www.minneapolisfed.org/article/2016/early-childhood-native-language-immersion-develops-minds-revitalizes-cultures

\(^{112}\) **For Furthers See:** Virginia Collier, Wayne Thomas, and Josefina Tinajero. (2006). “From Remediation to Enrichment: Transforming Texas Schools through Dual Language Education”, Direct URL Link: https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5d854ac170b66a71d1de71d39/5d9cb7f68bf4a5f0016cd471/1570551800081/2006-spring_tabe-journal-v9_from remediation to enrichment.pdf

\(^{113}\) **Direct Quote Source:** “Early childhood Native language immersion develops minds, revitalizes cultures”, (2016). Direct URL Link: https://www.minneapolisfed.org/article/2016/early-childhood-native-language-immersion-develops-minds-revitalizes-cultures
be connected to the same schools on the Rez. That has been our intent and our recognition, to begin the “Warrior/Brave—In’a/Hunk’chola/Maiden Program” we must connect it and house it at the OLC, with OLCERI providing the space, off campus, for Agri-self-sufficiency training, horse riding, and inter-generational cultural/linguistic catered events, as well as civics and social-justice training. For the time being, the initiative is on hold, dependent on what happens to our diachronized “new” world system under the global pandemic.

Native Citizenship and Suffrage on Pine Ridge

As previously mentioned in this way too long work, it will not be until The Snyder Act of 1924 is passed that the Indigenous people of the continent will receive U.S. citizenship; hence, the legal right to representation under the law by means of voting has continuously been challenged by the status quo, which consist of Whites. Paradoxically, although the Fifteenth Amendment of 1870 had already granted African Americans citizenship and voting privileges, US Natives will not be awarded that privilege until 1924, when they become U.S citizens.

Extraordinary and beyond logic, the first peoples of the continent have been continuously prohibited from having the same rights as other people. Not only will US Natives be blocked from freely voting, but even after they receive the right and the citizenship standing, will states reject the federal mandate citing issues of federalism, i.e., a state rights to be racist, to disenfranchise, to marginalize, etc…. In 1948 with the landmark case, Harrison v. Laveen and Trujillo v. Garley. supposedly, the 1962 rulings will change the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and secure and protect that right for the Indigenous peoples of the US. Wait! Stop! That’s just not true. To the contrary, Indigenous voting rights continue to be suppressed, especially so in
Republican-led states that recognize their potential power in further changing the US political landscape.

At OLCERI, we believe that it is beyond important to teach this to our community’s youth. As such, social justice and civics is critical to our program design, especially for work with our much anticipated “Warrior/Brave—In’a/Hunk’chola/ Maiden Program”. Once again, reminding the reader that although Americans, in general, likes to promote a faulty narrative that supports a totally White nationalistic ideal circumventing a misconstrued sense of freedom and justice for all; it is, precisely, this type of imaginary idealism that has become a vital aspect of uncontested Americanism; meaning that Native history, as well as the history of Americans of African ancestry, and Mexica, continues to be negated and disqualified throughout the American public school system—even by those same groups.

From the point-of-view of US, pedagogical practices and weak nationally-centered, curriculum, --to the Academy—and—to the countless teacher prep programs located throughout the US; clearly, the American education system, its curriculum, and its teacher prep programs are deliberately designed and intended to continue colonizing Natives (Rossatto, Valles & et al, 2020; Tuhaiwai Smith, 1999; 2012). This extends itself to Native suffragism, as well. Keep them away from the vote. It matters.314

“Hey, I’m a US citizen!!” “How’s that Legal!!

When applying a diachronizational lens, US Historians can easily appreciate the distinction between Natives and “Others” when we reflect on the Constitution’s 13th, 14th, and

---

15th Amendments which will, eventually, promote the emancipation of African Americans and legalize their right to vote, pre 19th Century—although, de facto, in typical White colonial fashion, this will not fully transpire for African Americans as issues of federalism, often referred to “state’s rights” have been, historically used by racist/conservative, mostly Republican-led states, in order to keep the status quo in check. Still, in the case of Native Americans, it will not be until the 20th Century that US Natives will be recognized as US Citizens under the Snyder Act of 1924, as already discussed repeatedly, eventually acknowledging that US Native are “Americans” and justified to full U.S. citizenship benefits, including the right to vote. Still, there will be states that will resist, even with the passing and ratification of this bill.

Native Americans continue to be prevented from participating in elections, precisely because of the US’s racist, colonial history; its White majority, and because of federalism, macro-vs-meso power tied to state’s rights. In the case of voting, as the ABA 2020 article titled, “How the Native American Vote Continues to be Suppressed,” explains in the following: 315

The Supreme Court invalidated the Section 5 preclearance formula in 2013 (Shelby County v. Holder, 570 U.S. 529 (2013)), removing one of the most powerful tools to ensure equal access to the ballot, including Alaska and Arizona, and two jurisdictions in South Dakota with significant Native American and Alaska Native populations. Since the Shelby County decision, efforts to suppress the vote have increased. For Native Americans, these voter suppression efforts can and do have devastating impacts

Essentially, the Constitution, under the US Supreme Court leaves it up to the states to decide who has the right to vote, just like it does with other “inconvenient issues such as gay rights, women’s rights, and, most certainly, Native rights. After the passage of the 1924 Citizenship Bill, it still took over forty years for all fifty states to allow Native Americans to vote. For example, Maine was one of the last states to comply with the Indian Citizenship Act, (ICA), even though it had granted tax paying Native Americans the right to vote in its original 1819 state constitution.

In the US, under Trump and Republican “leadership”, we are witnessing a return to legal discrimination, sanctioned at the state level, dependent on the state, and now endorsed by the federal government in an attempt to “Make America Great Again” (Rossatto, Valles & et al, 2020). From Maine in the 1930’s to North/South Dakota in 2018, US Native voting rights continue to be challenged. In democracies, like the US purports being, voting is one of the most visible ways citizens use the political process to express their opinions and to resolve conflict. Under the current political climate, it is the only way to try to preserve democracy, this is why it continues to be on the “endangered” list..

In the end, “legitimate” voting (as in a Democratic system of government, although this is continuously challenged since 2016) is more than just this. In its most fundamental form, voting is about power: who has it?, how’d they get it?, and what are they willing to do to hang on to it? Under Trump’s administration, marginalized population members, women, and even the planet should be concerned (Rossatto, Valles, & et al, 2020; Tuhaiwai Smith, 1999; 2012). Clearly, the US is attempting to return to an earlier period in US history, one in which Whiteness prevails and power and the institutions remain White. You take the vote away, you disempower people, groups, and the planet. This is what is meant by
“Make America Great Again”, Trump’s rallying cry to Whites, White racists, and White Nazi supremist, all “very fine people,” according to Trump.316

316 NOTE: It should be noted that there is continued debate from Trump supporters, in particular, regarding the statement, which is argued by them as having been “taken out of context by Democrats” (See, James S. Robbins’, opinion columnist for USA Today, titled: “Trump did condemn white supremacists, too bad so many people won't listen; Did you know Joe Biden said, 'many fine people ... continue to display the Confederate flag,'” “in OPINION (10.02.2020). Direct URL Website: https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2020/10/02/trump-and-white-supremacy-he-did-condemn-and-has-repeatedly-column/5883336002/ ). My response to this argument, proof is in the policy, and the policing, for that matter.
4.8 Post-Millennial, Historical-Trauma: The Oglala Lakota People Today

According to Derezotes, (2014), historical trauma is “a reaction to [a] violent experience[s] that challenges [a] the person to develop new ways of thinking and behaving” (Derezotes, 2014, pg. 5). In the case of US Natives, this is attributed to the brutal, violent, and relentless episodes behind US colonial history and the, consequential, socio-historical trauma experienced by US Natives, as a collective group, as well as at the micro-level.

As Derezotes (2014) elucidates, “There are many kinds of traumatizing events, of course, and individuals may respond very differently to the same event. The kinds of experiences that may traumatize us include life threatening events… people can also be traumatized by loss or anticipated loss of loved ones…” Additionally, as Derezotes (214), explains, “Trauma is sociohistorical when perpetrated by people on people, such as in child maltreatment, domestic violence, or war. Historical trauma has helped design the architecture of human beings…” Our current theories suggests that human responses to trauma influence not only the individual across the lifespan but also the traits of our descendants.

At the same time, it is worth considering how nature tends to create especially powerful memories of threatening events. This is because organisms that respond effectively to threats in the environment tend to survive, and powerful memories are more likely to be remembered. Threatening events often challenge us to develop new ways of thinking or acting that may help us cope with future challenges. In a human being, historical trauma seems to be stored in an evolving ‘memory complex,’ which contains many forms of information…

Another way to express this is that trauma is a body-mind-spirit- environment process. Ecological processes include influences of family, culture, community comma and the local ecosystem. The biology of trauma includes evolution, neurological processes, an overall
physical health. The persons formal and informal social supports, psychological well-being, and spiritual beliefs about herself and her world also affect the trauma process. (Derezotes, 2014, page 5.)

As purposefully designed, the DRM paradigm posits that the diachronizational history of US Native Americans and US marginalized populations, respective to US colonial history, specifically, has contributed relentlessly to a multitude of unethical and unjust wrong-doings committed against such communities. In this case, specific to the Oglala Lakota Sioux, this fact has impacted Native Americans to an unquantifiable degree and is manifested into historical trauma (Rossatto, Valles, & et al, 2020; Saiz & DeMaio, 2019; Danforth, 2015; Harjo, 2014; Derezotes, 2014; Pevar, 2012; Williams, 2012; Giddens & Duneier & et al, 2011; Josephy, 1970, 1978; Lilienfeld, Lynn, & et al, 2009; Wilkinson & The American Indian Resources Institute, 2004; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, 2012; Getches, Wilkinson, & Williams, 1998; Deloria, 1985; Foreman, 1976; Weber, 1973).

Herein, is where data for such communities must be responsibly considered in relation to the latter. People/communities who are repeatedly taken advantage of, decimated, cheated, oppressed, marginalized, etc…, no matter their race, religion, or gender, will have community consequences that manifest themselves in the types of data variables we seek-out, as researchers, from such communities. An excellent example of how historical events impact current history, and feelings attached to those histories, is easily referenced to the 1862’s, “The Dakota 38”, specific to historical trauma and its effect on community, both at the micro and meso-levels, as previously discussed in an earlier section of this work.

Throughout this work, what is clear, or should be by now, is the fact that through US traditionalist research methodologies, the academy within US education systems, and other
Euro-White institutions such as the judiciary, the legislature, and, especially so, through past US presidents, and their White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, nationalism; a centrist US history has been established in which Whites rule supreme. Yes, there was one Catholic US president, but we all know how that went down. All “Other” non-White groups are negated, downplayed, marginalized, and, for Natives, “Rezzed-downed”, forcibly placed on Rezs. In addition to this, continued racism specific to US Natives, and a multitude of other socio-cultural and economic injustices are further facilitated, which have contributed, directly and indirectly, to the attempted demise of such groups.

Conversely, application of the DRM paradigm promotes Indigenous well-being by means of the research collaborative. DRM posits that the curative properties encompassed in documenting, as a form of redress, the psycho-socio-cultural-economic consequences of the diachronical history of the people, and, the publication of that history, as well as the intellectual enlightenment that will come when shared with others via the research initiative and subsequent publications, will, eventually, serve as a means of addressing, incrementally, relevant issues negatively impacting Native/marginalized communities today in a manner not currently done, or considered.

What needs to be made clearer to US domestic policy makers/legislators, academics, researchers, educators, and others from throughout the world, is the correlations between the present life of US Natives regarding the psycho-cultural, physical, and emotional residuals of the colonial experience, which is forced upon them to this day. Incidentally, similar correlations with Natives everywhere can be made. Without a doubt, within each government systems that dares to call itself a democracy, what must happen is that they must be called out when they fail to apply equality to all.
One of the relevant implications of the data, specific to all this historical trauma, must be the recognition of the consistent insurmountable issues directed continuously by US Federal Policy created to plague Natives are a consequence of unhealthy inter-tribal relationships, which are further exacerbated by interference by non-tribal entities, such as the countless US agencies that attempt to wreak havoc on tribal communities. Just as important, US policy is embedded in its racist past and, as such, continues to spew out rulings that are in all sense, fully undemocratic.

These types of rulings are constantly threatening to Native well-being. For example, US policing authorities such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)\textsuperscript{317}, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), tribal police officers, and the judiciary at all levels, etc, all practice dangerous policing and unjust treatments against Natives and marginalized population members, in particular, young males of color, respectively.

At the same time, while US Native, male, youth are excessively abused by policing authorities, tribally, locally, and federally; similarly, US Native females are being murdered, or go missing, without even an investigation. While socio-economic indicators vary widely across different regions, the poverty rate for those who identify as American Indian or Alaska Native is around 27%. Why is that? Clearly, the connections are simple to understand, whenever one dares to examine the arguments made throughout this work.

\textsuperscript{317} Accordingly, a U.S. Commission on Civil Rights report released in June 1981 titled, Indian Tribes: A Continuing Quest for Survival found that “many facets of Federal law enforcement in Indian Country have received widespread, repeated, and justified criticism from public and private organizations over the past decade.” Additionally, “Among the study’s findings: inadequate FBI resources for the investigation of criminal offenses in Indian Country; FBI agents are widely perceived as biased against ‘militant’ Indians; procedures for filing, investigating, and reporting complaints of agent misconduct are lacking; insufficient Federal prosecutorial resources; lack of coordination; and inadequate statistics required to analyze accurately the quality of law enforcement,” as reported by Chen & Grether, 2015; Fountain, 2016). Additional Source: U.S. Office of Civil Rights: \url{https://www.usccr.gov/pubs/sac/sd0300/ch3.htm}. (see: Appendix).
Furthermore, in 2010, the US pledged to "support the United Nations (UN), Rights of Indigenous People" after voting against it in 2007. With Trump’s ascendancy to president, he has, successfully, led the defunding of the UN human rights sector, and has even had the US pull out of the UN; hence, ensuring limited oversight when he chooses to blatantly and boldly attack “Others,” specifically, non-Whites as he has been doing since he, tragically, became president of the US in 2016.

According to the IWGIA318 the United States has not ratified the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169),319 (ILO Convention No. 169). Other, similar bellwethers, specific to Indigenous rights in the US, rests in the complexity of issues surrounding sovereignty. As such, federally recognized tribal nations are “sovereign”, but, legally, are considered wards of the state, making issues surrounding federalism extremely problematic for US Natives. As a consequence of the US Constitution’s loop clause (the 10th Amendment), under #10, states have the power over other entities, even the federal government, in some cases. In the instance that a state might be a Republican-led state, or a southern conservative state, in general, they have, historically, been segregationist, and anti-(1964), Civil Rights advocates. For states in which US federally recognized tribes are commandeered by Republican led leaders, the trend has been to continue their oppression and marginalization, as data, policies reflect to this day.

---

319 See: Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169) – ILO, AKA, “The Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 is an International Labor Organization Convention, also known as the ILO-convention 169, or C169. It is considered the “forerunner” of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous, purported to “serves as a framework for indigenous and tribal peoples’ empowerment. Access to decent work enables indigenous women and men to harness their potential as change agents in poverty reduction, sustainable development and climate change action,” according to their Website: https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/indigenous-tribal/lang--en/index.htm
Issues surrounding the *US Native* experience are only understood when their history is acknowledged, as well as recognizing that US history has been, and continues to be, embedded in racism and the protection and maintenance of White privilege. For *US Natives*, civil rights issues are embedded within the US justice system, both at the meso and macro-levels, as already mentioned throughout this work. In fact, they became the focus of a report released by the *Advisory Committee of South Dakota (ACSD)* in October 1977, according to Chen & Grether’s (2015) piece titled, “5 things that may surprise you about Native Americans’ police encounters.”

According to the authors, in the study titled, “*Liberty and Justice for All,*” the *ACSD* examined state, county, and municipal law enforcement agencies practices specific to the treatment of US Natives. Conferring to Chen & Grether (2015), the *ACSD* found abuses stemming from “selective law enforcement; search and arrest without cause; harassment and brutal treatment; arrest of intoxicated persons on disorderly conduct charges; and simple discourtesies.” Just as well, the study was “critical of the court-appointed defense attorney system and the bail system, as presented by the authors (2015).

Amongst other pertinent concerns, the *ACSD* report found “serious under representation of *Native Americans* in the juries and among the personnel in the courts and law enforcement agencies” (Chen & Grether; 2015). Chen & Grether 320, (2015), explain that “The commission recommended increasing the number of *Native Americans* on the force, but 15 years later, the number of native officers on the 120-man Rapid City force has jumped from just

---

one to three in a city where about 10 percent of the population is native” (Chen & Grether, 2015).

In South Dakota, where the Great Sioux Nation is situated, Chen & Grether, (2015) share how Native Americans told them that “police seem to target people driving license plates that begin with the number 6 – meaning they’re registered to residents of a reservation – or that display images of native identity, such as bumper stickers with feathers on them,” a clear and deliberate attempt to discriminate against US Natives further (Chen & Grether (2015).

Other disturbing events discussed in Chen & Grether’s (2015) important article describe “Two recent incidents involving white officers in the state have stoked suspicions:” In August, a tribal police officer on the Pine Ridge Reservation repeatedly used a stun gun on 32-year-old Jeffrey Eagle Bull. Then, in the state capital Pierre, the parents of an 8-year-old Rosebud Sioux girl sued police after four officers surrounded the child and used a stun gun on her when she was “threatening to harm herself” (Chen & Grether: 2015).

For US Natives, this is commonplace treatment under US law, and it must be stopped. In 2000, Chen & Grether (2015), write about a report from the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 321 which noted that “‘many native Americans in South Dakota have little or no confidence in the criminal justice system’ and warned that ‘the administration of justice at the federal and state levels is permeated by racism,’” (Chen & Grether (2015).

Likewise, as reported on by the authors, a Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice analysis of Centers for Disease Control and Prevention data, found that “Native Americans account for 1.9 percent of police killings even though they’re just 0.8 percent of the

---

321 Chen & Grether (2015)
U.S. population. In comparison, *African-Americans* make up 13 percent of the population and 26 percent of police killings,” (Chen & Grether, 2015). Moreover, “*Native Americans* convicted of crimes in South Dakota were handed down 57 percent more prison time than whites, according to *University of South Dakota* research from 2003,” (Chen & Grether, 2015).

As reported on by the authors (2015), “Richard Braunstein, an assistant professor of political science, looked at data from 1994 to 2000 and discovered that American Indians’ prison sentences averaged a little more than five years while whites’ sentences averaged just over three years,” (Chen & Grether, 2015). As if this weren’t enough, other relevant data and studies presented by Chen & Grether (2015) is as follows:

- According to the *CDC*, the homicide rate for *American Indians* and *Native Alaskans* was 5.9 people per 100,000 in 2011, nearly twice that of the 3.2 rate for white Americans,” (Chen & Grether, 2015)
- *Native Americans* have also faced a high rate of victimization for other violent crimes, including simple assault, aggravated assault and sexual assault – more than twice the rate of any other racial group, according to a 2003 *South Dakota Law Review* article,” (Chen & Grether, 2015)
- The motor vehicle fatality rate is also higher – 16.6 for *Native Americans* to 11.5 for whites. However, the suicide rate for *Native Americans* – 10.6 people – is lower than the 13.9 rate for whites,” (Chen & Grether, 2015)
- *Native* men and women, for instance, are overrepresented in the prison system and as victims of sexual violence. Yet *black* and *Latino* males have become the faces of mass incarceration (Chen & Grether, 2015)
- *Native* students are suspended and referred to law enforcement and even expelled from schools at disproportionate rates (Chen & Grether, 2015)

All this on top of what we already know about *US Natives*, that US reservations have disproportionately higher rates of poverty and unemployment than anywhere else in the US, and that some of the poorest US Counties are located on *Pine Ridge*.

Nevertheless, in their articles, Chen & Grether, (2015), recommend that “Not only do *Native*
Americans need to be included in the debate over police violence against minority populations, but their inclusion must also expand beyond such discussions to other social issues.” More than this, Congress must act judiciously on their behalf.
4.9 Second DRM Component, Diachronizational History of Pine Ridge
Interview with Bryan Deans, OLCERI Director Oglala Lakota Cultural, Economic, Revitalization Initiative Pine Ridge Reservation, South Dakota

Indians survived on the American continent for thousands of years based on a pervasive set of cultural values integrating human life with other forms of life. Today the same values guide tribes in the United States as they move into an era of unprecedented sophistication in managing reservation environments.

Most important for the non-Indian West, Indian values are crucial for the future of a region where resource issues are intertwined with economic and social survival.

Tribal peoples have made a wealth of cultural contributions, many of which have gone unnoticed. The Indian legacy most valuable for the future of the American West is a philosophy of permanence. Just as tribes have maintained cohesive societies against incredible odds by living their philosophy, so can the West.

Author Vine Deloria argues dramatically that ‘American society could save itself by listening to tribal people,’ who have a unique ‘understanding of the world.’ Acceptance of the Indian philosophy means understanding how all human activity relates to the natural world. It requires us to recognize that survival, cultural and physical, demands that we modify and limit human activity when it is not in harmony with the natural world.

As Getches & et al (1998, pg. 33) explain in the above, “a philosophy of permanence” is rooted in “the values that enabled American Indians to survive and which have kept them intact reflect a philosophy deeply embedded in aboriginal societies of the Americas. It is a philosophy that commits the people to a permanent existence in harmony with everything around them that explains the success of these people in surviving in America for thousands of years…”.

---

322 Quote Source: Getches & et al, 1998: 33
Within the study of cross-cultural psychology, theories have surrounded the idea of an “etic” approach to research design in which a universalist approach to understanding phenomenon is applied to a methodology (Kim, Yang, & Hwang, 2006; Yang, 2000). As such, this would mean that a Western, Euro-American approach to understanding human phenomenon would be incorporated into the work. Within work with Indigenous, or marginalized populations, I have argued against this, and fiercely.

To be clearer in regards to the primary distinction between Indigenous and marginalized populations, which could be considered a global question of sorts; “Indigenous populations” as opposed to “marginalized populations” rests on the distinctiveness of that groups history. Although the word “marginalization” applies to Natives and other non-White, Euro-American groups, both consist of populations that are, intentionally, marginalized with the major distinction resting in the history of the groups. Natives, precisely, being native to the continent, then to the regions in which colonization takes hold of their existence, to the point of attempted obliteration.

In the first three chapters of this work, I have attempted to point out the disingenuous aspects, as well as the unethical dimensions, such an approach encompasses; precisely, when it is research that involves Indigenous peoples and marginalized population members. In my academic opinion, it is beyond dishonest to do so. In fact, in many ways it could be argued that such research is faulty because it negates the relevant facets of a distinct community when a traditional, Euro-American lens is applied to the research approach and, ultimately, the findings. In reality, and from a critical theorist approach, it is a form of cultural manipulation which is intended to undermine non-dominant, populations.
Conversely, post-modern, Western, Euro-American, cross-cultural approaches to research present the idea of an “emic” approach, that is to say, a cultural-specific approach, also referred to as an Indigenous approach (Kim, Yang, & Hwang, 2006; Yang, 2000). Still, I argue that a distinctly novice approach is required, and it should be one that is taken from the standpoint of the Indigenous and/or marginalized groups’ perspective/standpoint. Likewise, it should be a paradigm designed as if an Indigenous, or marginalized population member, had designed it for their specific community. That is an intent of the DRM paradigm.

Addressing the cultural bias is necessary and as leading academics in cultural psychology argue, “it is only when considerable indigenous research has been conducted, the integration of Indigenous theories and findings with those of mainstream psychology for theoretical innovation as suggested by Morris et al (1999) will become a real possibility,” as argued by Leong, Leung, & Cheung (Morris, Leung & et al, 1999; Yang, 2000; Morris & 2010, pg. 593). For way too long, this simple truth has been denied to Natives, the marginalized, and all others. DRM is designed to counter this aspect of traditional research practices, stagnate academia, and in the field of cultural psychology and social theory.

Within a DRM approach, it is critical that the Diachronizational history of the tribe/community be accounted for—from their perspective—and, then, shared in any research publications that may arise as a consequence of the collaboration. Recall that, accordingly, the Diachronizational history of a community, like in the case of languages, is that point in history wherein a community is disrupted and irrevocably altered to the degree that it cannot ever return to what it was previous to the moment in history.

The group/community psychological ramifications as a consequence of such events are enormous and must be documented, instead of obstructed or negated. These
momentous periods of diachronization are points in a community history where language, culture, spirituality, property, economics, politics, etc….vaporize; henceforth, the community will never be able to return to a previous existence. In the case of the Indigenous peoples of the world, this would be the historical moments in which White, Europeans begin to infiltrate and take over Indigenous spaces.

Additionally, any publications that result as a consequence of the research collaborative. Again, this is achieved with the clear understanding that all work relative to this must be approved by the working tribal/group collaborator. It is within this recognition and understanding that the following section is presented. The diachronizational interview has been shared with me through the eyes and lived experiences of Bryan Deans, OLCERI director and Oglala Lakota Sioux. Bryan has a rich and illustrious history within the Pine Ridge community. As mentioned earlier, Bryan is the nephew of Wilmer “Stampede” Mesteth. Bryan is also the lead writer of the Lakota Plan, which will be discussed in this following sections, and has served as tribal council member. The following is dedicated to the beautiful and strong Oglala Lakota Sioux people.

Pre-Diachronizational History of the Oglala Lakota Sioux, As Shared by Bryan Deans, Oglala Lakota Cultural & Economic Revitalization Initiative (OLCERI) Director

Figure 4.24: The Great Plains

Image Source: Daily Kos. Blades, M. (2018). For the Lakota, December 1890 was disastrous: Sitting Bull was shot; 300 were killed at Wounded Knee,” Saturday December 29, 2018 - 9:00 AM MST. Daily Kos Website Source:
“I am Lakota, my people are Lakota. I follow the traditional ways of my Ancestors”

-Bryan Deans, 2018

*Post-Diachronization, Contemporary Life on the Rez*

Bryan, the owner of the place, could be seen as a visionary. He talks about his particular use of the land as being the first steps toward a seven hundred-year plan for his people to achieve sustainability and self-determination.

In order to win this battle against local and global corruption and a fundamentally unsustainable model of living for the human species, man must refocus on the seven tenets; food, water, fire, shelter, earth, spirit, self. Man must take a pledge to serve these tenets equally, so that it may find balance and ensure the survival of its livelihood and its own.

To fulfill this vision, every human being must join the struggle, and take part at every local level in a change of consciousness that must occur globally. Bryan pauses, his dream demands energy and focus. Sometimes, it collapses under the weight of reality, logistical needs and everyday hardships; but it always gets reborn, in an infinite cycle of hope and despair punctuated by small successes and failures and carried by a powerful dream of a better and healthier future.

From Chesnais, A., 2017: 1

In the time before the Whites arrive to the North American continent, the buffalo, like the Lakota people roamed freely and in great numbers. In the region of the sacred
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https://www.dailykos.com/stories/2018/12/29/1820334/-For-the-Lakota-December-1890-was-disastrous-Sitting-Bull-was-shot-300-were-killed-at-Wounded-Knee
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325 From Chesnais, A., 2017: 1, WOLAKOTA: The face of ReZilience in “post”-colonial America
**Paha Sapa**, now referred to by the Whites as the *Black Hills*\(^{326}\) of the *Great Plains*, this is the place from which the Lakota originate from. The *Oglala Lakota Sioux*, like other Indigenous peoples of the North American continent, roamed freely. In that time there were no boundaries, no borders, no Western European concepts having to deal with “owning” anything. The *Lakota*, like many other Indigenous communities, believe that no one can own anything in nature. From the land humans rest upon, to the two and four legged, to the flyers and crawlers, or the trees, air, water, or space humans take-up within the cosmos, this all belongs to the Great Creator, with whom all is interrelated with.

*The Great Sioux Reservation*

![Figure 4.25: Great Sioux Reservation](image-source)
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326 Image Source: *Daily Kos*. Blades, M. (2018). For the Lakota, December 1890 was disastrous: Sitting Bull was shot; 300 were killed at Wounded Knee,” Saturday December 29, 2018 - 9:00 AM MST. *Daily Kos* Website Source:
The Carving-Up of the Great Sioux Nation

In 1890, what remained of the once Great Sioux Nation was now a reservation, one that would, continuously, be forced open by the US Federal Government in order to allow White settlers into the remaining Great Sioux Reservation. According to the Fort Laramie Treaties of 1851 and 1868, this now “reduced the area in which the Lakota (and other tribes) were allowed to live. But everything from the Missouri River west to what is now the boundary between Wyoming and South Dakota, including the sacred Black Hills, was to be theirs forever. And non-Indians were supposed to stay out, according to Blades (2018).”

Tragically, this did not happen. Deliberately going against the treaties, the Wašíču continued to tear apart, further, the Lakota Nation whenever it was convenient for them to do so, even up to the 1960’s. What followed was continued warring between the Natives and the Wašíču that serves as testimonial to the “ReZilience” Chesnais’ (2017) references in her work. As Blades, (2018), explains in the following:

But when a thousand soldiers under George A. Custer confirmed the presence of gold in the Black Hills in 1874, a deluge of miners staked claims on reservation land. This led to repeated conflict.

The clashes and the refusal of thousands of Lakota to keep to the reservation ended in the Battle of the Greasy Grass (Little Bighorn River) of Montana on June 25, 1876, a Pyrrhic victory for the Lakota. Just four months after Custer and his men died in Medicine Tail Coulee, Washington imposed the Treaty with the Sioux Nation of 1876. Under the provisions of the 1868 Treaty, terms could only be changed with the approval

328 Source: Daily Kos. Blades, M. (2018). For the Lakota, December 1890 was disastrous: Sitting Bull was shot; 300 were killed at Wounded Knee, Saturday December 29, 2018 · 9:00 AM MST. Daily Kos Website Source: https://www.dailykos.com/stories/2018/12/29/1820334/-For-the-Lakota-December-1890-was-disastrous-Sitting-Bull-was-shot-300-were-killed-at-Wounded-Knee

329 Source: Daily Kos. Blades, M. (2018). For the Lakota, December 1890 was disastrous: Sitting Bull was shot; 300 were killed at Wounded Knee, Saturday December 29, 2018 · 9:00 AM MST. Daily Kos Website Source: https://www.dailykos.com/stories/2018/12/29/1820334/-For-the-Lakota-December-1890-was-disastrous-Sitting-Bull-was-shot-300-were-killed-at-Wounded-Knee
In 1888, a federal commission sought to collect signatures from three-fourths of Lakota adult males. They were unsuccessful. The next year, they stepped up the pressure, but still the Lakota refused to assent. Spokesmen John Grass, Gall, and Mad Bear opposed it, and though not chosen by his people to speak, Sitting Bull did speak, and urged everyone not to be intimidated into signing away the land.331 …in 1889, Congress passed the Sioux Bill, opening the reservation to non-Indians and making acreage allotments to individual Indians with the intent of breaking up tribal land held in common and ending reservations and tribal identity entirely. Non-violent resistance continued after the law took effect in early 1890. After Sitting Bull was killed, and the people camped at Wounded Knee were slaughtered, all resistance ended. More land was taken in 1910.332

Many non-Lakota homesteads were abandoned in the 1930s, but instead of restoring these lands to the tribes, Washington turned them over to the National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management. Even more land was taken for the Badlands Bombing Range during World War II. When the Air Force declared that that land was unneeded, in the 1960s, it too was transferred to the NPS instead of being returned to communal tribal ownership.333
Tragically, for the brave Lakota, this is how diachronization under the US Government begins.

To this day, it has not stopped.
4.10 Diachronizational History: As Shared by Bryan Deans, OLCERI Director

SUMMARY KEYWORDS people, Lakota, rez, land, community, call, black hills, reservation, pine ridge, natives, monies, white, homes, nation, war, trump, build, question, Biden, agreed

SPEAKERS

P: Participant,

RA: Research Advocate

RA: My name is Estella Valles. I’m a doctoral researcher from UTEP. I’ll be asking you questions relevant to the history of your community. The content will be recorded audio visually and will be used as possible content for my dissertation which focuses on educational research and indigenous communities. I will also use portions of this session for publication purposes and grant proposal writing undertaken on behalf of your community. The community leaders representing the respective community have access to this content. Do I have your permission to record the session with this understanding?

Participant 23:43

Yes,

RA 23:44

thank you.

RA 23:44

So could you please tell me your name?

Participant 23:48

Bryan Deans,
what do you do for a living?

I’m currently running a nonprofit called OLCERI. I also ranch in Slim Buttes Community Pine Ridge Reservation.

What is your educational background?

engineering?

mechanical engineering

from where did you get your degree?

um

yeah, Phoenix and

I did a bunch of stuff for the military.

And that would be the army?

Yes.
RA 24:29

Where were you born?

Participant 24:31

Pine Ridge Reservation.

RA 24:34

And What year were you born? Please?

Participant 24:36

1970.

RA 24:38

What are you currently live?

Participant 24:41

Pine Ridge Reservation, Slim Butte community?

RA 24:44

How long have you lived there?

Participant 24:48

Roughly 17 years.

RA 24:51

Have you lived somewhere else previously?

Participant 24:55

Yeah, I mean, I was born here and raised here. I left and came back many times.

RA 25:03

Why did you move back to Pine Ridge?
Um,

after

a lot of deployments and I had kids is kind of some of the main things and I wanted to raise them on a ranch

Your children are Lakota, Does that have something to do with that decision?

Well, absolutely. I mean, the people and our culture can’t get it anyplace else.

What is your marital status?

Currently divorced

Do you have children and if so, how many?

I have three

from a marriage
Participant 26:00

and then a couple others later on. Those ones aren’t here. I do keep my son and my
daughter here

RA 26:11

Okay, are those your son and your daughter, are those the ones from the first marriage?

And you don’t have to answer any of this if you don’t want to, at any point. Are those
children from your previous marriage or from the other relationships?

Participant 26:26

from my previous marriage

RA 26:29

Okay. And they, all your children five oh, excuse me. I’m not sure how many but at
least three are all *Lakota* and self-identify as *Lakota*.

Participant 26:39

Yeah.

RA 26:40

Where they born on Pine Ridge?

Participant 26:43

Yes.

Participant 26:45

Well, *Pine Ridge* and,

Participant 26:48

one of my kids was born in Rapid.
Participant 26:53
So
RA 26:55
go ahead, Sir,
Participant 26:56
which is a service provider for IHS.
RA 27:01
Okay, so the children, the majority of them live on the Rez while
RA 27:08
one lives in Rapid City.
Participant 27:13
Currently they’re all on the Rez.
RA 27:15
Okay, so all are on the Rez?
Participant 27:18
like the closest major town. See? Like my oldest daughter was living up in Rapid. And now she’s back because COVID, jobs opened up. So now she’s down here.
RA 27:36
Can you tell me about the community in which you lived in previously? And what was that like?
Participant 27:44
I’ve lived in a lot of places. Because, you know, I was military for years, So, I lived in a lot of different places. And then,
Participant 28:00
like my mom, and them they took jobs

Participant 28:04
in Oregon and North Carolina, and

Participant 28:08
also in California,

Participant 28:13
and Wyoming, Montana. Okay,

RA 28:22
what was that like compared to where you’re living in right now?

Participant 28:29
Um,

Participant 28:31
there’s not a whole lot of culture, connections,

Participant 28:36
you know, family connections.

Participant 28:40
When you’re out traveling around because like everybody wants to mind their own business. And over here, everybody kind of knows. Every

Participant 28:51
everybody’s business. Yeah.

RA 28:53
In what other ways might this be different?
Participant 29:04

There’s a lot of differences. I mean, indigenous communities are

Participant 29:11

how we organize how we think.

Participant 29:18

There’s a lot of, I

Participant 29:20

don’t even know how to quantify it,

Participant 29:22

I guess.

RA 29:23

Okay, but what would you say would be one of at least two of the major differences that you come to recognize in terms of being indigenous and then having lived off the Rez?

Participant 29:37

Well, like when you live off the reservation, it’s actually pretty easy to live because you don’t worry about anybody else except yourself. And okay, it’s very isolated, and maybe you can. I lived in Phoenix in our apartment complex for two years and never really knew my neighbors, you know, living right on top of each other, don’t even have a conversation with folks.

RA 30:11

And right now you currently live where explained to me, please? What’s that like
Participant 30:18

in the Slim Buttes community, on a ranch, but I have, you know, family and tribal
members and things. People come over and talk about different projects and things. I
mean, I have people coming from all over the world to just experience like, you know,
how we think and how we organize, and I guess we’re a lot Wilder and freer here than
anyplace else. I mean,

RA 30:50

You like that?

Participant 30:51

Oh, excuse me.

RA 30:53

Are you comfortable with that? considering it’s so different from where you were living
at before?

Participant 30:58

Oh, absolutely.

Participant 31:01

I mean,

Participant 31:03

white man’s world, it’s all about laws and contracts and things like that, and Indian
world, It’s more about relationships and

Participant 31:16

like,
Participant 31:20

personally, knowing folks and

Participant 31:23

like, there’s never, There’s hardly ever any kind of written contracts. I mean, nothing like call somebody that knows this person and you kind of background on them. I mean, you can get your whole family history.

Participant 31:44

This was a simple phone call.

RA 31:47

So this what you say you live on a ranch, please tell us how big that Ranch is.

Participant 31:55

Or where the homeplace is there’s 76 acres, and then across on my sister side, there’s another 230 acres, and then I’ve got like fractionated pieces all over. When I’m leasing, you know, the places 10,000 acres plus

Participant 32:20

currently not leasing any

Participant 32:25

range unit thing, but we still use that land, you know for our rides, trail rides and things like

Participant 32:36

that when you’re releasing.

Participant 32:39

Um, there’s things here that are called Ranger unit.
Participant 32:48

Land held in common

RA 32:50

with family members, or with community members?

Participant 32:54

with community

Participant 32:56

members

Participant 32:59

and thousand areas on that 10,000 acres but

Participant 33:04

so to get the use of that land, and you just pay a rent, an annual rent based on an Animal
Unit measurement. And, can we pause for a second I gotta grab a plugin. My phone’s
getting low.

RA 34:02

Okay,

Participant 34:03

I’m back.

RA 34:04

you were talking about land leasing. And taking that back to what you had said earlier
there on the Rez, there’s no contracts and none of the stuff that you would find off the
Rez in terms of, you know, legalese and that sort of thing. So how do you keep your
word on the Rez? How do you know that when you say something to somebody, or even
within the tribe, or the tribal government system, that people will come through with
what they’re saying?

Participant 34:39

By knowing people,

RA 34:41

knowing? means what?

Participant 34:50

personal relationships

RA 34:54

so with personal relationships you don’t require contracts? The word is enough. Is that correct?

Participant 35:00

you know, an understanding, you really got to know the folks, I mean, some people, if they’re going to go on to screw you over, they’re going to do it no matter what, I mean, whether you have a contract or not. And I mean, we have absolutely learned that from white man’s dealings. And to know, kind of where they, where people are in that kind of an honor system is pretty important in your dealings.

RA 35:00

Is that you’re saying?

Participant 35:43

So, I mean, it’s not that we don’t use contracts, somebody will write down on something, we’ll write down the major things. And but at the end of the day, it’s, I’m going to do this for you. And you’re going to do this for me and your words, are your bond. And after a while, you just weed out folks that don’t honor those things.
RA 36:11
You call it an honor system, or, you use the term “honor” system? Would you say that is a Lakota principle? Or is that something that

RA 36:18
that’s a side of the Lakota principles?

Participant 36:22
Oh, that’s an absolute,

Participant 36:25
traditional principle, because we didn’t have contracts, we didn’t have jails, we didn’t have, I mean, if you didn’t live up to what you say you’re going to do, eventually, you’re, nobody’s going to help you, and then

Participant 36:42
you’re probably going to perish.

RA 36:44
So community was necessary, and central to it, is that just tribal life on the Rez, or before the Rez?

Participant 36:57
It was before the Rez. And like, there’s a lot of people that have like, you know, modern issues like drugs, alcohol, things like that. And, you know, you can trust them. Because you know, their family. And you know, how they’ve conducted themselves before, you know, like 40,000 people live here. So, if you don’t know them directly, you know, somebody that does know them, and they’ll give you the whole background on them.
RA 37:26
So that was one my next question, how many community members are currently living there? And you said, 40,000? Is that correct? Approximately?

Participant 37:35
Yeah, approximately, I mean, that’s including non-voting age. That’s, you know, a whole population. That’s not.

RA 37:44
And that’s it?

Participant 37:46
I think registered voters is around 20,000, 21, or 22,000.

RA 37:52
That’s pretty impressive half, half of the community and the data says you at least 25% is youth, or something to that to that effect. But my question to you next is, basically---no, actually 25% is your older folks on the rez.

Participant 38:13
correct

RA 38:13
Right? But when you say 40,000 you’re talking about the nine districts, is that correct? The entire Reservation?

Participant 38:23
Um,

Participant 38:23
yeah, but we also have a lot of our registered folks that are in Rapid City because that’s
where the jobs are.

**RA 38:34**

Okay. So it’s a combined bi-coastal, kind of, I guess it’s not a coastal thing but, something bi, bi- community, communal, economic factor?

**Participant 38:48**

Yeah.

**RA 38:48**

In *Rapid City*. So of those community members, how many would you estimate more or less are permanent residents?

**Participant 39:02**

Um,

**Participant 39:04**

I know there’s probably around mid 20-23 to 25,000. Better, we, always, fairly steadily stay around that.

**RA 39:19**

I do have the next question. They’re probably going to be a little bit longer if you have to stop now. Bryan, we can stop, and we can continue tomorrow. Because my next question is what is the history of your community? Going back to the beginning?

**Participant 39:35**

My community is the Slim Buttes community are like
the Lakota version of what was here. It’s called Paha’ Shota, smoky hills.

That was established when we came back to the reservation and they called this “Bad Water” cause a white rivers, you know, full of sediment and things like that, the animals don’t particularly like to drink the water, it’s got a lot of alkali in it. And so then White Clay community, they call that good water “mini-wasc-teh”

that goes, that’s a little bit East of here and then it kind of comes around and joins up the wagon crossing where they used to go and bring annuities from the railroad and then through the gravel bottom, they could cross wagons there. And like Slim Buttes community is, has always been pretty small. And the original residents here most them died off on a smallpox epidemic. So we’re sparsely populated here. There’s about 80, 80 households, roughly a little bit less. And so, you know, our residency out here is
Probably 5-600.

RA 41:12

And that would be at the time of establishment of the Reservation, is that correct?

Participant 41:17

Yeah.

RA 41:18

Okay,

RA 41:19

so previous to the time of Reservation establishment, what was the history of your people?

Participant 41:26

We were nomadic.

Participant 41:29

And, you know, we organized under

Participant 41:35

“he’ honchos”, or chiefs, in white man’s speak.

Participant 41:42

They would,

Participant 41:44

like I’m from

Participant 41:47

I guess you call it a clan of
Participant 41:55

people under Bull Bear,

Participant 41:57

who was murdered by Red Cloud when he was trying to consolidate the might of the

Sioux Nation, Bull Bear had

Participant 42:07

in his plan was called

Participant 42:11

qi’ axha

Participant 42:14

and there was 1100 lodges, It was kind of the fighting strength of the nation. And then

later after he got murdered most of the

Participant 42:23

Lakota people went to (unclear)

Participant 42:29

Crazy Horse and they were up in Wyoming, Montana, they were at the Greasy Grass

Fight Site, my family was yellow knife, cut knife, and stabber

Participant 42:44

who, were

Participant 42:48

combatants, at the Greasy Grass Site, stabber got shot in the hips and was crippled for

the rest of his life after that. And but he was known to be you know,
Participant 43:04

a war leader.

Participant 43:08

And

Participant 43:10

they rode with crazy horse for a while and then like some of the qi’axha went to Sitting Bull. And some of them became

Participant 43:21

the

Participant 43:23

some of the families went south. And they are

Participant 43:34

the gambling tribe down there, they’re not actually a tribe. I

Participant 43:42

can’t think of the word right now

RA 43:45

You said gambling, You mean that they own the casinos, or they’re involved in the casino.

Participant 43:51

They own the casinos.

Participant 43:53

Shakopee Tribe. They’re not actually tribe. They’re segments that the Lakota peoples,
And they became qi’axha people.

RA 44:04

So segment means what exactly,

Participant 44:07

um, they broke off. It’s like when Bull Bear was murdered by Red Cloud. Everybody makes their own choices, who they’re going to claim as their leader Bull Bear was murdered. So hardly any of them wanted to go to the Red Clouds with bad faces. So there was only like 20 lodges out of 1100, 23 -27 lodges that went with Red Cloud who were actually relatives of his already. And then like, with Shakopee was another set of families, and they had relatives that were down east and, you know, that’s when Dakota 38 was going on. So they were going to go down there and join those families. And they never quite made it, but they became But they wound up going on their own reservation and became Shakopee Tribe rather than be shipped all the way back up here. And then the biggest portion, there was like 700, and some loggers went to Crazy Horse in Wyoming and Montana. And then there was another hundred and 60 loggers or so, went up to join Bull Bear, not Bull Bear, Sitting Bull in Canada. And then those people were actually the longest lasting free Lakota anywhere.

RA 45:37

under

RA 45:39

under, Sitting Bull

Participant 45:40

under, Yeah, at Moose Jaw in Canada, and we still have relatives up there. And, and
then, like

Participant 45:54

when Crazy Horse finally came in,

Participant 45:58

then

Participant 46:04

that was the last of the free Lakota in the United States. But there was still free Lakota in Canada, and they continue to live free for another, Oh, like 40-60 years or something like that, until eventually, Canada made claim to their [Lakota] territories and so on and so forth.

RA 46:29

How do you know this history?

Participant 46:31

Um, my uncle Wilmer, most of our history is oral,

Participant 46:38

and backed by,

Participant 46:41

you know, some documents that happen back around the turn of the century. And so I sat and we talked about a lot of this stuff with my uncle Wilmer,

RA 46:54

um, the community in which you currently live in for some years.

Participant 46:59

Yeah.
RA 47:01

Why? Why do they live where they live? Why do they live in Slim Buttes, excuse me, and not somewhere else, on the Rez or outside the Rez?

Participant 47:11

Well, I mean, Pine Ridge

Participant 47:15

The town village of Pine Ridge was a distribution point for annuities. So that’s where the government dropped off a provisions.

Participant 47:29

Or you call it

Participant 47:31

their concessions.

Participant 47:34

Or, for us retiring from the battlefield, because the United States never won a war against the Lakota. They actually lost their wars. And so like our annuities were like, the payment or rent for us retiring from the battlefield. And had they not made those treaties they would have lost the war, The Civil War. And so, I mean, they kind of just lied their way into a “peace” because they couldn’t fight us. We defeated them and forced them from the battlefields and, burnt their forts to the ground when they retired from the field.

Participant 48:21

And

Participant 48:24

so Pine Ridge was a distribution point, they had a railroad went through here, over by
Oryx, and they would download off trains from there, and then they would wagon train them out to Pine Ridge for distribution. And so each one, when they created the reservation everybody was supposed to get 160 acres. And so they took little pieces of that hundred and 60 acres and traded them for a camping spot near because it was all wagons and horses and things like that to get around. So it took a long time. And so they would, and they didn’t know exactly what the schedule was for when the annuity was arriving. So they would take bits and pieces of land, and we had different chiefs that would stake-out a place in a certain area and then everybody would get a little piece of land right around there. And then they had a camping spot next to Pine Ridge, so they could sit and wait for their annuities. And

Participant 49:34

then like qi’axha

Participant 49:38

under Bull Bear, most of us settled out by Kyle, which is about 96 or 98 miles over that, that was a pretty good ride on horseback, a couple of days.

Participant 49:51

Then, like

Participant 49:54

we got

Participant 49:56

other smaller pieces of land and Chain Creek and the Slim Buttes area within the family. So we had a place fairly close to Pine Ridge. Slim Buttes, where I live now is about 14 miles
from Pine Ridge. And they still did a lot of subsistence hunting. So they had to be spread out a little bit so that they didn’t overharvest one area and then, you’re, everybody is starved. And so that’s how that came about.

RA 50:25

So is what you’re saying basically that the tracts that were assigned to different families, by the US Federal Government was not actually done by them, but actually by the people. They selected their tracts in some ways, or how did that work.

Participant 50:40

Absolutely.

RA 50:41

Okay.

Participant 50:42

All right. Because we didn’t lose the war.

Participant 50:46

We selected where we wanted to be. But we didn’t trust white man either. So I mean, our original reservation was the Black Hills, and what we call them, it’s The Badland but

Participant 51:07

it was

Participant 51:09

the stronghold.

Participant 51:12

This is like where we would retreat if we were getting surrounded. And then we knew
the terrain better than anybody else. And then we could turn around and kill them. And so we kept the stronghold. And we kept the meat basket, which was The Black Hills. But then Custer came in and violated treaties, and then they basically stole it once they had enough troops here to contain us. But they never actually opened up another war with us. And so and then, you know, through attrition, bad nutrition, and different methods, they weakened our people to a point where we were no longer a pertinent fighting force.

RA 51:57

So, sorry

Participant 51:59

they, they lost the war, but they, they won the veiled war. I mean, they lied, cheated and stole until they weakened our people to where we were no longer pertinent. But they still sign their own agreements under The Constitution, “all treaties, henceforth, fourthly,

shall be the supreme law of the land, reaffirmed 11 times in The Constitution...”

Participant 52:31

But that’s only if you have honorable people.

RA 52:35

Only you have honorable people.... Going back to what you said about the Black Hills as to why Lakota would retreat there. You said because you knew the terrain. and,

Participant 52:46

The Badlands, you see, there’s a spot where the Badlands come up against The Black Hills. And in the Badlands, we call it the stronghold. And, if you go out there, it’s like, you know, I don’t know how to explain it. It’s like castles. You have, you know, natural
formations that are abutments and, places you can hide and conceal and ambush and things like that. And then there’s places out there where there’s like little oasis is where you can go to resupply.

**RA 53:28**

Other reasons why *The Black Hills*, because it sounds like *The Black Hills* are important to the *Lakota*, what would be some other important reasons as to why that might be the case?

**Participant 53:38**

Well, I mean, for us *The Black Hills* is the emerging place. That’s where we came from. When we emerged from the earth; we came from *Wind Cave*. And there’s the birthing place of the *Lakota* people, up there, on *Wind Cave*, a lot of other sacred sites where we would go for “humb’ledge,” or like our sacred ceremonies, or war ceremonies and other sacred ceremonies.

**RA 54:10**

And how do you know this?

**Participant 54:15**

history, [laugh], I could..

**RA 54:18**

from the families?

**Participant 54:20**

Yeah.

**RA 54:20**

generation to generation?
Participant 54:22

There’s ruins and things too, you know, there’s some you know, petroglyphs and different things like that

RA 54:39

Do you know why your community members? Um, the question is, how are they, How did the community members adjust to this period in which they have selected their tracts and then they become part of The Reservation?

Participant 55:00

Part of like, you know, the official policy of the US government was killing the Indian save the child and select re-education, education. And it was part of the attrition to weaken us, you know, they got rid of our traditional ways, they tried to get rid of our language and our culture, and to some degree were successful.

Participant 55:32

And in some way agreed to,

Participant 55:35

because, like, the Chiefs knew that, you know, white man was coming like fleas on a dog’s back. And we couldn’t defeat them after a while. So we agreed to be educated in the white man’s ways. And it was a really hard adjustment period, because it costs so many lives. And, you know, when you have dishonorable people, when your existence relies on this agreement within uh dishonest people, then, you know, it costs lives, it cost the lives of our children that had to go to boarding school and be reeducated, it cost, our culture and our history in order to be reeducated in the white man’s way. I mean, it was, it was and is, to this day, still extremely detrimental to the Lakota people and all.
RA 56:43

Thank you so much for that. And can you tell me a little bit about your current home?

RA 56:48

What is it like?

Participant 56:50

Excuse me?

RA 56:52

your current home, the home you live in right now?

RA 56:55

What’s it like?

Participant 56:56

It’s, um, pretty typical of the reservation. I mean, it was a nice place 20 years ago. But like, it’s a mobile home. So you know, you have things that are built for climates that are not here. They just don’t stand up. But it was hit about four or five years ago, with straight line winds over 100 mile an hour, it busted in the mooring straps and track building, and so it should be

Participant 57:27

condemned, [laughs] And

Participant 57:32

yeah, it’s pretty typical. I mean, I was a FEMA Inspector, across this Reservation. I went in over 1000 homes, and you know, I’d say 80% of them are in same kind of shape.

RA 57:45

Thank you for sharing that.
RA 57:48

So your home is on it on at least 76 acres. And then you’ve got other communities after that, is that correct? Correct. And then what kind of people live in your district? Would you say they are honorable people, or dishonorable, or a combination of the two? Would you say they are traditional,

Participant 58:10

Yeah, we’re very traditional. I mean, we

Participant 58:15

kind of loosely organized around what’s called

Participant 58:17

the tiyospaye, which is like your family and kind of extended family. So like, half a mile from here is my sister’s place. And then about three quarters, a mile is my uncle’s place, and then a mile, we got two cousins. And so like, we can all watch out for each other. And, yeah, we’re very traditional, at least in my family.

RA 58:47

Okay, so when I asked you when you said, that you’re traditional, What can you elaborate on that? Just a little bit, please.

Participant 58:55

we

Participant 58:56

organize around Thiwáhe, tiyospaye, Oyate-levels which is very family oriented. We’re all related to each other. And so, um, you know, we’re kind of all in the same sundown circles and
Participant 59:22

which is like our,

Participant 59:24

I hate to call it a religion.

Participant 59:27

It’s more of a lifestyle than a religion. But

Participant 59:32

most white folks would consider it a religion, because we still honor our sacred
ceremonies. We have seven sacred ceremonies that were given to us under the woman of
the white buffalo calf, pass the pipe, coming up with typos like the making of, of
civilization for the *Lakota* people. And there’s certain ceremonies, we follow on things,

RA 1:00:03

Can you tell me a little bit about the woman and the white buffalo calf?

Participant 1:00:07

White Buffalo Calf?

Participant 1:00:10

Well, she brought the pipe, like before

Participant 1:00:14

before we were the Dine’ nation, which is the buffalo nation, we were the wolf people,
and we hunted in packs or clans and

Participant 1:00:33

we didn’t know
Participant 1:00:35

anything about being humans,

RA

Really?

Participant 1:00:35

And then when Woman with the White Buffalo Calf brought the pipe she brought the ceremonies that are, we celebrate, our honor when we do our thing so like it’s the social organization behind the people

RA 1:01:02

when you say the pipe, Do you mean the peace pipe? Or what pipe Are you referring to?

Participant 1:01:06

According to White Buffalo Calf Pipe, that’s our civilization pipe

RA 1:01:13

pipe for civilization meaning that you became civil only up to that point when you received it, is that correct? as a as a community?

Participant 1:01:21

Excuse me?

RA 1:01:23

The pipe signifies basically civilization, the establishment of it, once you receive or were gifted with it, is that correct?

Participant 1:01:30

Yeah, unlike all the other pipes that come after that, the pipe is a conduit to talk
Participant 1:01:40

with spirits.

Participant 1:01:43

I guess it’d be like your preachers praying to God and how they have their God and things like that. Except this is physically our, This is our telephone, if you will.

RA 1:01:57

alright

Participant 1:01:57

so, I don’t know how to quantify it exactly

RA 1:02:02

that’s fine, in order to get some information regarding that, to be sure I understood it. So up to the point that you’re telling me about the civilization pipe, the Lakota people have emerged previously, that Lakota people emerged from the Black Hills. So they were always part of this continent. Is that correct?

Participant 1:02:25

yes

Participant 1:02:26

Yes.

RA 1:02:27

Oh, this, this idea, white man’s idea about the Siberian pass and all this other stuff is Does not apply? Is that correct?

Participant 1:02:34

No. I mean, as far as the white man’s ideas, they say 2000 years was the establishment
of the earth and a lot of stuff, we can trace our lineage back 7000 years. And, you know, we have ruins that are far out date. They’re our Bible. And

**Participant 1:02:58**

yeah, good.

**Participant 1:03:02**

There’s, there’s a lot of holes in white man’s theory, what they call

**Participant 1:03:08**

anthropology.

**RA 1:03:10**

Okay. So how, if it, if it at all, are Lakota connected to, (I don’t know if they are, I’ve been kind of asking this to other tribes on this continent,) this entire continent.

**Participant 1:03:27**

Um,

**RA 1:03:29**

what are the teachings on that?

**Participant 1:03:32**

there’s many people’s

**Participant 1:03:35**

every, there’s 540 some odd, distinct dialects here in

**Participant 1:03:43**

North America.
Participant 1:03:47

And everybody has their own origin stories, a lot of them are pretty similar. But um, and then, like, a lot of the tribes they were forced into extinction by white man, and then, so and then a lot of them have lost pretty much all of their culture and history so they’re the Lakota, we somehow we managed to keep ours. So, you’ll hear Lakota words in their ceremonies of these other tribes a lot, because when they go looking for spiritual knowledge, a lot of them come to Lakota

Participant 1:04:33
carriers, or medicine people. So

Participant 1:04:39

um, and then, like, we say, Mitákuye Oyás’iŋ. We are all related. So, even amongst all the other tribes and peoples, we’re related to them also, I mean we’re all from this land

RA 1:04:59

with That? Is there a relationship with whites?

Participant 1:05:07

Um, excuse me?

RA 1:05:09

You said you’re all related, the natives from the continent. Is that correct? Is that what you say?

Participant 1:05:15

Yeah.

RA 1:05:17

and how does that work with Whites though?
Participant 1:05:22
distant cousins, I suppose. It goes back to like core beliefs, right? The medicine wheel, the colors of all the people, the Mun’shi Makhá, Mother Earth,

Participant 1:05:39
you have,

Participant 1:05:41
you know, the red nation, white nation, black nation, and yellow nation. So that kind of represents, and then everybody has an area that they are

Participant 1:05:58
responsible for?

Participant 1:06:03
And, like,

Participant 1:06:06
me, this gets really, really, really deep. And this is like really old stuff.

RA 1:06:13
You don’t have to talk about it at this point. Can I ask you one more thing about your color wheel in particular? So you gave, you gave me some colors, but you didn’t include a brown color?

Participant 1:06:26
Um,

Participant 1:06:28
yeah, there’s not really
you have the red nation, but like, black and brown can be used in that medicine wheel.

They’re kind of

you use one of the darker colors

in that segment.

All right. So can you give me an idea, moving on to contemporary times? What are the income levels of people in your area? in general?

Um, most households, now this is household? This isn’t the individual

are about six to 8000 annual.

What, and what are the education levels, overall? For those homes? households?

I know there’s getting to be quite a few degrees around because of the Lakota College. But I mean, on average, I don’t know. Some High School. You know.
RA 1:07:37

alright then, And how does that work out? Because that’s, I take it that, what they offer,
well, first let me ask, the high school teaching that’s taught on the rez, is it following the
Euro-American education system? Or is it a combine of Euro-American and indigenous?

Participant 1:07:56

It’s, um

Participant 1:07:58

it was public school stuff for the longest time. And then in the last 20 years or so that’s
getting changed quite a bit. There’s a lot more indigenous things being taught.

RA 1:08:12

Okay, so the, you talked about the college? That is the Lakota College. how’s that, is
that? How is that funded? And how are public and private schools funded presume

you have some on the Rez?

Participant 1:08:27

Um, we have one private school Red Cloud High School, and the rest of them are pretty
much public school funding.

RA 1:08:38

Okay, how was private. How is Red Cloud funded?

Participant 1:08:44

Mostly donations.

RA 1:08:46

And what makes it different from the other ones?
Participant 1:08:51

Well, it used to be a Jesuit School. So it’s got a lot of religion stuff taught in it, and it’s Euro-Western religion for the most part.

RA 1:09:04

And when you said donations for that particular school, what kind of donors are we talking about?

Participant 1:09:10

umm, mostly private. I think they get a little bit of public stuff, too. I mean, grants and things like that.

RA 1:09:19

Okay. Do you know how the schools are structured in terms of how they, how they segment the kids? Do they actually have like a kinder. pre-k? Do they have kids put together like “three to six” grade, to sixth grade? Do you have any idea how that works?

Participant 1:09:36

Yeah, let’s, you know, they divide them into grades.

RA 1:09:41

Individual grades, right?

Participant 1:09:42

Yeah.

RA 1:09:43

Okay. And how are the schools? What, what are the expectations of the schools and what type of curriculum do they have?
Participant 1:10:02
I, I’ve not real deep into that stuff. I mean, it’s pretty much the same thing that’s
Expected from most public schools. Like, *Red Clouds* a little bit more stringent on who
they accept. And I mean, you have to be accepted to go to school there. And the other
ones are same criteria that’s used in any public school.

RA 1:10:31
Okay, do you have any ideas about the curriculum, language or cultural expectations in
the school venues?

Participant 1:10:37
I don’t really.

Participant 1:10:40
We do have this new high school that’s just getting started this year. That’s kind of
based on technical training. And I mean, it’s still up. We haven’t seen any results from it
yet.

RA 1:10:59
who’s bringing it in? Is it a federal funded school? Or is it private? If

Participant 1:11:03
it’s federal? It’s under the

Participant 1:11:08
*County School District?*

RA 1:11:11
Do you know what the delays might be? Or what’s happening? What’s the status of it at
this time?
Participant 1:11:16

Um, they’re, they built a new school, and then the COVID stuff, kind of set it back a little bit. And my daughter’s enrolled in it. And they’re doing most of their stuff online right now.

Participant 1:11:31

And they’re supposed to be open on the second semester, physically open?

RA 1:11:40

How are the school supported by the community?

Participant 1:11:46

Not very well.

Participant 1:11:50

Excuse me,

RA 1:11:51

either by the Reservation itself as an entire, entire nation.

Participant 1:11:56

Yeah, not very well, really. They’re segmented schools, kind of do their own thing. And as long as they meet federal criteria, then they’re allowed to operate.

RA 1:12:10

So there’s no, even though you told me that you’re not familiar with it, but you do have a daughter who goes to school there? What do you know, in terms of, are they teaching anything having to do with indigenous history, indigenous ways, etc? Kind of? Lakota
College does that because of Uncle Wilmer?

RA 1:12:30

Yeah. Uh oh.

Participant 1:12:35

There is, there’s been a lot more interest in that lately.

Participant 1:12:40

In the last few years, so most of them have some sort of a Lakota class.

Participant 1:12:47

And there’s a couple emergent schools on the reservation too, mostly public funded ones. I really don’t know much about them.

RA 1:12:59

Do you know if they’re using computers or have internet accommodations at the schools?

Participant 1:13:05

Yeah, they really stepped that up this year because of the COVID thing.

RA 1:13:09

Okay, so it was up to this year that that actually took off. Is that correct?

Participant 1:13:13

Yeah.

Participant 1:13:16

Like my daughter, she got a, they gave her a school issued computer and a hotspot
Participant 1:13:23
to support the computer so she can get

Participant 1:13:28
anyplace she’s got cell service. She’s got internet access.

RA 1:13:32
Oh, Good. So she’s using her cell phone in order to access internet. By the

Participant 1:13:37
No, they have this thing that’s just a

RA 1:13:40
device.

Participant 1:13:42
Yeah. device.

RA 1:13:43
ok, so she’s Using the device then?

Participant 1:13:45
Yeah, it’s a Bluetooth thing.

Participant 1:13:49
It’s pretty good.

RA 1:13:51
So the reception, connectivity all that’s working out pretty well.

Participant 1:13:56
Yeah, with that designated device seems to work pretty well.
RA 1:14:01

Okay. Um, how

RA 1:14:05

it worked. Better yet, in what ways do you think the schools could be improved?

RA 1:14:11

As a parent, *Lakota*, as an elder,

Participant 1:14:15

there’s a lot. Yeah, I mean, like, if you could figure out a way to go on, because ours is an oral history, and we don’t have a lot of knowledge keepers left. So if we could get, you know, some sort of program that would, you know, help that particular thing, where you can bring youth and elders together more easily. And

Participant 1:14:57

yeah, I think if you could

Participant 1:15:02

create more social setting type things that would help a lot.

RA 1:15:07

that is what You and I have talked about trying to initiate

RA 1:15:10

Is that correct?

Participant 1:15:11

Yeah,
RA 1:15:12

exactly what we’re talking about trying to get that type of a structure set up. Because, do you have something like that, at this time, on the Rez?

Participant 1:15:24

only to a very small degrees. I mean, we have youth activities, or we try to go and connect elders and youth on those things, but they’re pretty intermittent. And there’s no steady funding or steady support for it. And everybody’s broke here. I mean, you got a six to $8,000 income. So how do you actually support that? And then everybody is so far apart because you know, our reservations, 100 miles, but three by 200 miles, and everybody lives, like quite a ways apart. So gas money is a big thing and feeding people when they get there. You know, there’s just a lot to it. logistic wise,

RA 1:16:12

with that in mind, do most people on the Rez own cars?

Participant 1:16:17

Um, yeah, for the most part, but they

Participant 1:16:22

have, keeping those cars running is an issue [laughs].

RA 1:16:25

They’re older cars, rundown cars. And

Participant 1:16:28

yeah.

RA 1:16:29

ok, If parents,
in terms of education,

how are they we related to; how do they feel about education attainment for their own children as a, as a community? What are the expectations that they have for the children?

Participant 1:16:53

I don’t think that’s really defined. That’s each individual family and, 

Participant 1:17:00

and individual, folks.

Participant 1:17:06

I mean, stay out of jail, try to be productive members of society and stay off drugs and things like that. I mean, that’s what many people are aspiring to [laugh].

RA 1:17:21

Okay, so we’re not talking about sending them to college, you’re not talking about Having them complete their education, high school education. Is that correct?

Participant 1:17:29

Yeah, I mean, 

Participant 1:17:33

those, hell, we’re in a survival situation here, we, for the most part. That’s not even really something you can focus on, Yet.

RA 1:17:47

Okay, so you’re saying that,
perhaps, that I just want to make sure I understood you right, that the community is still in survival mode. So therefore, they are not focusing on the educational structures at this time? And the ways they probably might be if they weren’t in survival mode?

**Participant 1:18:06**

Oh, absolutely.

**Participant 1:18:10**

I mean, if you’re worried about how you keeping your house heated, you’re worried about how people are going to eat, how you’re going to get gas to get you from point A to point B. And I mean, 6-8,000 bucks, imagine living on that, not just by yourself, but with an entire family. And just trying to keep propane, electricity on and let alone supplying clothing, food, all the other things. Yeah.

**RA 1:18:41**

When you talk about family, you’re including extended family from what you said earlier, is that correct?

**Participant 1:18:46**

Yeah, cuz mostly homes here, should be,

**Participant 1:18:53**

you know,

**Participant 1:18:55**

they should be burnt down [laugh]
Participant 1:18:58
And so you’re struggling with inefficient structures, overcrowding, lack of basic
nutrition, all of those type of things. And, so like, a lot of things really degenerate into
Participant 1:19:16
survival thinking.
RA 1:19:17
Do You have an idea as a community leader, because I know you’re a community leader
and have been one for quite some time. Do you have any idea about how the children do
in school overall, just as a generalization?
Participant 1:19:42
I mean, no, I can’t really generalize that because some kids really buckle in and see
education as a way out of the situation. And other kids are like “this ain’t gonna do me
any good. I gotta get out and do whatever I need to do to Go and survive and help mom
or dad or, or grandma or whatever”. And they don’t have a lot of interest in it, same
thing as any inner city thing.
RA 1:20:11
So, um, let’s see. How does the community reach consensus on issues impacting them?
Participant 1:20:25
Um,
Participant 1:20:27
there’s not a very good coordination thing on that, because you’ve got council people,
who get elected in, and then whatever their ideas are for that two years as what happens.
And then, then you get some new ones, and then the direction changes. I mean, that’s the
main reason why we created the *Lakota Plan* so that we have this long range, direction for people to go. And consensus is a hard thing.

**RA 1:21:09**

You have *the Lakota Plan*, but no consensus. Is that correct?

**Participant 1:21:15**

Yeah, I mean, *The Lakota plan* is not.

**Participant 1:21:21**

I mean, it was widely based and thought about, but it’s, and it was accepted into, like a directional law, almost. But then you have individuals that are deciding these things on a short term, two year plan.

**RA 1:21:39**

Who wrote the Lakota plan?

**Participant 1:21:45**

I was the original pen on it.

**RA 1:21:48**

And then, Are there any community spots where people gather to talk about things that happen? Or if something happens, where people go right away to meet with others? How does that work?

**Participant 1:22:03**

Can you restate that?

**RA 1:22:05**

Are there any communal spots, places on the *Rez* that people meet when something happens? or some type of uprising or event takes place? And all the community wants to
discuss the matter? Do you have anything like that?

**Participant 1:22:18**

Oh, kind of sort of. I mean, like, they have council meetings, and they put it out on radio and on the internet. And people can watch, and they can call in.

**Participant 1:22:29**

So sort of,

**RA 1:22:31**

Okay, what type of resources are available to the community in terms of those spots? Do they have internet for community use? Do they have a computer’s, scanners? That sort of thing?

**Participant 1:22:45**

Yeah, many do. I mean, there was a big push under the *Obama Administration* to make fiber optic available across reservation and cell phones. But, and most folks have a cell phone. So not everybody,

**Participant 1:23:05**

oh, excuse me

**RA 1:23:05**

no, you go ahead, sorry

**Participant 1:23:06**

not everybody has a cell phone, but most do.

**RA 1:23:11**

I know the Obama phones, as they call them, may have or may not already still be available? What do you know the status on that?
Participant 1:23:21
Um, they’re expiring

Participant 1:23:25
some people have already expired and some of them are expiring, you know, as they progress is, I think the last of them will fade out of existence by a year and a half to two years.

RA 1:23:41
Okay, are there any issues regarding the county facilities, such as water, electricity, and so forth? And I know

Participant 1:23:51
oh yeah, there’s lots in the main, we have one major water line that runs across here and supplying that thing I mean, I got sick drinking off of the RO water system myself. And then electricity is exorbitantly high, true cost through Lake Creek Electric and then you know, reliability on our systems. You get a big storm, lines go down, powers off for days, and

Participant 1:24:30
it’s just typical

Participant 1:24:34
rural living and

Participant 1:24:37
reliability stuff.

RA 1:24:39
Okay, and when someone can’t pay their water bill, or electric bill on the Rez, what is
the procedure for that?

**Participant 1:24:47**

Umm, currently there is no water bill because it came in under federal appropriations. Although they are transitioning into charging for the water. They have meters on all houses. And I imagine they’re just going to be going out and shutting people off.

**RA 1:25:09**

But that’s the bad water you referring to? Is that correct?

**Participant 1:25:12**

Yeah. And some places still have their own wells and things. And as long as they can pay electricity, they still got water.

**RA 1:25:21**

And if they can’t pay electricity, what happens, what is the next step?

**Participant 1:25:25**

all goes off, you can’t put water.

**RA 1:25:26**

The Tribal Council doesn’t help fund anything or work with the companies.

**Participant 1:25:33**

They, their fiscal planning sucks [laugh]

**RA 1:25:39**

How are communal medical issues addressed? someone gets sick, someone’s having a baby, they start to deliver?

**Participant 1:25:46**

Yeah, we have *IHS, Indian Health Services*, which is one of the things that the federal
government has agreed to under the treaties, and It’s public health now. You get arterial bleeding, you get a band aid and, and the ibuprofen kind of thing.

RA 1:26:10

[laugh] Sorry, we’re laughing. It’s just the way you said it? What type of issues are most relevant in terms of these infrastructures, hospitals? electrical, electrical, electrical access, even water access? That’s healthy and free of harmful chemicals? What type of assistance is taking place at the tribal level?

Participant 1:26:49

Not a lot. [laugh]

Participant 1:26:51

No, the tribe doesn’t handle that. So they create programs. And they kind of retain a little bit oversight for them. And those programs keep, create their own operational things.

Participant 1:27:08

Yeah, there’s a lot of problems.

RA 1:27:11

So, um, for the entire reservation,

RA 1:27:16

how is it funded?

Participant 1:27:20

There’s federal appropriated dollars, that come down by population is like, you have Indian money. So the annuities that they owe us for retiring from the battlefield.
Participant 1:27:37

You know, these are concessions the United States pays

Participant 1:27:42

for us, letting them use our lands. So it’s basically rent, and each individual Indian is eligible for X amount of dollars per year.

Participant 1:27:56

And that goes through, by census, and then that

Participant 1:28:01

dictates how many dollars are handed down to the tribe. And then they operate within their Parameters that financial structure. And there’s no taxes generated, to run things, Because, you know, all that tax base in our territory is supposed to cede to us and the taxes that are generated and then like, the mining and all the other things that they take from our lands because like our territories that run you know, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, Montana, all the way down to Mankato, Minnesota is the food territory. And all of the tax base off all of those lands is supposed to cede to the various tribes of the akicita\textsuperscript{334}, and the allies too Cheyenne and Arapaho. But the federal government holds those monies in trust, and they only issue out the basic subsistence levels of each individual Indigenous person, So we’re operating on like a very small portion of what our debt capital is generating.

RA 1:29:23

How do those monies trickle down to community members, so they get checks or how does that work?

\textsuperscript{334} “Lakota” for warrior, according to Deans.
Participant 1:29:28

no, their services

Participant 1:29:32

that the actual individual Indians don’t get [laugh]. You can get commodities and EBT and then that turns into these white folks saying that, you know, they’re all living off welfare. No, we’re living off of our rent. Excuse the French, but and you owe a lot more rent than what You’re paying, you’re only paying like a very small portion, and the federal government’s holding on to the rest of our assets, because they are our guardians. So they don’t think we’re smart enough, you know, we’re wards of the state, and they don’t think that we are capable of running our own affairs. And,

Participant 1:30:27

you know, we have to cast off that

Participant 1:30:30

Guardianship, we have to take ourselves out of wardship. And then, you know, all those monies that are sitting in our bank accounts in Washington DC, get seeded out on people’s

RA 1:30:44

does that? Sorry, you want to say more?

Participant 1:30:49

No, that’s good [laugh]

RA 1:30:52

I was gonna ask you about the money for the *Black Hills.*
Participant 1:30:55

*The Black Hills* is actually a very small piece of the claim. We’ve won that. And but our guardian is telling us we have to take the money and we’re saying, No, we don’t. That’s our land, we don’t have to take that money, you owe us other monies, from back pays and ☐ like that. We don’t have to sell nothing. You’re our guardian but you are not us. So like, if you have a child that you are the guardian for, and they receive an income from the state, you deal out a, allowance. And then there’s this rule cash thing that they can do, and you tell them they have to sell this or sell that.

Participant 1:31:51

You don’t have to. I mean,

Participant 1:31:56

those monies are won, they’re set aside, but we’re not taking it as a purchase of *The Black Hills*. None of our land is for sale. I mean, this is our land under allodial title,\(^{335}\) which is under God. And it predates anything Euro-westerns have established. And we don’t have to go on & let our guardian dictate the terms of our dealings.

RA 1:32:27

Okay, so next question. And final question for this particular interview. What type of immediate issues are of concern to the community? The most, perhaps, the top two or three?

\(^{335}\) An **allodial title** is a “real property ownership system where the real property is owed free and clear of any superior landlord. In this case, the owner will have an absolute title over his or her property. Property owned under *allodial title* is referred as *allodial land.*” Source: [https://definitions.uslegal.com/a/allodial-title/](https://definitions.uslegal.com/a/allodial-title/)
Participant 1:32:41

Um, acid Leach mining\(^{336}\) they’re trying to do it in the Black Hills? Because that affects the entire Upper Right Brea.

Participant 1:32:54

Water shed?

RA 1:32:58

Okay. Yeah.

Participant 1:33:01

I mean, so it’s the largest freshwater deposit in the nation. And almost all of it is under Lakota, Dakota, Nakota lands. And it’s a complete violation of their guardianship. And it gives us cause to revoke that guardianship. Okay, that’s one of the largest. Then there’s the pipelines, which is also a water issue. Because if they destroy our water reserves, then this land becomes uninhabitable for anybody. And, so those are the two largest and the, the other things are this constant encroachment on our rights as, because we’re the true landlords, we didn’t lose our wars, we won them. And we paid for it in blood. But so, um, but since there’s so many more white people, and they have the biggest guns, and they have the planes and the bombs and tanks and things like that, they think they can dictate terms to us. But those are two completely different issues. They just keep running over us and our rights to our ownership of our lands and our territory.

And these usury deeds, you know, people think the citizens of the United States

government think that they own land, but they don’t. They have a user deed that’s been assigned to them by the federal government. That’s why they pay taxes which is rent to us. Now we are the true landlords of this land. Now if we take ourselves out of this guardianship Ward, thing the land still cedes to us, the true ownership cedes back to the indigenous peoples of this area. And so those are like the major things that we have to contend with right now.

RA 1:35:14

So, um, this is just another this is no longer on those last few personal question as, as a native man.

RA 1:35:23

How do you

RA 1:35:25

with what you just said? How do you negotiate all that? And this idea of being American and this idea of democracy in the greatest country in the world, and yet living on a reservation with some challenges, some serious challenges, including the pipeline’s you’re talking about?

Participant 1:35:42

Well, it, in the relationship

Participant 1:35:48

that was established under the honchos, the chiefs of the people way back when, all right, we knew we were being overrun by these white people coming out of the East. And we knew we couldn’t win another war after this. So the Chiefs went to the negotiating table. And they said, we’ll quit warring. But we need a reserve, where white people can’t come and kill us at random. That’s why it’s called a reservation, it was
reserved for so occupancy of indigenous people. And that was to keep our people safe.
And then they also negotiated to educate the children. So we agreed to that also. Now,
we did understand, like the Constitution of the United States when we agreed with it to
some degree. And, so, in our honor bound negotiations with the United States,

Participant 1:36:56

we

Participant 1:36:58

agreed to a relationship kind of like the big brother, younger brother is coming up, and
he’s wanting to take over things. So we just took on a mentorship role to these white
people. And we supported the constitution to some degree, because, you know, there’s
so many people coming. And we have to learn how to get along and blah, blah, blah,
you know, but we often knew that we had to protect our own way of life, and so we had
to educate our youth. And so the way we see it is, like that relationship between an older
brother and a younger sibling, and we had a responsibility to teach that

RA 1:37:44

the Lakota Nation being the mentor and then the whites being the mentee?

Participant 1:37:50

Yep.

Participant 1:37:51

And so we still fielded warriors to go to war, to kind of keep it keep an eye on that stuff
and make sure that it wasn’t unjust, and so on and so forth. And

Participant 1:38:08

but, I mean,
Participant 1:38:10
sometimes,

Participant 1:38:14
little brother becomes a monster.

Participant 1:38:17
And you have to do something about that. So that’s kind of what we’re coming to.

RA 1:38:24
And then, finally, Bryan, just again, another personal question. You don’t have to
answer it. But you did say you served in the military for I think it was eight years. How
do you negotiate with that being a *Lakota* man

Participant 1:38:37
with that same, same thing we had, I had a responsibility, I fulfilled that responsibility.
And now it’s something, it’s time to do something about the wrongs of this nation is, is
committing on

Participant 1:38:51
all the other brown peoples of the world.

RA 1:38:54
What would be a positive constructive way to address these, these histories, these
injustices, etc?

Participant 1:39:04
Well, I mean,
Participant 1:39:07

this nation has been operating on stolen land for so long. They just think that that they can get away with it. You know, they’ve had all the resources for so long. And they’re perpetrating the same kind of extraction economy on the entire world, any other indigenous or people of color around the world, whether it’s, you know, the Afghans or

Participant 1:39:44

Oman desert, or

Participant 1:39:48

these, or so many examples of them, expressing might on smaller nations.

Participant 1:39:56

I mean,

Participant 1:40:00

To put those resources back in the hands of the people who truly own them and truly understand how to do them, and to bring some harmony back to things instead of just this extractive mindset all the time. And then how can we give back to more than just putting money in some old white guys account?

RA 1:40:28

Yeah. So when you did go to the military, Bryan, what was the impetus for you doing so? So what’s the reason you did it? pushed you to do it?

Participant 1:40:37

Um,

Participant 1:40:41

probably, you know, we’ve had warriors and every armed conflict, and that’s ever
happened since we agreed to

Participant 1:40:54

retire from the battlefield.

Participant 1:40:57

And I had uncles and my father, who was a Bronze Star winner, and my uncle was a multiple Purple Heart winner, and so probably family history.

RA 1:41:18

Okay, it wasn’t anything else. Nothing. Nothing happened or anything like that.

Participant 1:41:24

No, I mean, I volunteered when the first Gulf happened. We knew it was precipitating. I volunteered at that time. That’s just like when you’re young and dumb, going to war seems pretty exciting.

RA 1:41:39

[laugh] Okay, that’s the end of the questionnaire here. For now, this is really what I needed just to kind of, because it’s the script I was supposed to use. So thanks so much. And I’m sorry it took so long.

RA 1:41:54

I owe you a big one.

Participant 1:41:56

All right. All right. Thank you.

RA 1:41:59

All right. Have a good one. We’ll talk soon.
Participant 1:42:02

ok,

RA 1:42:02

All right. Take care. Bye.

Bryan Interview 10.03.20
4.11 Third DRM Component, Communal Collaboratives

In the following section, according to the DRM paradigm, the third objective of the paradigm requires that the research-advocate be responsible for bringing-in to the participant community third-parties, and/or external parties in order to facilitate the needs of the community respective to the collaborative work being undertaken. This can include third parties; monies, grant opportunities, educational/internship opportunities; doing additional work in support of the collaborative, as agreed upon between the participant community and the research-advocate, etc.… In short, what is required is a communal collaborative that benefits the work partnered on. The following section addresses the third DRM objective

Initiative I: Funding

- Hiring a full-time program coordinator/planner
- Hiring a part-time IT Webmaster
- Addressing monthly website upkeep fees
- Addressing monthly “incidentals” budget needs, i.e., fuel costs and other services
- Expanding garden hubs to the northern half of Pine Ridge reservation
- Hosting nature connection / wilderness camp(s) for Lakota youth & families
- Implementation of the OLCERI Food/Bus Program: on-site bus for delivery of healthy, tribally-grown, food staples, and for necessary travel on Rez for community events, such as tribal meetings, voting, etc.…

Response

As research collaborator, I have become a member of the OLCERI team. In fact, in the fall of 2019, I was asked to become an OLCERI Board member on the condition that I would serve for a minimal of three years, which I have committed myself to since then. As
such, we have applied for three grant opportunities. To this day we have not been awarded any large grant from a non-traditional source. Our work in this regard is a continued, collaborative effort.

Since partnering up with OLCERI in 2016-17, I have served as a researcher and grant writing assistant, a “jack” of all types. Typical of the Lakota approach to living in Wolakota, to live in a good way, all work with OLCERI is a joint collaborative effort, so we will continue to apply for additional grants. There are specific mandates the OLCERI organization now focuses on, one is that we no longer work with the Wašiču’s institutions. We are, now, pursuing grant opportunities with private funders, tribal entities and institutions, and through non-traditional means. This is a relatively new approach, but there are significant reasons for this going back to some of the subjects I have addressed throughout this work dealing specifically with this imbalance power structures when joining-up with the Wašiču. Henceforth, funding collaboratives will, only, be with private donors, tribal entities, and through non-traditional means.

What I have offered-up, additionally, are business plans for OLCERI’s consideration. In the proceeding page is an example of one. The idea behind the business models is to create small, potential, economic packages that will sustain OLCERI costs up until we have entered into a fruitful grant opportunity. To be clear, just because I write them up doesn’t mean they will be used. The ideal behind the DRM paradigm is to allow the participant community to “call the shots”, “lead the way”, and “set the bar.” Nevertheless, the proceeding business plan was offered-up to Deans and the Board, before I became a member of the Board, in order to cover the costs of our website, phone, gas costs, as well as to financially compensate our Webmaster for the work he does for our organization. Again, this is one example of the
innovative ways we attempt to raise monies. *OLCERI* has other means, including film venues, and product sharing with other private entities. In the meantime, once I have accomplished dissertation work, I will be refocusing on larger non-traditional grant opps.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bags</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount Ordered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price per bag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Price</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping &amp; Handling Cost for Bags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total S/H Price</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Bag Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shipping & Handling Equipment Fees**

| Equipment Fees |  |
| **Total Price** |  |

**Order Processor Stipend (One-time, Temporary Cost)**

| 1st time Fee to be paid to mail order processor |  |
| **Total Price** |  |

**Grand Total Sums**

---

---

---
Initiative II: “Warrior/Brave—In’a/Hunk’chola/ Maiden Program” & Indigenous Socio-Cultural Justice Program

- Implementing Oglala Lakota anti-hate/racism initiative with local college/public schools
- Addressing continued budget needs for completing construction of the Indigenous Wisdom Center
- Creation, and first-steps” of the yearly “Warrior/Brave—In’a/Hunk’chola/ Maiden Program”

Through OLCERI’s collaboration with public schools and tribal colleges, OLCERI aims to send 5-6 Lakota youth to sustainable building training with Mike Reynolds in Taos, New Mexico. Reynold’s is considered the leading expert on Earthship building, self-sustainability practices, and creating eco-friendly human habitats, we will be pursuing a collaboration with Reynolds in this regard.

Response

Back in 2018-19, we were able to get Bryan into one of Reynold’s summer sessions as a scholarship opportunity. The idea behind this was to open a door for a potential internship exchange with Reynold’s school, one in which we would, eventually, have a space
for sending Native students to Reynolds for intensive work and knowledge-gleaning in the area of cutting-edge, self-sustainable practices. Although Bryan, and several of the Board members have expertise in this area, we are always seeking out newer and more expansive practices, especially since Deans decided he wanted OLCERI ‘s Lakota Plan to go global.

As such, we are attempting to better understand a variety of climatic and environmental approaches to global self-sustainability practices, unlike the ones we are currently familiar with. Unfortunately, at the time, Bryan became deathly ill from bad water he drank while attending a peaceful, protest on behalf of Native water rights. Bryan became so ill from the bad water that he spent a week in ICU and, once out of the hospital, underwent a recovery period of almost 3-5 months. We intend to return to this, post COVID 19. My intent is to join the OLCERI representatives at Reynold’s school in the near future, and to do so via a group scholarship opportunity. Again, this is contingent on the outcome of the world order relative to COVID-19.

The other matter is specific to the “Warrior/Brave—In’a/Hunk’chola/ Maiden Program” which has been temporarily been halted due to the COVID19 pandemic. Pre-COVID 19, under Bryan’s leadership, we will be connecting with the Oglala Lakota College in order to present our package to them so that they can take the lead on this. Similar to how the UTEP Mother/Daughter-Father/Son Program works, we will be modeling our program based on that model. Consequently, we were able to recruit Dr. Josefina Villamil as one of our advisors, specific to this particular project. In retrospect, it is just amazing how much the virus has impacted our work, as I am sure is the case for all educators. Still, the ideas are, temporarily, on hold, as they are for UTEP’s Mother/Daughter-Father/Son Program. We believe that with Tinajero’s experience and cultural/linguistic expertise, that we will be able to facilitate in the
setting-up of this program, recognizing that Native culture and tradition responds best from within, as opposed to externally. The program is a Native program and will require Native accommodation.

Language Repatriation

Another request made on behalf of OLCERI was that I assist in locating a much-valued and sought-after set of Edison Disc Recordings\textsuperscript{337} that held 19\textsuperscript{th} Century Lakota language recordings that had been recorded by Lakota ancestors in their attempt to preserve the language, songs, and oral histories for later Lakota generations. As discussed in Kent’s 2016 

\textit{Lakota Country Times} article, titled, \textit{“Audio Artifacts Returned To The Oglala”}:

The first recordings were created in 1896 by Alice Cunningham Fletcher,” Chu explained. “She made them in Washington, D.C. And the purpose was to record and preserve the sounds of the people. Those recordings were of sacred music that was created by an Oglala Lakota Sundance singer named Thunder Bear.” A second set of audio artifacts were created during World War Two. “About 8 hours of recordings that were made by Willard Rhodes here on the Pine Ridge Reservation between 1941 to about 1947,” commented Chu. These recordings include secular music, noted Chairman Chu, and were accompanied by photographs and journal writings that reflect the lives of the Oglala Lakota during that time period.

Considered almost sacred, understandably, Wilmer had told Bryan about them many years back, and Wilmer, before his death, had asked Bryan to find them and bring them back home. Originally, I was told that the Smithsonian in DC had them. Upon several phone calls, emails, online searches, I was able to ascertain that the discs had been returned to OLC. These types of wins fuel Lakota well-being. Once I found the information, was able to substantiate it, I forwarded the findings to Bryan/the Board for their use.

\textsuperscript{337} For Further See: \textit{Lakota Country Times}: “Audio Artifacts Returned To The Oglala,” Kent, J.. (October 20, 2016). Direct URL Link: https://www.lakotatimes.com/articles/audio-artifacts-returned-to-the-oglala/
The OLCERI-Charlie Clark Partnership

Initiative III: Pine Ridge Housing Project

- Continued development and implementation of the Sustainable-Housing, Eco-friendly, Demonstration Sites (SHEDS)
- Producing the Fourth Annual Indigenous Wisdom & Permaculture Skills Convergence, (open to the public)

Response

In early Spring of 2020, the first news about a virus originating in China first began appearing on US national news station. Originally referred to as the “Corona” virus, some Americans joked about it by referring to it as something that they had already had, i.e., “Corona Beer,” a Mexican produced beer”. While an inept president joked about it, blamed it on the Democrats, and assured a, once, powerful nation that it would not impact the US, and “that it would go away, just like that.”

At the time, Americans were being misinformed, lied to, undermined, and, repeatedly, negligently, assured by their president\textsuperscript{338} and his administration that all would be well relative to the arrival of COVID19 to the US. It was not. To the contrary, the country’s current state of chaos, dramatic economic downfall, race riots, and constant division, have, now, become a new “America” under the Trump presidency—not to mention the needless deaths that have resulted as a consequence of so many failures from the Trump administration relative to the rapid spread of the virus. In fact, the US leads the world, once again, but in the number of cases and deaths consequential of Trump’s irreverence and his intentional downplaying of the deadly, and powerful, nature of the virulent virus.

It will be later released by Bob Woodward, a highly respected investigative journalist who is considered one of the world’s leading “reliable” journalists, and is a famed author for work he has done in which truth collides with the political messages DC constantly emits, that Trump was made aware of the serious and deadly nature of the virus in early January of 2020, and, still, Trump politicized it to the high cost of needless human loss. This is how the Wašiču operates, over and over, and over again...

Woodward is also the associate editor of the Washington Post whose leadership at the Post has been essential, especially so, after the Khashoggi murder. Woodward’s most recent bestseller titled, Fear, Trump in the White House (2020) was published using a series of recorded conversations between Woodward and Trump, that Trump agreed to but will later deny happened. Incredible. In one of the conversations, Trump is clearly heard stating, “goes through air, Bob. That’s always tougher than the touch. You know, the touch - you don’t have to touch things, right? But the air, you just breathe the air. That’s how it’s passed. And so that’s a very tricky one. That’s a very delicate one. It’s also more deadly than your - you know, your - even your strenuous flus.” All this significant knowledge about the virus, handed down to him by scientist and his political staffers, while he continued to downplay the virus and show his disdain against the science, and against Americans, about the virus by refusing to wear a mask, which is considered one, potentially, a viable way to avoid direct transmission.

339 Khashoggi was a Washington Post Report murdered by a Saudi-backed hit squad of which Trump has played down, as acknowledged in the Woodward recordings.


In a *National Public Radio (NPR)* podcast interview with Steve Innskeep, Rachel Martin states the following:

Several times during the Trump administration, a whistleblower has accused the president of wrongdoing. This time, in effect, the whistleblower is the president himself. Recordings show he said one thing on TV and another off camera. He made misleading claims about the pandemic, a life-or-death matter affecting almost every American.

One only need to watch any news station, with the exception of *FOX News*, to witness, via Trumps’ speeches, news conferences, rally talk, and in interviews, that he lies, back and forth, forward and back. “Real power is, I don’t even want to use the word, *fear*.”

**OLCERI**, like everyone else in the US, Christian, Jew, immigrant, migrant, citizen, corporate leader, politician, schoolteacher, and, now, even president, now, *lives in fear* of what can happen when the virus touches your community. For a community like *Pine Ridge*, that fear is warranted. With a population demographic of 2% that continues to dwindle, as already discussed, any sensible human that cares about human life, no matter where it comes from or where it might be located at, recognizes the implications of a newly arrived virus in their home spaces. Especially so, when we re-examine this way too long dissertation.

Aside of the lasting ramifications of the virus on humanity, both for the living and those who have passed on because of it; the virus has changed human existence, even in “America the Great”. Under Trump’s fake mantra, “*Make America Great Again*,” which his sappy cult followers wear proudly, along with their other cheap, “Made in China”, red-colored, synthetic Trump gear, which is, generally, a message board of sorts delivering messages such

---

as, “God gave us Jesus, Trump gives us Hope,” or “Thank you, Russia!”, what is beyond clear is that the US has lost its way and is now paying, dearly, for that costly indiscretion.

For OLCERI, so far, we have managed to avoid the final outcome of the virus, but it has impacted us in ways in which we find ourselves trying to figure out next steps. We were unable to host Convergence in 2020 because of the virus. Moreover, we do not have enough people “on Rez” to help with the work started by Bryan decades ago. Moreover, the entire country is no longer sure of where it is going, consequential of the Trump administration.

Still, under all these circumstances, OLCERI has continued to move forward, in spite of the challenges. One of the matters I facilitated, on behalf of OLCERI, was the introduction of a gentleman named Charlie Clark to our organization. Clark is from Harlingen, Texas and is also the head of the leading US Nissan dealership. A gentleman who is easy to spot a mile away because he is so vivacious and exudes positive energy in abundance; unbeknownst to many, Clark is also a follower of ancient and sacred Indigenous practices specific to “conscious-raising” and spirituality. As such, he was delivered an important message from the Great Creator.

By means of the ancestors, Charlie received a message so powerful, given to him by a Lakota grandmother, in which she pleads with him to “help her people.” Consequently, Clark has pledged to help OLCERI in ways not fully developed but has shown his commitment to our organization when he donated 8.4 M dollars on a 14 M dollar project. The “wood” project facilitated OLCERI’s purchasing of freshly cut tall trees. This purchase served the Pine Ridge Community in two major ways; first, it provided wood for burning in order to keep homes warm during the cold, early months of the year.
As already discussed, many Pine Ridge homes do not have electricity, so it is not uncommon for community members to use wood to keep their homes warm. At the same time the mega-tall trees will also serve in the continued building of the OLCERI Wisdom Center. The Wisdom Center is where OLCERI will host events such as the “Warrior/Brave—In’a/Hunk’chola/ Maiden Program”, as well as, hopefully, future Convergence events. It will also serve for teaching, community building, and even house people (community/members and visitors to the OLCERI community). It will be the indoor space for what OLCERI has been conducting outdoors.

There is much work to do, and little time to do it in, so, we anticipate the completion of the Center in order to establish some of the OLCERI program initiatives, as well as to continue the work they do. On our wood project, aside of Charlie Clark, we would like to thank Tiyospaye Winyan Maka,\textsuperscript{343} the Disaster Mutual Fund,\textsuperscript{344} and Food Not Bombs\textsuperscript{345} for their continued support and generosity in our work on Pine Ridge. What is continuously demonstrated on Pine Ridge in spite of the hardships, heart breaks, environmental, psychological, emotional, physical, economic trauma the tribe has sustained as a consequence of the advent of Whites to the continent; as Aude discusses in her 2017 work, is ReZilience. At OLCERI, this is what it looks like.

\textsuperscript{343} For Furthers See: Tiyospaye Winyan Maka Website, Direct URL Link: https://www.tiyospayewinyanmaka.org/about-us.
\textsuperscript{345} For Furthers See: Food Not Bombs Website, Direct URL Link: http://foodnotbombs.net/new_site/.
5.0 Introduction

Many years ago, while sitting in on a master-level linguistics course housed in the comfortable, air-conditioned, but outdated, classroom of a highly “Hispanic-Serving” institution of “higher” learning, located somewhere in the “badlands” of the Southwest US Borderlands; while listening-in on a lecture about how language develops, how it changes, factors that change it, and how it, sometimes, dies-out; it hit me like a bolt of lightning, this happens to people too!! The polite terms used for this phenomenon in linguistics is synchronic and diachronic, of which I have already discussed sufficiently throughout this work in earlier chapters.

As a critical race theorist and a political science major with strong liberal ideals rooted in the belief of the importance of education, ideals surrounding “goodness,” fairness, and justice, this made perfect sense. I had reached a point in the academy that I felt that, intellectually, it was “too White,” despite of the fact that I was sitting in a classroom wherein the majority of students were of “Hispanic” genetic ancestry. They are different, “this place” is different, in spite of the consumerism and capitalism that was beginning to divide and conquer.

---


Source: Library of Congress, Grabill Collection: "consists of one ninety-three items, of which one hundred and eighty-eight are photographs. The collection was sent by John C.H. Grabill to the Library of Congress in DC for copyright protection between 1887 and 1892, according to the Library of Congress Website.
even, from within. There has always been a sense of “Indigenous” collectivity, which is common amongst colonized spaces. It is there, in that place where the sun’s rays are so strong we never sleep. Different, yes; so much so, that a rampage shooter will select this place to go “hunting” for “Mexicans.”

It is within this setting that I begin to consider the problem of Indigeneity in a country seeded in racism, an issue that goes back to the very beginning of its inception and is first intended for “Injuns” and “slaves”. Later, it will be aimed at “stupid chinks”, “stinky jews” and “dirty, lazy, mez’icans,” as their “manifest” deems them free to move out westward without any fear. Afterall, “Real power is, I don’t even want to use the word, fear.” I refer to this phenomenon as the “Paradoxical Conception of Colonial Collectivity,” (PCCC), meaning, is it really possible to have equality in a country so steeped in Whiteness? Collectivity infers that a republics citizenry functions as “one”, despite the diversity it holds from within.

A country that has, historically, sided with Whiteness, in spite of their delusional argument that the US is the “land of the free” is extremely problematic to deconstruct, especially so, when there is so much, intentional, blockage from all sides of the argument, both from within the academy and outside of it. One such blockage is racism, then there’s nationalism, followed by the now old “phenomenon of Trump,” who boldly stated back in 2016, after announcing his run for the presidency, that he could shoot someone on 5th Avenue and get away with it. This, from the leader of the country with the strongest military, the deadliest bombs?

The other PCCC centers on this idea of religiosity, a shot in the arm of religion for US Christian evangelist, who are some of Trump’s most consistent supporters, in terms of

variables. They are, also, mostly White. For the US, especially now under Trump’s regime, Christianity no longer makes sense, even to the scholar who studies it. To the contrary, under the Trump Regime, Christianity has become very, un-Christ-like, focusing on money, lies, meanness, revenge, and GIGANTIC-sized hypocrisy. A misnomer for the true teaching of the Christ, who when asked, “Master, what is the greatest commandment given by God, the Father”? The Prince of Peace responded: “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind,” before also paraphrasing a second passage; “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.”

The academic expectation is that a republic that calls itself a “democracy” allows for this work to challenge that faulty standing. Furthermore, it is the responsibility of the colleges, universities, academies, researchers, teachers, instructors, professors, etc… to address the inequities and to bring them to the attention of the legislative, whether through voting, or petitioning our grievances. However, it cannot work if people, especially the latter mentioned groups, continue to remain ignorant, silent, passive, and dumbed-down. Let’s not even go with the “Christian” thingy that has now morphed out of control, under the Trump regime. It is in this way that the DRM framework, potentially, breathes life to education and the US institutions that have played a long-lasting, and significant role in the oppression and marginalization of Natives and people of color. Why go there? Because the US is supposed to be a democratic system of government that promotes equality for all, even if it just written on paper. Academics, educators, researchers, etc… it is our responsibility to bring light and a semblance of truth to the subjects we teach across the board.
5.1 State the Research Problem

The need to create this paradigm, DRM, is a definitive outcome of those and similar early life experiences. Why focus on the Indigenous and marginalized? Because these are the groups most burdened with a long list of repeated injustices and unethical policy/legislation aimed, deliberately, against them by the White, Euro-American status quo members, the power holders of US government, post-16-17th Century. Even now they continue to wield the scepter of power. With the arrival of the first Europeans on the “American” continent, the process of seeding colonization will be given birth. Under this guise, re-found religiosity, and Euro-American education systems, as well as the institutions that comprise a government system, will all follow suit in oppressing, suppressing, and marginalizing these groups. Drastic changes commence for the Natives of this continent at the setting of the first, European footprint on this continent, and, it will, in the end, begin the process of devastation and great-loss for the Indigenous, which I refer to as diachronization.

As I read more, learned more, and continued in the quest to put the pieces together; in due course, I will come to understand that the inadequacies in democracy that float around carelessly in the United States—if only we dare notice them—were never there for some groups; while, always, there for others. Frankly, it is easier and more comfortable to remain ignorant and inactive. Complicit and compliant. Within that context, ignorance really is bliss. Instead, I have chosen the rougher path. This work serves as proof of that fact.

Secondly, after having read countless history books, US Federal Indian Law books, journal articles, etc… dealing with the “continental American,” Native experience, it remained indisputable that the socio-cultural issues associated with the US, historically, are entrenched, and drenched, in racism and sexism, as well as White privilege. I need not go on
with this. With these two main boxes in check, all else falls into place, i.e., White land-grab, degradation of the Natives, all other life (the plants, animals), and the, once, plentiful, natural resources of the continent, all will be diachronized, almost to the point of extinction, as in the case of the US Native and that majestic, sacred beast dear to the Lakota, the buffalo.

Consequently, left drained and bothered by these facts, the need for renewed, healthier, research methods, specifically for work with Indigenous and marginalized communities is recognized and given birth. In this dissertation I have formulated a Hypothesis centering on all this, is there a better way to do research with Natives and marginalized community members that steps away from White, Euro-American methodologies? After my introduction and work with OLCERI, the answer is a resounding yes, to the degree that I have committed the next two years of my life to our work together.
5.2 Chapter Overview and Chapter Review

Chapter one of this work introduces the DRM framework to the reader by focusing the argument made under the introduction for this section of the work. I contend that the academy, historically, has contributed to an imbalanced worldview of Natives when research is conducted applying traditional quantitative methods. Arguing that such an approach fails to include the diachronizational history of an Indigenous community; consequently, chapter one will discuss the need for the development of a new research paradigm, specific to research work respective of Indigenous and marginalized populations. That is the purpose of the study, this dissertation, to apply the DRM framework and assess how application of it transpires. The significance of the study will be determined by the outcome of the research collaborative. The chapter ends by proposing a new view to research, one that acknowledges the impact of colonization in data, and in real life. Hence, the research question centers on whether the DRM framework will be effective, or not.

Chapter Two: Review of the literature

Chapter two of this work discusses, to a robust degree, the ethical issues surrounding White, Euro-American research traditions when that methodology is applied to colonized population communities. Amongst the multitude of concerns in this regard, I apply three specific arguments to the chapter discourse, as follows:

Paradigm 1: A Critique of Traditional Research Methods & the Scientific Method: Western Epistemology will be presented as a faulty “cultural broker” for work with Indigenous/marginalized populations specific to educational research initiatives.
Paradigm 2: A Review of the Literature Specific to Research Methods: DRM will be presented as a judicious research paradigm that incorporates Indigenous Research Methods that focus on the needs of the tribal/marginalized community partnership.

Paradigm 3: The Impact of Colonization: History, Cultural Trauma, & Continued Issues of Power. The DRM model will address the Native experience appropriately, and from the community’s perspective.

Discussion on the Development of Instruments Applied for Data Collection

The first paradigm centers on the ideas of a Western, Euro-American centrist epistemology when applied to non-Europeans, as in the case of Native peoples and marginalized groups. Other methodological issues surround the problem of the impact of colonization on Indigenous and marginalized population groups, which I argue is a history that is not addressed in the research, in the literature, in the academy, and in US university teacher programs located throughout the country, and abroad. Instead, that history is deliberately negated, or swept aside. I also contend that the field of Indigenous research studies demands the respect and consideration worthy of acknowledgement in these traditional mediums.

A vast majority of the lack of equilibrium in these areas attests to the power struggles that continue in the US. Even so in the academy. As such, US colonial history undermines the impact, the validity and legitimacy of the colonial experience for Natives and marginalized communities, something that I argue skews the research in ways not addressed currently in research. This transfers to the literature, and within traditional quantitative methodologies, as well as in US teacher prep programs. This debilitates democracy, the respective groups, and, even, truth, because the truth is embedded in that history, which is a long, long story of taking, stealing, killing, and oppressing Natives and other marginalized
population groups (Rossatto, Valles & et al, 2020; Tuhiwai Smith, 2012). And, it has been conducted without any type of trepidation on the part of the colonizers. Instead, the academy, public schools, teacher prep programs accommodate it in their textbooks, curriculum, and lesson plans, even within the spaces it has repressed (Rossatto, Valles & et al, 2020; Tuhiwai Smith, 2012).

Also discussed in chapter two of this work is the cultural trauma and issues of power that circumvent from that history and how these have impacted, and continue to impact, Native and marginalized populations. Again, this is something not fully discussed in the literature, or at the least, discussed to the degree required. As such, I argue that these particular factors contribute to the type of phenomenon the data tells us transpires on US reservations. In essence, researchers know the problems are there, but are not informed, to a necessary degree, as to why these data sets tell the type of stories that they do. Instead, researchers, academics, the literature, and teacher prep programs must bring it to the forefront of education in order to face it, contend and reckon with it, then dismantle it (Rossatto, Valles & et al, 2020; Tuhiwai Smith, 2012).

Also, briefly discussed in chapter two is the matter of whether the DRM framework is centered on gender equity as a part of the framework. The answer to that is no, unless it is called upon by the participant group. Instead, DRM advocates that each tribe/community will be unique unto itself, and that the issues of gender equality must be recognized as cultural factors respective to each participant community. I explain that this is necessary to consider, otherwise the framework can be used to further undermine Native/marginalized communities further, which is something the framework mandates cannot happen.
Operationalization: Re-Defining Traditional Quantitative Research Variables

In chapter three, what is addressed is the DRM framework itself and how it is supposed to be used. Although the chapter offers a “DRM Package” for use for novice researchers, it is an optional choice. What is significant about the chapter is that discusses the three objectives, which center on the nine tenets. The three objectives are as follows:

1.) The use of quantitative data in the research design provided by the research community upon acceptance of the research-advocate collaborative
2.) The addressing of the colonial/post-colonial experience within the body of the research report, and in any future publications related to the research project written by the research-advocate, incorporating the perspective/history of the partner community
3.) The incorporation of a third-party external partnership through a grant, institutional collaborative, or private funders that is agreed upon by the community partner and/or community leader/s. The collaborative should attempt to address the research subject as specified by the community. Additionally, the research advocate will address and adhere to the community’s instructions specific to the initiative.

The nine DRM tenets are fully discussed in chapter three. In essence, they do not allow for “objectifying”, nor does they adhere, or advocate, for Euro-American conceptions surrounding time, ontology, epistemology, axiology, and/or, other Euro-American constructs, either socio-cultural or economic. The distinctions between the two standpoints must be recognized and a fundamental part of the DRM framework.

Chapter Four Overview: Establishing a Research Collaborative

Chapter four is the application of the DRM framework to the research collaborative. In this particular instance, that collaborative is with the OLCERI group of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation located in South Dakota. The collaborative included the DRM framework into the work we undertook, which is work that continues and I have committed myself to when I was invited to join the OLCERI Board of Director panel, which I accepted.
The focus of the collaborative centers on the promotion of servant leadership, the concepts of Wicozani, meaning, “to live in harmony with nature and with others”. Also, and just as important are the concepts behind 7/7/300, which center on the following ideograph, which is designed on the Lakota teachings of five basic needs of life, which are, food; fire; water; shelter; and earth. As taught by the Lakota, and OLCERI, when these basic needs are met, then consciousness is raised.

Also referred to actualization, for an individual to actualize one must become “self-aware” in order to achieve Lakota spirituality. Self-actualization is a consequence of being able to support one-self, and their tiyospaye. For a community like Pine Ridge, this model serves as a viable means to better understand the types of phenomenon that take place on the Rez, many of which have been glanced over in this work.

Adherence to the 7/7/300 leads to “Wolakota,” meaning, to live in a good way, which is the outcome all peoples should be allowed. Tragically, this has not been the case for many Lakota, and for the Indigenous people of the world. Still, OLCERI and its supporters, Native and non-Native alike, are convinced that his is doable; however, we DO recognize the enormity of the phenomenon. This does not stop us from doing what must be done, it just impedes our progress, for the time being.

Finding a Home & Data Collection

In retrospect, the most challenging aspect of the DRM Paradigm was finding a home site, which will be difficult for non-Natives to do. I have already gone into why this might be so. In the end, I ended up learning to respect and honor this fact. In this way, DRM’s flexibility facilitated a non-traditional collaborative that was on the Rez, but wasn’t a part of the tribal council, or any other official segment of the Reservation. Such a predicament would have
required more stringent federal procedural policies to be followed, as is the case for all research work with US Natives. It is because of this that I was able to receive an IRB exemption from my university for my work with OLCERI. The fact that I was welcomed by OLCERI was a result of the Creator, and the ancestors, creating the nexus points for us to first meet, just like what transpired with Charlie Clark.

The second most difficult issues related to the application of the DRM framework had to do with dealing, psychologically, with the implications of the data and its impact on the community, in particular, for the helpless, the young and old, and the needy. The case studies were emotionally draining as I have come to know the community, and other Native communities, in ways that their injustices impact me psychologically. The burden of the truth is a heavy one, although a necessary one. Learning to deal with it was not easy to do. Initially it required days of rest and Disney film watching, after a trip to a Rez.

At the same time, the tips allowed me to better understand the DRM framework in ways I had not considered. For example, promoting the use of the DRM 15 Page Report Package, (see: chapter 3) in the work initially has been reconsidered. The guide was especially designed for the novice-researcher, as well as for use within stricter parameters, as in the case of, required, stricter IRB protocols. Yet, I found out that the paradigm was so simple to use that the DRM 15-Page Report wasn’t necessary. Either way, use of it is meant to facilitate the collaborative in which ever manner the research-advocate deems best for all concerned. In fact, the DRM paradigm is so easy to use that it can go either way. Again, the toughest part of my work, to this date, was finding a “home.”

As discussed in chapter three, the DRM 15 Page Report is optional. When I designed it, I did so “thinking-up” a young, undergraduate, Native student “getting to work”
from within their community in order to address some of the phenomenon they had experienced throughout their young lives. What do they need? What did I need when I first started? That is how the packet was developed, and the frameworks (chapter 3) offered throughout the work are based on what I have learned after decades of White man’s schooling. And yes, it is possible that many young Natives, and young, marginalized population members, do come from stable homes wherein food is plenty and, at the least, one parent is there when you need them. The problem with that is that the data, repeatedly, tells of a different narrative. That narrative is one that requires attention, sensitivity, and perseverance in its pursuit.

The other matter specific to my work was the data collection. The DRM framework requires that the data be shared with the research-advocate by the welcoming partner, once they have been welcomed into a collaborative. That data is supposed to come from within the community. There are specific reasons for this. One such reason is because insiders better understand what’s happening within the community, in spite of external data, such as in the case of the US Census Bureau. However, the downside to this is that it is difficult to substantiate such data, especially so, when the data is a bit off from other data, as has been the case. Again, this would be a valid concern, unless you understand the dynamics of a community. As has been, repeatedly, emphasized, not only through Re-member, but through other sources, is that on Pine Ridge, the community is fluid. People go to where the jobs are, and they return home when they need to.

I chose to “layer” the data in order to substantiate, to a degree, the numbers. What this means is that I applied data provided to me by Bryan, specifically from ReMember, then cross checked it with sstate and federal data to a limited degree. I also relied on highly respected sources actually doing work within the community. There are more than enough
connecting points to substantiate the current affairs on *Pine Ridge*. The big difference is that we are looking at the data through the eyes of an insider. In my particular case, those insiders were Bryan, Aude, Aaron, Janet, *Re-member*, etc., and even people like Huey, who for a short period of time, were welcomed into the *Pine Ridge* community. I made it a point to stay away from tribal council business and, unlike the Navajo Nation who posts their educational data on their website, this was not the case on *Pine Ridge*. At all times, I had to follow the instructions given to me by my university’s *IRB* office, which is discussed in an earlier chapter.

*Chapter Five: Dissertation Conclusions*

Early in my public-school education, I recognized the inconsistencies that were being taught in the US public school system. Due to my sex, race, and traditionalist** upbringings; consequently, throughout my public schooling experience I refrained from asking highly politicized, ethically-grounded questions that I was already thinking about, recognizing that they were not welcomed by the teacher, or the other students. For instance, in middle school, I recall asking the US History instructor why early Americans ever owned slaves, if they were Christians. He replied calmly, “they didn’t do it [slave owners]. Their same people sold them to the early Americans,” which did not answer my question at that time. I kept silent after that instance.

On another occasion, when I was in high school trying to assist my godmother in getting a petition signed asking the city to build an overpass over a particular train track that, historically, had a long history of tragic deaths due to faulty gates and train track lights; my government teacher, with whom I shared the petition with before class, allowed me to present it

---

348 I was raised in a very patriarchal, Roman Catholic-centered home life. We were taught and followed European cultural concepts highly influenced by my father's side of the family, while my mother's home culture was one of Mexica traditionalisms, with the exception that my mother attended parochial schools throughout her public schooling; hence, fortifying Catholicism at home.
to the other students during class. One of my colleagues, a young man with whom I had attended elementary school with, raised his hand and asked me why he should sign it. I replied, “because it improves the area in which we live-in by making it safer for all.” He responded, with bangs hanging closely to one eye, “You know, if you don’t like it here, you should move…” He was familiar with the type of statements I often made throughout my early life at school, which consistently advocated for community and civic participation.

Attending university, in some ways, has continued that legacy to the point of frustration and repeated moments of wanting to give it up—caring, that is. When I began attending critical theory courses, I felt renewed and recognized the need to continue to push for a more equitable world; hence, a more united world. I recognize that humans cannot ever unite if they fail to look outside the micro-level of their existence. These early public-school and college experiences, in spite of my failure to remember other matters in life, have centered me, especially so, as I continue to grow older. As a feminist of mixed ancestry who comes from a low SES background, maturity has warranted me with a unique place in the academy. In spite of age, still, the inner voice continues to build, recognizing the limited, remaining “tic-toc’s” of my life.

Chapter Five Conclusion: Data Analysis & Findings

Native Environmental & Ecological Concerns: Preparing for the Future

OLCERI’s home site is one of nine Pine Ridge tribal districts located on the Rez. The Slim Buttes OLCERI site is being designed, actively, as a fully off-grid, Eco-Ranch, representative of a “Garden of Eden” model. For itself, the model site serves as, and provides, an example of affordable, yet modest, solutions to the five, of seven, basic needs for
community members located on the Reservation. Home ownership, which is one of the main areas of concern for OLCERI, changes the dynamics.

When individuals learn to build their own inexpensive homes by means of individual labor—with community cooperation and by taking advantage of used and/or recycled home building products and the use of natural resources, such as dirt/mud and the sun, they are investing in their family, and, in their progeny’s future. They also tend to become more involved in community, and begin the process of self-actualization, which leads to the concepts behind the Lakota teachings of Wicozani and Wolakota.

Furthermore, as Deans explains, when Natives own their own homes, they can produce their own food on their own property. They can also learn important practices such as capturing water, using wind tunnels in order to plant year round, and, eventually, they can learn the skills for going off the grid, which are all viable means for self-sustainability; hence, a return to Native ways. They can also be trained in animal husbandry, crop growing, farming, etc… Natives living on the Rez, generally, are non-homeowners, as much data will make clear. Even when Natives own land, the upkeep of it is substantial, if they don’t have others to assist them in the work. This is why community is so important in the work OLCERI does. Creating and building eco-friendly homes on the Rez will change life on the Rez.

Plainly, when people own their own homes, they not only contribute back to the economy, but they have better lives. Moreover, adults create a space for their children and elders which, in turn, under healthy conditions, has the potential to create strong, loving, and prosperous home lives. As research indicates, repeatedly, homes in which children experience stable and healthy home environments serve as places of individual and collective exponential growth (Giddens & Duneier & et al, 2011; Lilienfeld, Lynn, & et al, 2009).
Besides all this, I have attempted to tie education into the work, with Bryan’s consent. I have suggested a model program for Native youth, based on Josefina Tinajero’s, successful, and long-running, Mother-Daughter/Father-Son program, housed out of the University of Texas. As I have worked closely with the program, as has Dr. Larry Lesser, I am convinced that it will become an important aspect of life on Pine Ridge.

There are a multitude of other significant issues that must be discussed dealing with the environmental injustices committed against Native peoples. These are taking place throughout the world and impact water, air, and earth quality. The essentials of life and Wolakota. It is amazing that such a simple aspect of well-being is, repeatedly, denied to Natives, even on their Rez’s. This is a continued challenge facilitated by a Republican world view that sees profit, even in their mother’s face. Although I have touched upon this slightly throughout the work, the extent of the matter is so heavy, literally and figuratively-speaking, that if I had pursued it in this dissertation, my work would be twice the size. Still, I acknowledge its importance and recognize that in my collaborative efforts with OLCERI we will be reckoning with it in the near future. We had already begun that process with the first steps we have already undertaken specific to the Global Lakota Plan.

Nevertheless, the severity of the issues on Pine Ridge will not be easy to combat in the short run as they will require much time, consequent of the fact that it has been through “US colonial time”, that is, the colonial legacy, that the socio-cultural and economic phenomenon has developed under the watchful eyes of the US federal government. Clearly, there are momentous challenges to address, the suicide one has been especially difficult for me. And yet, we have made it clear that Native peoples are capable of ReZilience and that a collective approach to the issues assures, eventual success. In the end, OLCERI, and I, believe
that people, in general, are good-hearted, kind and more than willing to do what must be done.

We are in this together. *Ahô Mitákuye Oyás’iŋ…*\(^\text{349}\)

---

\(^{349}\) Lakota-English Translation: “We are all related.”
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GLOSSARY

Unless noted, the majority of terms below are definitions adapted by the author of this work and are used in conjunction with this work.

**Absence rates:** Vallès: Data collected by education systems that reflect a student’s absences in relation to other student’s absence rates.

**Axiology:** According to Wilson, (2001) a set of morals or a set of ethics (p. 175); Vallès: individual or collective morals/ethic systems that are central core values to an individual or collective value system.

**Flyvbjerg’s Five Common Misunderstandings about Case-study Research:** Used in DRM, according to Flyvbjerg (2006, Pg. 219):

1. Theoretical knowledge is more valuable than practical knowledge;
2. One cannot generalize from a single case, therefore the single case study cannot contribute to scientific development;
3. The case study is most useful for generating hypotheses, while other methods are more suitable for hypotheses testing and theory building;
4. The case study contains a bias toward verification; and
5. It is often difficult to summarize specific case studies.

**Bi-nationals:** Vallès: Individuals/groups of people/populations that have historically resided in a specific geographic region of the Earth; however, their existence has been interrupted by modern changes in national boundary lines, generally accomplished through colonization. It is important to note that in spite of modern day changes in national boundary lines, such populations continue to maintain a collective (more than one country)/individual cultural, linguistic, and ethnic qualities, which have been, in general, established through millennia and reflect a unique diversity which can encompass more than one language, cultural practice, or national identity, therefore they are referred to as “Binational” as they are nationally bound to more than one country or “land of their own volition.”

**Borderlanders:** Vallès: Individuals/groups of people/populations that have historically resided in a specific geographic region of the Earth; however, their existence has been interrupted by modern changes in national/state/city boundary lines, generally accomplished through colonization. It is important to note that in spite of modern day changes in boundary lines, such populations continue to maintain their collective/individual cultural, linguistic, and
ethnic qualities, which have been, in general, established through millennia and reflect a unique diversity which can encompass more than one language, cultural practice, or national identity, therefore they are referred to as “Borderlanders” as they dwell in more than one “land.

**Capitalist: Vallès:** an economic system of governing that allows and promotes individual ownership and control of property, business, overall, commercial control. Many times there are no caps or control on economic attainment which promotes and allows for corruption, greedy practices and compromised institutions of money. Many progressives and philosophers argue that the system is greatly influence by race and gender, with colonizers controlling such systems and institutions. In addition, rampant capitalism has been connected to abuse and misuse of the Earth and marginalized populations.

**Colonialism: Vallès:** the state of being colonized.

**Conscientization: Freire:** The process of developing a critical awareness of one’s social reality through reflection and action. Action is fundamental because it is the process of changing the reality. Paulo Freire explained that we all acquire social myths which have a dominant tendency, and so learning is a critical process which depends upon uncovering real problems and actual needs.

**Critical Race Theory:** According to **Ladson-Billings**, (1998), CRT is a framework grounded on the idea that systems of oppression; specifically, racism, are so entrenched as a norm in society that its use and practice are accepted as natural (Ladson-Billings, 1998)

**Cultural Deficit Model (CDM): Vallès:** proponents of this model link Indigenous and minority underachievement to their respective cultures. Students who are from minority or Indigenous groups, in general, are from lower socioeconomic (SES) backgrounds, and many times are recent immigrants or a part of a migrant or transnational community, yet, they are tested against the mainstream population and expected to be able to “compete” with them via data collected from the school population.

Just as troubling, within Westernized education systems, teachers (both from mainstream populations and outside of the mainstream), as well as researchers and administrators, often times attribute minority student achievement levels and their problems with schooling as something that is a consequence of the student’s culture; their family backgrounds or a perceived lack of family support due to their cultural upbringing, in short, the student’s culture. As such, the student and their respective community is viewed as a part of the problem when in reality they are an important part of the solution to the discrepancies in test scores amongst such groups.

Consequently, a CDM approach to understanding relevant issues in school within such populations will place “the problem” on the student, specifically because of their supposed
cultural differences. Research results grounded in a CDM approach to education phenomenon clearly are skewed; therefore, they are incorrect. Ironically, a CDM approach to understanding school phenomenon within minority and Indigenous populations will promote the idea that allows for educators and researchers to direct the phenomenon studied back on the student, because of this, it could be argued that continued institutional oppression is promoted further and practiced. Furthermore, CDM allows for negative stereotypes, innuendos, and false racial and cultural assumptions to be made and, often times, promoted and printed in research, regarding certain groups or communities. An excellent of this is “work” done by Ruby Payne (2001) in her highly controversial Framework for Understanding Poverty. Disturbingly, Payne was later placed on a university site in which a pre-recording reflecting the arguments for her work were allowed.

**Diachronic Research Methods (DRM), Research Advocate’s Pre-Project Description Packet: Vallès:** A fifteen page Separate Document used as a vital tool of the research process. The Research Advocate is required to fill out the packet in collaboration with the community in which the research project will be taking place. The document is only completed through repeated oral exchanges with community leaders, group participants, etc…and finally signed. The document is created in order to ensure an open understanding between the research advocate, the community, and those involved in the project, prior to publication of research results.

**Epistemology:** According to Wilson, (2001) how we think about reality. **Vallès:** our individual systems of knowledge/knowledge belief systems, in general, a consequence of collective influences further established as individuals become educated.

**European Colonizer: Vallès:** Historically documented Westerners who have settled in regions of the world which they were not innately a part of. In general, such colonizers have established their existence in such areas via war, conquest, inter-marriage/breeding, fear, economic imbalance, and institutional support systems which they have implanted into such regions.

**Feminist Theory: Vallès:** A rich and multi-stranded complex system of understanding of which at the core is the concept of standpoint theory, which is a theoretical approach of understanding others and phenomenon via subjective thought process, analysis, and attention and adherence to social justice.

**First Peoples of the Land (FPL’s): Vallès:** similar to the term First Nations People; however, modified for application to indigenous groups in the United States, as opposed to Canadian.

**Geopolitics: Vallès:** Politics specific to a particular geographical region, in spite of national, state, and municipal politics. Many times, they are specific to the regions that others do not fully comprehend, because they are in unique geographic regions and/or are marginalized from mainstream population dictums.
Grade Point Averages (GPAs): Vallès: A part of quantitative data collection within education systems in which students overall grades are accumulated into one grade point average using specific formulas.

Historically Marginalized (groups of people): Vallès: These are ethnic populations, in general, that have been colonized or who were forcibly brought to new regions of the world of which they did not originate in. As such, these groups of people are disempowered groups as they have historically been disadvantaged by the colonizer, economically, politically, socio-culturally, and many times, psychologically.

Imperialistic Domination: Vallès: the term originates with Ancient Roman Rule and has been carried through historically by Western civilizations whose peoples have gone into regions of the world that they are NOT native to but have forcibly implanted themselves into. As such, their worldviews, institutions, government rulings, and economic infrastructures are implanted into the new regions, usually through war, physical and psychological control systems, or thievery. Once in control of the region, devices of maintaining their power hold on native populations or distinct ethnic groups become a vital part of the new world order.

Indigenous: Vallès: Indigenous communities are comprised of individuals/collectives that have lived and maintained their geographic place in specific regions of the world for millennia. In doing so, they have established unique language systems, distinct cultural values, particular ethnic practices, and specific communal understandings, morals and/or ethics unlike those of other communities. In general, such populations have close relationships to the Earth, consequently, valuing it in ways not seen in other cultures, as well as Earth’s life forms. This type of “nature-centered” bond extends itself to the Universe and is incorporated into an Indigenous way of life as these naturalistic aspects of Indigeneity are viewed as innate and, therefore, are central to individual/group Indigenous value systems.

Although Indigenous peoples located throughout the world, understandably, hold diverse epistemologies, ontologies, and axiological worldviews, even amongst other Indigenous communities-- their unique bond to the Earth, the universe, and to their community, is a common attribute recognized and accepted as a vital characteristic of an Indigenous worldview. As such, their worldview differs from that of Western/modern communities, which tend to value the individual and center materialism as a part of their daily life. There is another characteristic that I connect to this proposal which puts forward the idea that another characteristic that Indigenous peoples located all over the world also share is a “colonial” history, although it varies from region to region.

Indigenous Research Paradigm: (Wilson, 2001; 2002): requires that “Indigenous people themselves decide exactly what areas are to be studied” (Wilson, 2002, Pg. 13). Wilson (2002) explicates that Indigenous research “is inclusive of all first peoples—unique in our own cultures—but common in our experiences of colonialism and our understanding of the world” (Wilson, 2002, Pg. 16). An IRP comes from the fundamental belief that knowledge is
relational, is shared with all creation, and therefore cannot be owned or discovered. Indigenous research methods should reflect these beliefs and the obligations they imply (Wilson, 2001, Pgs. 175-79).

**Intersectionality:** According to Crenshaw (1989,) this term refers to the convergence or intersection of race, gender, and social class; denotes the various ways these social constructs interact and shape multiple dimensions of Black women’s experiences (Crenshaw, 1989).

**Kuhnian Insight:** According to Flyvbjerg’s (2006) work which were influenced by Kuhn’s (1962) philosophies which centered around the concepts of "scientific revolution" and "paradigm", both are concepts developed by him), the argument is made by Flyvbjerg that a scientific discipline without a large number of thoroughly executed case studies is a discipline without systematic production of exemplars, and that a discipline without exemplars is an ineffective one. Flyvbjerg promotes the idea that social science may be strengthened by the execution of more good case studies (Flyvbjerg, Pg. 284).

**Lived Experience:** Vallès: As Patton (2002) explains, a lived experience is rooted in the daily experiences individuals become involved in, understand, practice, and use to build individual knowledge systems; therefore LE’s are not secondhand experiences, according to Patton (2002): however, I would argue that the Lived Experiences of others influences individual knowledge building; nevertheless, to be specific, it is based on “direct” individual experiences. It is experienced in how an individual perceives, describes, feels, judges, remembers, makes sense of, and talks about the experience (Patton, 2002).

**Mixed-methods:** According to Creswell (2009) a research design (or methodology) in which the researcher collects, analyzes, and mixes (integrates or connects) both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study or a multiphase program of inquiry. (Creswell, Pg. 119).

**Organizational Leadership:** According to Parker (2001), this term refers to the practice of leadership within a context where individuals are held to norms, values, and beliefs of the organization’s culture (Parker, 2001).

**Ontology/Ontological:** “a belief in the nature of reality. Your way of being, what you believe is real in the world” (Wilson, 2001, 175).

**Paradigm:** “a set of beliefs about the world and about gaining knowledge that goes together to guide people’s actions as to how they are going to go about doing their research” (Wilson, 2001, p. 175).

**Indigenous Research Paradigm (IRP):** According to Wilson, (2001), an IRP is a research paradigm exclusively for work with indigenous populations that is “made up of an Indigenous ontology, epistemology (Wilson, 2001, p. 175).
“Phronesis”: a Greek concept that means “practical wisdom, practical judgment, common sense, or prudence” (Flyvbjerg, Pg. 284).

**Phronetic Planning Research Paradigm** (PPRP): (Flyvbjerg, Pg. 284). When implementing a PPRP approach when conducting quantitative data collection, the approach to the research project should set out to answer four questions in direct relation to power and the values for specific instances of planning, according to Flyvbjerg (2004a).

**Socially Disadvantaged**: According to the SBA (2004), this term refers to individuals who have been subjected to ethnic prejudice or cultural bias because of their identity as a member of a group without regard to their individual qualities (SBA, 2004).

**Sociocultural Theories**: According to Merriam & Caffarella (1999), this term refers to theories that consider social constructs in analyzing power dynamics within bureaucratic and other systems where power can be used to oppress (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999).

“Universalist Reality”: (Vallès, 2013). An UR is an understanding on an individual level that all humans are a part of the one humanity recognizes that in spite of our oneness, our histories are different. Finally, an UR requires the implementation of a critical consciousness.
The human family tree may have to be rewritten after scientists found evidence that the ancient ancestors of humans, apes and monkeys evolved in Asia - rather than Africa - tens of millions of years ago.

The astonishing claim follows the discovery of four species of early primate in the Sahara Desert, dating back 39 million years.

The creatures - or anthropoid primates - are unlike anything seen before in Africa from the same time period or before, suggesting that they evolved elsewhere.

Afrotarsius (top left) Karanesia (top right) Biretia (bottom left) and Talahpithecus (bottom right) were early precursors to humans.

Scientists say there is overwhelming fossil evidence that mankind evolved from ape-like creatures in Africa, two to three million years ago.

The last common ancestor of humans and chimpanzees lived five to seven million years ago, while we split off from the gorilla branch of the family tree around 10 million years ago.

Many researchers have believed that the common ancestors of all apes, monkeys and humans also evolved in Africa.

Humans were in China '60,000 years earlier than previously thought'

But the new finding challenges that view.

'If our ideas are correct, this early colonization of Africa by anthropoids was a truly pivotal event—one of the key points in our evolutionary history,' says Dr. Christopher Beard, of Carnegie Museum of Natural History and an author on the paper in today’s Nature journal.

At the time, Africa was an island continent. When these anthropoids appeared, there was nothing on that island that could compete with them, he said.
'It led to a period of flourishing evolutionary divergence amongst anthropoids, and one of those lineages resulted in humans. If our early anthropoid ancestors had not succeeded in migrating from Asia to Africa, we simply wouldn’t exist.'

Although the researchers found only fossilised teeth at the Dur At-Talah escarpment - part of the unspoilt, remote Sahara in central Libya - they have a rough idea of their size and shape.

The ascent of man: Human evolution, from apelike beings of 20 million years ago to modern man.

The four creatures were small, weighing between four and 16 ounces, and resembled monkeys or lemurs.

Three of the creatures came from distinct families, or 'clades', of primates - showing that they had been evolving from a common ancestor for a long time.

The researchers say there is no evidence of similar primates from Africa before 39 million years ago.

So either there is a “striking gap” in the fossil record of North Africa - despite more than 100 years of fossil hunting expeditions in the region - or the early primates came from elsewhere, said Dr. Beard.

“This extraordinary new fossil site in Libya shows us that 39 million years ago there was a surprising diversity of anthropoids living in Africa, whereas few if any anthropoids are known from Africa before this time,” he said.

“This sudden appearance of such diversity suggests that these anthropoids probably colonised Africa from somewhere else. Without earlier fossil evidence in Africa, we’re currently looking to Asia as the place where these animals first evolved.”

The human family tree gets more complicated with every new fossil discovery.
Scientists now believe the first human like ancestors or hominids appeared around two to three million years ago.

The first homo sapiens appeared around 400,000 years ago, while modern humans emerged in the last 100,000 years.

The latest thinking is that modern humans evolved in Africa and left to colonise the world around 50,000 to 1000 years ago.

There they met the descendants of previous migrants who had left Africa much earlier - including the Neanderthals of Europe.

**Story Source:**  [http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-1324243/Human-evolution-started-Asia-Ancient-ancestor-walked-Sahara-39m-years-ago.html](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-1324243/Human-evolution-started-Asia-Ancient-ancestor-walked-Sahara-39m-years-ago.html)
Appendix B: Vallès Geo-Gender, Race & Socio-Cultural, Hierarchy Output Mechanism
Appendix D: Euro-centrist Knowledge Pyramid

"Euro-centric" Knowledge Systems, which are rooted in Ancient Greek Knowledge Systems

"Euro-Ameri-centric" Knowledge Systems, which are rooted in European World Views but have been adapted to American Ideologies Rooted in

"Indigenous Knowledge Systems", which are NOT included in education textbooks, research approaches, or education curriculum. Such a system is rooted on preservation and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophical/Ethical Research Tenets</th>
<th>Diachronic Research Methodology</th>
<th>Traditionalist Research Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axiology</td>
<td>Is reflective and appropriate to Indigenous/marginalized community <strong>value systems</strong> in non-Westernized, Euro-American ways, i.e., Earth is not for sale but is to be shared with ALL, including non-human life forms system</td>
<td>A patriarchal value system centered on Judeo-Christian concepts and materialism, i.e., <strong>nature/land/animals/people/water, ALL are/is for sale. A heavily, value-laden</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmology</td>
<td>Indigenous concepts regarding human origins; the design &amp; development of the universe/nature/God, etc., is reflective and specific to each respective Indigenous community and tends to be nature-centered and harmonious respective to all lifeforms which are understood as inter-connected</td>
<td>A patriarchal value system centered Judeo-Christian concepts in which all is, historically, male-domainated, even GOD/the Universee-<strong>and-- all is specific to man’s needs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemological</td>
<td>Unique theory of <strong>knowledge</strong> that reflects community’s traditions and values based on a naturalistic system of understanding unlike a Western, Judeo-Christian one. Knowledge stems from nature/“Creator”</td>
<td>Knowledge reflective of traditions and values rooted on Western, Judeo-Christian concepts that are non-Naturalistic but instead a consequence of an omnipotent “God,” who is man-like &amp; controls ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontologically-Sound</td>
<td>Community’s “truths” dealing with the nature of being/existence which are non-Western, Euro-American, and grounded and centered in nature and the collective community, and the Ancestors</td>
<td>Community’s “truths” dealing with the nature of being/existence grounded and centered on Westernized, Judeo-Christian concepts perceived to be “truth;” all else is deemed as “untruths/myths”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts Specific to Time &amp; Space</td>
<td>Time is measured cyclically: A Non-Western group view of existence centered on time, space in non-Euro, American Concepts</td>
<td>Time is measured linearly, promoting a Westernized view of time, space, human existence, and/or is grounded in the “Scientific Knowledge System” of the mainstream, non-Native, population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work is Communal</td>
<td>Communal: Interconnectedness Established between researcher and collective</td>
<td>Potential to Be Communal: Dependent on Whether Quantitative, Qualitative, or Mixed-Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work is Ceremonial</td>
<td>Approach to work/community is sacred and respected and may consist of sacred ceremonies/ traditional expectations initiated by community</td>
<td>Is not traditionally ceremonial, if fully quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Does Not Objectify</td>
<td>Cultures are not trivialized or essentialized, nor are they referred to or perceived as myth. Instead, they are viewed and recognized as highly-valued Indigenous aspects of humanity</td>
<td>Methodology serves as a colonial Research structure that centers on Ameri-Euro-centrist value systems rooted in colonial, European Empiricism allowing for pre-conceived expectations, standards, and ideologies to impact research findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work is a Nexus</td>
<td>Work <em>must</em> serve as a meeting point between nexus community, research-advocate, and potential the research third parties</td>
<td>Collaborative <em>potentially</em> serves as a between the issues addressed in work &amp; community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: *Diachronic Research Methodology Visual, The Three Objectives & Nine Core Component Pyramid*

Quantitative Data Provided by Education Institution or Institution

Nine Core Components of Diachronic Research Methodology

Colonial/Post-Colonial History as Presented Collaboratively by Participant Community

Plan of Action Used to Address Phenomenon Studied, i.e., a grant that allows for the results of the phenomenon studied to be improved or addressed further
Appendix G: *Diachronic Research Methodology* Process Visual
Appendix H: Adaptation of Fanon

An Adaptation of Fanon’s “Psycho-effective Response” Model
Adapted by Estela L.G. Valles

Primary Experiences:
- Physical Body/Individual Appearance
- Individual Emotions
- Individual Imagination/Psychic Life

Secondary Experiences:
- Historical Effects on the Individual
- Individual Social Effects/Experiences

Continued Impacting Experiences:
- Individual
- Group Political Experiences
- Individual Ethical Judgment

Psycho-effective Response

Reality
- Engagement with Reality
- Resistance to Reality
- Inauthentic Action/Reaction (Subversion)

OUTPUT

Individual Development & Growth
Appendix I: Deans Email Consent, 11.30.2019

To: Alas

From: Bryan Deans <deansbryan@gmail.com>

Nov 30 at 4:38 PM

Hi must be storm related connection problem I have had my phone on me all the time, yes, of course, you can have access.

Bryan

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 30, 2019, at 4:30 PM, Alas <alas2004@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

Good Evening, Bryan,

Tried calling you earlier today. Please call me when you have a chance so we can talk.

Also, please let me know, electronically, if you will allow me to use the following public available sources for work I am doing, including future grant writing on OLCERI’s behalf, with your guidance, of course:

- Oglala Lakota Plan Packet Data
- OLCERI Website Info, including Photos
- You Tube Videos available with your image/information/video

Thank You,

Estella L.G. Vallès
Appendix J: Grabill Picture Log, Library of Congress

The one hundred and eighty-eight photographs sent by John C.H. Grabill to the Library of Congress for copyright protection between 1887 and 1892 are thought to be the largest surviving collection of this gifted, early Western photographer's work. Grabill's remarkably well-crafted, sepia-toned images capture the forces of western settlement in South Dakota and Wyoming and document its effects on the area's indigenous communities. The...

- **Contributor:** Grabill, John C. H.
- **Date:** 1887
- **Collection Items:** View 193 Items
**Appendix K: Common Lakota Words and Terms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asampi</td>
<td>Milk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ate</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heyoka</td>
<td>Opposite to nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunka Lowampi</td>
<td>The Hunka ceremony or making of relatives. Lowan means song or singing. Lowampi means singing with ceremonies or performances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanultonwan</td>
<td>The Yankton people. Those who dwell by the end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanultonwanna</td>
<td>The smaller division of the Yankton people. Or Little End dwellers, Yanktonais.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iktoni</td>
<td>Spider Like (the trickster spirit who once was called Ksa, son of Inyan).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inyan</td>
<td>The Stone or Rock. Before there was any other thing, or any time, Inyan was, and his spirit was, Wakan Tanka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inyan was soft and shapeless but he had all powers. He gave of his blood to make Maka (Earth) and became hard and powerless. His blood was blue and became the waters of the earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isamni or Sisotonwan</td>
<td>Those who lived near Knife Lake east of the Mississippi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwobha</td>
<td>Blizzard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iya</td>
<td>The second son of Inyan, who is utterly evil and the chief of all evil beings. Committed incest with his mother Unki and their offspring is a very beautiful, enticing and deceitful demon whose name is Gnaaki.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iya Tate</td>
<td>Wind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kana</td>
<td>Incomprehensible. An incomprehensible fact that cannot be demonstrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kata</td>
<td>A male friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ksa</td>
<td>The older son of Inyan brought forth full-grown from an egg in an anti-natural manner by Wakan, God of wisdom but he became the imp of mischief and his name is (now) Ikton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maka</td>
<td>The Earth and Grandmother of all things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazak wakan</td>
<td>Wakan iron or gun. (Because the shot from it is like the act of the Wakan.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medewakomtonwan</td>
<td>Spirit Lake or Sacred Lake people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini wakan</td>
<td>Wakan water, intoxicating liquor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagi</td>
<td>The spirit that has never been in a man. The spirit that guides man but is not part of a man. Both good and bad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niyina</td>
<td>Ghost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okaga</td>
<td>South Wind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olowan</td>
<td>A song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyate</td>
<td>The People or Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicun</td>
<td>Guardian or intellect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skan</td>
<td>The Sky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taku Skanskan</td>
<td>Changes things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taku Wakan</td>
<td>Wakan Relatives. (“Relatives” relates to all things in nature, not just to blood relatives or other humans.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some Common Lakota Words and Terms From Lakota Belief and Ritual by James R. Walker & Reading and Writing the Lakota Language by Albert White Hat Sr
Appendix L: Wilmer Stampede Mesteth, Tribal Historian Verification Documentation

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BETORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of
POWERTCH (USA) INC.
(Dewey-Burdock In Situ Uranium Recovery Facility)

Doculent No. 40-0875-MLA

Declaration of Wilmer Mesteth

1. My name is Wilmer Mesteth. I am the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer ("THPO") for the Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation. In my activities as the THPO, I regularly review cultural resource surveys and reports, including the survey and reporting methods.

2. The Oglala Sioux Tribe is a body politic comprised of approximately 41,000 citizens with territory of over 4,700 square miles in the southwestern portion of South Dakota. The Oglala Sioux Tribe is the freely and democratically elected government of the Oglala Sioux people, with a governing body duly recognized by the Secretary of Interior. The Oglala Sioux Tribe is the successor in interest to the Oglala Band of the Tetu Division of the Sioux Nation, and is a representative nation of the United States of America. The Oglala Band reorganized in 1936 as the Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation ("Oglala Sioux Tribe" or "Tribe") under section 16 of the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, ch. 536, 48 Stat. 987, 25 U.S.C. § 476, and enjoys all of the rights and privileges guaranteed under the existing treaties with the United States in accordace with 25 U.S.C. § 478b. Its address is P.O. Box 2070, Pine Ridge, South Dakota 57770-2070.

3. In 1992 the U.S. Congress adopted amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act (P.L. 102-575) that allow federally recognized Indian tribes to take on more forma responsibility for the preservation of significant historic properties on tribal lands. Specifically, Section 101(d)(2) allows tribes to assume any or all of the functions of a State Historic Preservation Officer ("SHPO") with respect to tribal land.

4. I am familiar with the license application recently submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission ("NRC") by the Canadian company Powertech Uranium Corp., doing business as Powertech (USA) Inc. ("Powertech" or "Applicant") for the proposed Dewey-Burdock in situ leach uranium mine in southwest South Dakota.

5. The lands encompassed by the Powertech proposal are within the Territory of the Great Sioux Nation, which includes the band of the Oglala Lakota (Oglala Sioux Tribe).
CONSTITUTION
OF THE
OGLALA SIOUX TRIBE
Pine Ridge Indian Reservation
Pine Ridge, South Dakota

PREAMBLE
We, the Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, in order to establish a more perfect organization, promote the general welfare, conserve and develop our lands and resources, secure to ourselves and our posterity the power to exercise certain rights of home rule not inconsistent with Federal laws and our treaties, and in recognition of God Almighty and His Divine Providence, do ordain and establish this constitution for the Oglala Sioux Tribe.

ARTICLE I - TERRITORY
The jurisdiction of the Oglala Sioux Tribe of Indians shall extend to the territory within the original confines of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation boundaries, as defined hereafter added thereto under any law of the United States except as may be otherwise provided by law for unrestricted lands. To regulate the inheritance of property, real and personal, other than allotted lands, within the territory of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation.

ARTICLE II - MEMBERSHIP
Section 1. Membership of the Oglala Sioux Tribe shall be automatic when:

(a) The person's name appears on the official roll of the Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation as of April 1, 1935 or if the person's name appears on any correction made within five years after the adoption Constitution on January 1936.

(b) A child is born to any member of the Oglala Sioux Tribe.

Section 2. The Tribal Council shall have the authority to adopt laws covering future membership.

**ARTICLE III - GOVERNING BODY**

Section 1. The governing body of the Tribe under this constitution shall be a council which shall be composed of councilmen chosen by secret ballot by qualified voters of the tribe, which council shall hereafter be known as “The Oglala Sioux Tribe Council”

Section 2. Each district of the reservation as follows, shall be entitled to representation on the tribal council according to population as hereinafter provided:

- **Oglala District:** The tribal council shall describe boundaries by ordinance with local participation, through district hearings.

- **Wakpamni District:** The tribal council shall describe boundaries by ordinance with local participation, through district hearings.

- **Wounded Knee District:** The tribal council shall describe boundaries by ordinance with local participation, through district hearings.

- **Porcupine District:** The tribal council shall describe boundaries by ordinance with local participation, through district hearings.

- **Medicine Root District:** The tribal council shall describe boundaries by ordinance with local participation, through district hearings.

- **Eagle Nest District:** The tribal council shall describe boundaries by ordinance with local participation, through district hearings.

- **Pass Creek District:** The tribal council shall describe boundaries by ordinance with local participation, through district hearings.

- **Lacreek District:** The tribal council shall describe boundaries by ordinance with local participation, through district hearings.
Appendix O: IRB Approval Email
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From: Ramirez, Christina <cramirez22@utep.edu>
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Appendix P: UTEP IRB APPROVED QUESTIONNAIRE

Approval: March 28, 2018

Script for Interview of “Las Gobernadoras de “La Comunidad Tarahumara de la Colonia Tarumara” de Cuidad Juarez Chihuahua, Mexico

Identificieron: My name is Estella Valles and I am a doctoral researcher from the University of Texas at El Paso. I will be asking you questions relevant to the history of your community. This content will be recorded audio-visualy and will be used as possible content for my dissertation, which focuses on educational research and Indigenous communities. I will also use portions of this session for publication purposes and grant proposal writing undertaken on behalf of your community.

The community leaders, representing the respective community, have access to this content. Do I have your permission to record this session with this understanding?

Identificador: Mi nombre es Estella Valles y soy investigadora doctoral de la Universidad de Texas en El Paso. Le haré preguntas relevantes para la historia de su comunidad. Este contenido se grabará audio-visualmente y se usará como posible contenido para mi disertación, que se centra en la investigación educativa y las comunidades indígenas. También usaré partes de esta sesión para fines de publicación y para la redacción de propuestas financieras redactadas en nombre de su comunidad.

Los líderes de la comunidad, que representan a la comunidad respectiva, tienen acceso a este contenido. ¿Tengo su permiso para grabar esta sesión con este entendimiento?

Personal Questions:

1.) What is your name?
2.) What do you do for a living?
3.) What is your educational background?
4.) Where were you born?
5.) In what year were you born?
6.) Where do you currently live?
7.) How long have you lived there?
8.) Why did you move there?
9.) Marital Status?
10.) Do you have children, if so, how many do you have?
11.) If yes: Where were your children born?
12.) Where do your children currently live at?
13.) ¿Cuál es su nombre?
14.) ¿Qué haces para ganarte la vida?
15.) ¿Cuál es su formación académica?
16.) ¿Dónde naciste?
17.) ¿En qué año naciste?
18.) ¿Dónde vives actualmente?
19.) ¿Cuánto tiempo has vivido allí?
20.) ¿Por qué te mudaste allí?
21.) ¿Estado civil?
22.) ¿Tienes hijos, de ser así, cuántos tienes?
23.) ¿En caso afirmativo: ¿Dónde nacieron sus hijos?
24.) ¿Dónde viven actualmente sus hijos?

**History of Community Questions (Post-Colonial)**

25.) Tell me about the community in which you lived at previously?

   Culturally, linguistically economically, etc...

26.) In what ways is that community different from the ones you might have lived in, or currently live in?

27.) How many community members are currently living here, approximately?

28.) Of those community members, how many of your members are permanent residents?

29.) Why did you move to this area?

30.) What is the history of this community?

31.) Do you know why your community members moved here?

32.) How are the community members adjusting?

33.) Tell me about your current home?

34.) Tell me about your neighborhood?

35.) What kind of people live in this neighborhood?

36.) What are the income levels of people in this area, in your estimation?

37.) What are the education-levels overall?

---

25.) ¿Cuéntame sobre la comunidad en la que viviste anteriormente?

   Culturalmente, lingüísticamente, económicamente, etc.

26.) ¿En qué se diferencia esa comunidad de las que podrías haber vivido o en las que actualmente vives?
27.) ¿Cuántos miembros de la comunidad viven actualmente aquí, aproximadamente?
28.) De esos miembros de la comunidad, ¿cuántos de sus miembros son residentes permanentes?
29.) ¿Por qué te mudaste a esta área?
30.) ¿Cuál es la historia de esta comunidad?
31.) ¿Sabes por qué los miembros de tu comunidad se mudaron aquí?
32.) ¿Cómo se están adaptando los miembros de la comunidad?
33.) ¿Cuéntame sobre tu hogar actual?
34.) Cuéntame sobre tu vecindario?
35.) ¿Qué tipo de personas viven en este barrio?
36.) ¿Cuáles son los niveles de ingresos de las personas en esta área, en su opinión?
37.) ¿Cuáles son los niveles educativos en general?

Community & Education

38.) What kind of schools serve this neighborhood?
39.) Are they public or private schools?
40.) How is the school funded?
41.) What are the grade-levels, and how are they structured (elementary/middle/high)?
42.) What kind of curriculum does the school support?
43.) What are the community members expectations for their schools (Curriculum, language/cultural expectations, etc...)?
44.) How are schools supported by the community? The city? The state?
45.) What type of computer/internet accommodations are available to the community/the school?
46.) In what ways could the school be improved?
47.) Are there any issues in regards to the school? If so, please discuss in order of importance?
48.) What are the community members expectations for the children in relation to education attainment?
49.) How do the children do in school, overall (GPA’s; attendance; testing, etc...)?
50.) Are students tracked GPA-wise; or by other means?
51.) How do the children transition between community and outside of the community?
52.) How many community members are going to university?

53.) ¿Qué tipo de escuelas sirven este vecindario?
54.) ¿Son escuelas públicas o privadas?
55.) ¿Cómo se financia la escuela?
56.) ¿Cuáles son los niveles de grado y cómo están estructurados ( elemental / medio / alto)?
57.) ¿Qué tipo de plan de estudios apoya la escuela?
58.) ¿Cuáles son las expectativas de los miembros de la comunidad para sus escuelas (curriculo, expectativas lingüísticas / culturales, etc.)?
59.) ¿Cómo son apoyadas las escuelas por la comunidad? ¿La ciudad? ¿El estado?
60.) ¿Qué tipo de adaptaciones de computadora / Internet están disponibles para la comunidad / la escuela?
61.) ¿De qué manera podría mejorarse la escuela?
62.) ¿Hay algún problema con respecto a la escuela? Si es así, por favor discuta en orden de importancia?
63.) ¿Cuáles son las expectativas de los miembros de la comunidad para los niños en relación con el logro educativo?
64.) ¿Cómo se desempeñan los niños en la escuela, en general (GPA, asistencia, pruebas, etc.)?
65.) ¿Los estudiantes son seguidos por GPA? o por otros medios?
66.) ¿Cómo hacen los niños la transición entre la comunidad y fuera de la comunidad?
67.) ¿Cuántos miembros de la comunidad van a la universidad?

Community Infrastructure

1.) How does the community reach consensus on issues impacting them?
2.) Are there communal spots?
3.) How do they serve the community?
4.) What type of resources are available to the community/schools?
5.) Who funds these?
6.) Are there any issues regarding the county facilities, i.e., water, electricity, etc…
7.) How are communal medical issues addressed?
8.) How does the city/county assist the community?
9.) What (or who) is the community’s funding source?

10.) What type of immediate issues are of concern to the community?

1.) ¿Cómo llega la comunidad a un consenso sobre los problemas que les afectan?
2.) ¿Hay puntos comunales?
3.) ¿Cómo sirven a la comunidad?
4.) ¿Qué tipo de recursos están disponibles para la comunidad / escuelas?
5.) ¿Quién los financia?
6.) ¿Hay algún problema con respecto a las instalaciones del condado, es decir, agua, electricidad, etc.
7.) ¿Cómo se abordan los problemas médicos comunitarios?
8.) ¿Cómo ayuda la ciudad/ condado a la comunidad?
9.) ¿Qué (o quién) es la fuente de financiación de la comunidad?
10.) ¿Qué tipo de problemas inmediatos preocupan a la comunidad?
Appendix Q: UTEP IRB APPROVED CONSENT FORM

CONSENTIMIENTO VOLUNTARIO DE OTORGACION DE DERECHOS

Investigación Educativa en Comunidades Indígenas

(Adulto)

Yo, ____________________________, como participante en este estudio acerca de investigación educativa en comunidades indígenas doy permiso a utilizar la información y datos y de otros escritos, en las cuales yo tomo parte. Comprendo que lo anterior puede ser usado sin ningún límite en publicaciones, artículos académicos, y otros medios disponibles al público en general.

Comprendo que durante el tiempo que dure el proyecto de investigación, seré invitado a leer y revisar los escritos, que serán utilizados en los documentos finales. Comprendo que puedo retirar o retener información del proyecto de estudio. También comprendo que mi identidad se puede usar formalmente entre el estudio propio con mi permiso por intentos de publicación(es).

Adicionalmente, comprendo que no tendrán limitaciones de tiempo en el uso de la información y datos que les he otorgado. Mi decisión de participar es voluntaria y tengo el derecho de terminar mi participación en la investigación sin afectar mi estatus en este proyecto.

Al firmar reconozco que he leído y comprendido las declaraciones arriba mencionadas. La información proporcionada al investigador se mantendrá en un archivo informático de propiedad privada "bloqueado" por medio de contraseña.

_____________________________  ______________________
Firma del Participante          Fecha

_____________________________  ______________________
Firma del Investigador Principal Fecha

Estella L.G. Valles, Ph.D. (ABD) Critical Researcher

POR FAVOR DIJIRA CUALQUIERA PREGUNTA A ESTELLA VALLES, MAIS, MA ED PHD DOCTORAL CRITICAL RESEARCHER at ALAS2004@SBCGLOBAL.NET

999-999-9999
Appendix R: Datasets

DATA SET I.

Re-Member » Pine Ridge Reservation

Pine Ridge Indian Reservation

Oglala Lakota County, South Dakota is the poorest county in the United States and the community that Re-Member serves.

Pine Ridge Indian Reservation

Verified and accurate statistics can be hard to come by here on the reservation, and only paint a partial picture of the realities endured by the residents of the communities on Pine Ridge.

The Pine Ridge Reservation occupies the entirety of Oglala Lakota (formerly Shannon) County, the southern half of Jackson County and Bennett County. The total land area of the Reservation is 2.1 million acres, with 1.7 million acres held in trust by the United States government. By land area, the reservation is the seventh-largest in the country.

Lowest and Last

The Pine Ridge Reservation is home to the lowest life expectancy, and a number of the poorest communities in the United States.

The average life expectancy on Pine Ridge is 66.81 years, the lowest in the United States. Other statistics, attributed to the Pine Ridge hospital, cite an average life expectancy for men of just 47 years. Women fare slightly better, with an average life expectancy of 55 years.

DATA SET I: Re-Member » Pine Ridge Reservation

Pine Ridge Indian Reservation

- There are 3,143 counties in the United States.
- Oglala Lakota County, contained entirely within the boundaries of the Pine Ridge Reservation, has the lowest per capita income ($8,768) in the country, and ranks as the "poorest" county in the nation.
- Oglala Lakota County ranked last in the state of South Dakota for quality of life and health behaviors.

Population and Demographics

The population of the reservation is constantly in-flux. Depending on availability of resources (e.g., access to food, transportation and utilities), a house may domicile more than a dozen individuals. The following numbers are indicative of the challenges in capturing accurate data:
• **18,834** individuals were recorded as living on the Pine Ridge Reservation during the 2010 U.S. Census. The vast majority (16,906) identified as American Indian.

• The South Dakota Department of Tribal Relations reports a **total tribal enrollment of 38,332**, with **19,639 living on the reservation**.

• The Department of the Interior reports a "Service Area population" for the Oglala Sioux Tribe of Pine Ridge Reservation of **32,152**.

• **42.4% of the population was identified as being younger than 20 years old** in the 2010 U.S. Census. By comparison, the state of South Dakota average for this demographic is 27.8%.

• **The median age on Pine Ridge is 25.4 years**; 24.6 for men, and 26 for women.

• **19.8% of the population was identified as being older than 50 years old**. The South Dakota average for this demographic is 33.8%.

**DATA SET I: Re-Member » Pine Ridge Reservation**

**Labor Force and Income**

• An **89% unemployment rate** was identified in a 2005 Department of the Interior report. With a labor force of 29,539 in the tribe (not specifically the reservation), just 3,131 were employed. The Department of the Interior has since ceased producing estimates of "unemployment."

• **Per capita income for American Indians living on Pine Ridge is $7,773**. The average for all reservations is $10,543. The United States average is $27,599.

• **The median household income is $26,721** for American Indians living on Pine Ridge Reservation. The United States average is $53,482.

**Poverty Rate**

• The officially reported poverty rate for American Indians living on Pine Ridge is **53.75%**. The United States average is 15.6%.

• Many assessments, drawing from sources other than U.S. Census data and government tabulations place the actual poverty rate in excess of 80% of the reservation's population.

• Two of the five "poorest communities in America" are located on the Pine Ridge Reservation:

  • Allen (#1)
  • Wounded Knee (#4)

**Education**
● The school drop-out rate is over 70%.
● 28.7% of the native population of Pine Ridge Reservation reports having attained a high school diploma, GED or alternative.
● 10.7% of the native population reports having attained a bachelor's degree or higher.

DATA SET I:  Re-Member » Pine Ridge Reservation

Health and Wellness

● One in four children born on Pine Ridge are diagnosed with either Fetal Alcohol Syndrome or Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder.

Statistics produced by the Oglala Sioux Tribe paint a bleak picture about the health of the reservation:

● Tuberculosis: 800% higher than America as a whole
● Infant mortality: 300% higher than America as a whole
● Teen suicide: 150% higher than America as a whole
● Approximately 85% of Lakota families are affected by alcoholism
● Approximately 58% of grandparents of Lakota families are raising their grandchildren
● Approximately 50% of adults over the age of 40 have diabetes

Data Source: Copyright © 2020 Re-Member, Inc. A registered 501(c)(3) Nonprofit Organization. All rights reserved. https://www.re-member.org/pine-ridge-reservation.aspx.
City-Data.com (2017). “Pine Ridge, South Dakota (SD) Poverty Rate Data Information about Poor and Low-income Residents.”


City-Data.com (2017). Pine Ridge, South Dakota (SD) Poverty Rate Data Information about Poor and Low-income Residents
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Poverty in families in Pine Ridge, SD

- **Children below poverty level:**
  - Pine Ridge, South Dakota: 52.7%
  - State: 16.3%

- **Poverty rate among high school graduates not in families:**
  - Pine Ridge: 43.6%
  - South Dakota: 20.2%

- **Poverty rate among people who did not graduate high school not in families:**
  - Pine Ridge: 100.0%
  - South Dakota: 39.2%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married-couple family</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, no wife present</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, no husband present</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I'm just going to do a quote and put it into the dissertation exactly as you say. Is that okay with you?

Sure.

All right. So you and I were talking about a couple of things you wanted me to put inside the dissertation, one was the explanation about Bennett County & why that was important.

Well, I gotta get in the right mind frame here.
Sorry about that.

Okay, so the original agreement the land of the Dakota Territories. Was, even to this day, it's still considered unceded territories. Right. And but the reservations were set aside for the Lakota people for undisturbed use, right. This is a place for us to learn European ways, go to school, learn to read & write, mathematics, all that stuff. And with us understanding that all of the lands are still ours, because we went to war with them. That's the unceded territory. So the reservations, the word is very important. Read "reserved". "Reservation," right? These are reserved lands for the sole occupancy of Lakota, Dakota, Nakota, Cheyenne, Arapaho.

What Bennett County was and Dawes Act, started with the Dawes Act. They allotted un-ceded territories to white people, without having clear title, no exchange for those lands after the United States lost the war and signed a treaty which says and reinforces 11 times in the Constitution, all treaties, henceforth, shall be the supreme law of the land. Okay, now they violate that right away with the Dawes Act. But when it comes to Bennett County, this is a reserved reservation, "reserved land", for the sole occupancy of the remaining indigenous population. All right. And when they put that out, to be settled by non-native peoples, that's kind of making a statement that "you guys are not going to go on and reproduce." There's no room for expansion, right. So each family member was supposed to get 160 acres. And once that was allotted out, they got that accomplished. We're still going to have kids, and the lands were reserved for sole occupancy of the remaining people. But instead, they allotted it out to non-indigenous peoples. And so, and that was a complete and total violation of the agreements of the treaties. And it was a complete and total theft at that point. Because to steal those lands for the use of white people, without any kind of clear title, any kind of transitional anything. I mean, that's just blatant theft. And they turned right around.

That has a lot to do with the Keepseagle case, Keepseagle v. Vilsack, No. 99-cv-3119 (DDC) (EGS), (1999), where non-European peoples, the blacks,

---

352 See: "Plaintiffs filed Keepseagle in 1999, alleging that since 1981, the USDA systematically denied Native American farmers and ranchers nationwide the same opportunities as white farmers to obtain low-interest rate loans and loan servicing, causing them hundreds of millions of dollars in economic losses. The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia approved a $760 million settlement in April 2011, but payments issued on the initial round of claims in 2012 left roughly $380 million of the settlement undisbursed. Since then, the distribution of the remaining funds has been the subject of extensive negotiations and protracted litigation. Most recently, the U.S. Supreme Court in March declined to hear an appeal to the distribution plans, paving the way for the final payments announced today.” Quote Source: Cohen Milstein, https://www.cohenmilstein.com/update/keepseagle-settlement-makes-final-payments-closing-out-landmark-racial-discrimination-case


The nationwide class action lawsuit Keepseagle v. Vilsack, No. 99-cv-3119 (DDC) (EGS) was filed in November 1999, and on April 28, 2011 the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia approved a historic settlement between Native American farmers and ranchers and the USDA which required USDA to: 1) pay $680 million in damages to thousands of Native Americans, to 2) forgive up to $80 million in outstanding farm loan debt, and to 3) improve the farm loan services USDA provides to Native Americans. The settlement provided that any
that was another case, I don't remember which one that one was called, and minority peoples were not being helped by land grant institutions. And it was just, you know, to quote the one Supreme Court Justice, you know, such "a more ripe and rank and dishonorable dealings," a blatant theft of resources from a peoples who the we had held trust. You know, they're, they're making our financial decisions for us, and they just blatantly stole it, completely total violation. That's why it's so important to make a statement about Bennett County because since Bennett County is within the boundaries of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, all of those lands are, it's up. It's like the Black Hills. It's a blatant thing, right. And it's something that we can just go back and seize back. We can annex them and not recognize their title and take back the entire county because those were direct reservation lands that they made allowances for, and then settled it.

Ev

So on when they broke up Bennett County. I mean, when they ceded Bennett County the US federal government, they broke up the connection between Pine Ridge and Rosebud, that was intentional. I would presume in order to disempower further the tribes and make it smaller. Is that something you would agree with or disagree with?

BD

Absolutely. Yup, decentralize a large people base. In doing so, and Bennett County is still, we still patrol Bennett County with tribal police. Because it's such a checkerboard thing. Some people took some allotments, and some didn't. And anything that didn't get allotted out, they turned into free batten lands, they didn't have a right to do it.

Ev

unclaimed funds would be distributed to non-profit organizations serving Native American farmers and ranchers, referred to as a “cy pres” distribution.

An extensive outreach campaign and claims process was conducted in 2011, which resulted in over 4300 completed claims, of which over 3600 were approved for payment in 2012. Successful Track A claimants, the vast majority of the claimants, received $50,000 directly, plus $12,500 paid to the IRS on their behalf to offset taxes. Track B claimants received up to $250,000, based upon their actual economic loss. This claims process left $380 million undisbursed.

Years of negotiations followed, and on April 20, 2016 the District Court approved an addendum to the original settlement agreement, reflecting a compromise between two competing goals: paying out more funds to claimants who successfully recovered through the claims process, and maintaining the cy pres distributions for the benefit of the class as a whole. That ruling was appealed to the D.C. Circuit, which affirmed the District Court on May 16, 2017. The Supreme Court then declined to hear the case on March 26, 2018, permitting the modification to the agreement to be implemented.

Under the modified settlement, a supplemental award of $18,500 was paid to each prevailing claimant, along with payment of $2,775 to the IRS on their behalf, to offset taxes owed. Those checks were mailed in late May 2018 and accounted for over $76 million of the remaining funds.

Keepseagle v. Vilsack (“Keepseagle I”), No. 99-3119, 2014 WL 5796751 (D.D.C. Nov. 7, 2014) (denying requests by two different groups to intervene in the case to oppose Class Counsel’s motion); Keepseagle v. Vilsack (“Keepseagle II”), No. 99-3119, 2015 WL 1851093 (D.D.C. Apr. 23, 2015) (adjudicating preliminary motions filed by a class representative who intends to move under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) for a different modification of the Settlement Agreement). A handful of issues remain to be decided by the Court, including the ultimate disposition of Class Counsel’s motion.
Sorry, that quote is actually, "a more ripen ranked case of dishonorable dealings will never, in all probability be found in our history..." And that actually comes from a lower court before it goes up to the Supreme Court. That sound about right to you?

BD
Yep.

Ev
Alright then. Anything else you would like to add?

BD
Um, well, I mean, I think there should be a mention that we have ceded lands within our reservation before. And we've taken back title to them. And there's a court case with as a Montana tribe, Red Lake Community where, and this was during Obama's term. And what it what that decision was, is backing exactly what I'm saying here is that the tribe, and this was a, like, there was a Supreme Court justice weighed in on it and said, well, the tribes can recognize title or not at their behest. Because they did pretty much the same thing on Red Lake community, they started letting white people settle into the reservation. And then during Obama's term, there was some disputes over land, the ability to hold land, all right. And so they took it up and took it up. And then there was Obama decided that this was up to the tribe, whether they would recognize title on those lands or not. And so this ties into Bennett County, this ties into the unceded territory of the entire population.

All right, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, all that stuff, because if we don't recognize the title that the United States created. Now, there's a Supreme
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353 Executive Order 13175, "Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments," was issued by U.S. President Bill Clinton on November 6, 2000. This executive order required federal departments and agencies to consult with Indian tribal governments when considering policies that would impact tribal communities. Executive Order 13175 reiterated the federal government's previously acknowledged commitment to tribal self-governance and limited autonomy.

Title III, Self-Governance, and the 1988 Amendments:

“...The 1988 Amendments not only shored up Title I, however. They also introduced a new phase in the legal evolution toward tribal self-governance: the Tribal Self-Governance Demonstration Project under Title III.193 "Self-governance" refers both to the broad principle that tribes have the right to govern themselves, and to particular statutory rights enabling them to do so through the use of federal program funding. As a statutory initiative, self-governance (1) expands the types of programs and responsibilities that participating tribes can take over; (2) places greater emphasis on minimizing oversight by federal agencies; and (3) maximizes flexibility for tribes to redesign programs and reallocate resources in their agreements. The origins of Title III illustrate the interplay of the self-governance philosophy and its legal mechanism in the ISDEAA.” Quote Source: AMERICAN INDIAN LAW REVIEW [Vol. 39] p:30. Direct Link: http://digitalcommons.law.ou.edu/ailr/vol39/iss1/1.
Court ruling and a weigh in on this, saying that the tribes have the absolute ability to not recognize the United States' system of land, whatever, the title on it, the usury title that they created. So this supports like all of the things that I'm saying we can do within our territories. And so those two things are pretty major things. There was a there was a ceding of fee patent lands in Porcupine District here. About 15-16 years ago, there was a ranch over there that had fee patent to it and the tribe wanted to get a hold of it, and to do some community development stuff. And so they annexed the land and took it back. But since it is in the middle of Pine Ridge Reservation, they were able to do it. And there was nothing ever really said about it, nothing really reported on it. So we do know that we have the ability to do this.

Ev
Okay, I'm looking. I'm trying to find the case that you're referring to. And I'm not finding it. But

BD
it was Red Lake Community. I don't remember what that tribe is. Exactly.

Ev
Okay. I'll look it up, then. And is there anything else you want to add to that? Bryan?

BD
Um, I can't think of anything at the moment. But I mean this is like, even today, it's like the Black Hills, you have people that have lands in Bennett County, and they're extremely wealthy white people.

Ev
Yeah.

BD
Same thing in the Black Hills. But you have a Supreme Court case saying that, yes, that land is your land, to, you know, the tribes. And yet they still occupy it and hold our lands. And anything that was produced from it, and anything, you know, that's all grievances that we have. And same thing with the pipelines. Now, none of the indigenous peoples want anything to do with pipelines or fracking. As the true owners, the allodial titleholders of these lands, because

355 Please Note: "Allodial title is a real property ownership system where the real property is owed free and clear of any superior landlord. In this case, the owner will have an absolute title over his or her property. Property owned under allodial title is referred as allodial land. Allodial lands are the absolute property of their owner and are not subject to any service or acknowledgment to a superior. In allodial lands there will not be any control by a superior landlord.

An individual’s allodial title is alienable in nature. Alienation can be done in the form of gift, mortgage or it may be distressed and restrained for collection of taxes. The allodial nature of a property will be lost when the property is transferred to more than one person. Therefore, to retain the allodial title s/he can transfer his or her property to another single individual. For example, when an owner of a property dies leaving ownership to more than one heir, the allodial status of the property is lost. The following is an example of a case defining allodial title: Allodial
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the United States has never won any wars against us. And they have never bought, traded or paid or rented or anything else, our lands. It is completely within our abilities as the true titleholders of the lands to say no. And to use this as a means to break our trust status. Okay. This is, you know, the child becomes an adult.

We have learned the white man's ways we have learned business, mathematics, reading all of that stuff. And that was the true meaning behind those treaties, was that we would learn those ways and then we would take over the management of our lands and holdings again. And so as the and we've had blatant mismanagement by the United States government, who is our guardian, Guardian, and this this stuff with the pipeline's so for us to take this back, we have to start exercising basics, and we have to go and focus on things like Bennett County, like the Black Hills, and the things that we have won and are easily winnable. And there's plenty of case history. We have all of this stuff to uphold this. And we can decide whether we're gonna accept a non-indigenous people person to hold title, usury title on our lands, we can recognize them or not. And if we don't want them, it is the federal government's responsibility to remove those people from our lands.

Now, if we agree that they are good for the people, and they're helpful to the peoples, then we can recognize their title and allow them to occupy that land. But yeah, but we have the ability to decide, you know, we don't have land back because it's producing taxes. And so they're basically renting from us and we can recognize that rental agreement, that usury deed if we want to but right now we have a wayward guardian. That is letting them perpetrate on us. Hopefully, I'm saying this all in a way that's understandable.

Ev
I think so. Yes. Then when you say we, you're referring to the entire tribe with, with standing with the tribal councils or how would that be determined?

BD
Okay, the tribal council cannot do this. Because almost all the tribes operate under the IRA, Indian Reorganization Act. Okay. The Council is not a traditional governance, because, alright, if you go back to the Supreme Court decision, as I think this was, like 1987ish. There was a Supreme Court ruling that regard sovereignty as it pertains to Native Americans. And it says, the Native Americans are sovereign, each individual onto his own. All right, the IRA is a representative of the federal government, they get paid from the federal government. So they are part of that guardianship, they are part of that wayward Guardianship for those bad decisions so far as like the survival of the

title is defined as one that is free.” [Stewart v. Chicago Title Ins. Co., 151 Ill. App. 3d 888 (Ill. App. Ct. 1987)] (Source: https://definitions.uslegal.com/a/allodial-title/).
tribe. So it takes each individual onto his own. All right, that doesn't say that we can't organize and create our own system. I mean, we have, you know, 10s of thousands of years of tribal organization without the IRA. The federal government only recognizes the IRA governance, however, that is our own decision.

Ev
So if you were as a tribe, if you were to challenge like Bennett County, as well as the other issues you brought up, when would that be done through a three quarter representation of tribal peoples? Or how would that how would that be to proceed?

BD
Oh, that wouldn't, all that would take is individual tribal members creating a tort claim to challenge it. A class action lawsuit, the challenge, that's all it would do would be and if far as that's concerned, we could circulate a petition to the IRA system and tell them, we are going to annex Bennett County. We're gonna take all of those titles back, now it's going to cause a lot of shit. But we can do it, it is within our realm.

Ev
Right. So that would be now going to show the history of US federal Indian Law, and how it has been used to, to rob natives, legally, in terms of the way whites do things. How? Don't you think that it would be very difficult to try to do that at a time when you have like a Republican House? Senate? presidency? You got white governors? Who are Republicans in North Dakota? and you know,

BD
yeah. There's, There lies like the real issues, okay. Because the federal government is this like, catch all thing, right? We negotiated these treaties on a nation to nation basis. All right. And so you're running to the Supreme Court, the nation that has everything to lose, if you know, there's a fair deal reached. And so they're gonna, and the federal law is always written to benefit the federal government. And so, the only real way to do this is get it into a venue where it is nation to nation. All right, so the first thing we have to do is cast off our guardian ship. We have to throw them away and say, No, we are not doing what you say anymore because you're a fucking crook.

Ev
And cutting off any type of government dependency, correct?

BD
Right. That's the first thing we have to do is say we are not going to follow the IRA governance system. We are not going to follow and So, like, there's a
series of steps that you have to do, because this is all based on *UCC, Uniform Commercial Code*, which is nation laws. All right. So that's the place that we have to see it, not the *Supreme Court*, we have to see it in under UCC or beyond, like *UN* kind of stuff. And that's where we have to get our first decisions. And once we have those first decisions, then we have to start acting as sovereigns.

We have to start taking those things. Okay. So now, you win those cases, right? Cause it's really not even a win. It's just a decision being made. All right. Yeah. So now you have to go and figure out how you're going to recognize those white people that are dwelling within our reserve first, same thing with our unceded territories. All right. Now, they can either be beneficial and join the tribe, or they can be against us. And we remove them. Which, you know, begins, we're going to have to start with, how do we hire our police force slash army to remove these people, and it is still part of the Guardians role to remove those people. So yeah, if Republicans are in there, you're probably not going to get any kind of cooperation to do this.

**Ev**
Right

**BD**
It'll be a little bit easier under a democratic setting, no matter what it's still going to be each individual thinks they're going to lose their land. But I mean, they can be either beneficial to the peoples that dwell here, or they can be against us. And if they are not beneficial, we don't recognize them. And they go away. And we got to do it house to house.

**Ev**
And Bryan, if that were something, you know, to happen in the future, that would mean then that native peoples would have to start paying federal taxes, is that correct?

**BD**
No, not at all. But we decided, because we're the allodial title holders. We don't have to base it on any kind of financial anything. I mean, you could look more closely to what, what this will be like, by looking to *Africa*, after apartheid, because they never bought or traded for those lands. And then they went down and create these big ass ranches and all this other stuff and mined for diamonds and gold and all this other stuff. And then now today, they turned around and they said, You didn't buy that land, you didn't, whatever. So now you're out of here. And they removed them. And they've been removing. So we use *South Africa* is a case study to try to figure out how to proceed in something.
Ev
Yeah,

BD
I mean, this is a bit different. But the methods and the ways they did it are very similar. So like the methods to reverse it are going to be very similar.

Ev
Okay. All right. Is there anything else you'd like to add in relation to what we're talking about?

BD
I don't think so.

Ev
Okay, and so my next question to you is, Bryan, you reviewed, we have reviewed the dissertation, Section four and five in particular. Are you okay with it?

BD
Yeah. I am

Ev
Okay. And is there, I did not fully address the issues having to do with environmental injustices specific to Native Americans and reservations, because that would have been another 200 pages, probably two to 300 pages. But this information that you've added, will help to address the little that I did address in the dissertation itself. The other thing I would like to say is basically that you had said that in relation to the diachronizational history of the Lakota people that it was kind of like old news, you already knew that. And I and I fully understand that. But did you understand why the paradigm was important? Because I tried to explain it to you and just saying to you kind of like what happened at the dissertation defense, we wanted to go over, we did not want to spend the time to talk about it or even present it. And that is the culture of America, that is the culture of academia.

BD
Yeah. And I did spend a little bit more time thinking on that particular thing. So, intone, context and intone are extremely important. Because what the Europeans because they were the only ones that could write. Okay, so what was understood what was intoned, and the intent behind the negotiations of the treaties were not written. They wrote down what they wanted to write down. Um, there's, there was one thing that most people have studied even a tiny bit of indigenous stuff. There was a treaty, or they said it was a treaty, they just being general people in regard to Native Americans, right. And I said, as long
as the grass grows, river flows, and, you know, sunsets and all this other stuff, right. That was never in a treaty. Okay, that was what a translator told the chief.

Ev
And that was a way to measure how long the treaty would be in effect, is that correct?

BD
Yep. And so, but I mean, what that does, is, that puts this red light on what was said versus, and what was understood what was said, versus what was written, puts a spotlight on it, in fact, because almost everybody that's common knowledge that that was a trade, right? But it wasn't, it was never written. So intone and context, so far as diachronization is extremely important, because the direction and the understanding of the indigenous peoples is extremely important to understand before you step into this other stuff.

Ev
Okay, and, and so the paradigm that I have shared with you, and you've allowed me to use in the work we do together, emphasizes that history, and it, more, Moreover, it emphasizes the need to have instruction at the academic level, and in teacher preparation colleges and in public school history classes and language art classes, in which this history is addressed in this in this manner, and it needs to be published, it needs to be brought to people's attention, in spite of the fact that there will be resistance.

BD
Yeah, yeah. Because without it, you have no idea what is the real truth? So I'm in. And I didn't I don't think I said that very well, in the defense. But, I mean, it is an extremely important thing to have on there.

Ev
All right. Thank you, Bryan, do you want to add anything else before we end this transcription update?

BD
Um,
I don't think so. I mean, if I think anything, I'll definitely reach out.

Ev
So think about that, because I'm going to try to wrap it up. And this is actually your opportunity to bring anything you want to be published in the dissertation that will actually be sitting in that library, with this history and this information documented. So is there anything else you want to add before we end the transcript?
BD
I don't think so at this point. I mean, there's so many historical things that have happened. But there's entire volumes of history.

Ev
Yeah. I think that one of the things that I probably did not, and I'm not and I couldn't, because we're emphasizing the work we were doing together is different from what we will later publish, God willing, and that is addressing the unequal distribution of power in terms of environmental issues for Native Americans, when native tribes are going up against corporations and government systems that back the corporations. That is a battle that really needs to be published about. It's written about, it's talked about, but it needs to be condensed in a way that it's at the meso-level within a particular tribal community. For instance, Pine Ridge, and that is something I'm hoping you and I will do soon. Okay.

BD
All right. Yeah.

Ev
All right. We good?

BD
I think we're good.

Ev
All right. We'll talk soon.

BD
Okay.

Ev
Appreciate it.

BD
Yep.

Ev
bye
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