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This edited volume is the result of a collaborative project of Indigenous graduate education training and higher education-tribal institution partnerships in the southwestern United States. We feature the work of interdisciplinary scholars writing about local peoples, issues, and knowledges that demonstrate rich linkages between universities and Indigenous communities. Collectively, as Indigenous peoples writing, this work takes the opportunity to explore why and how Indigenous peoples are working to reframe dominant limits of our power and to shift educational efforts from the colonial back to an Indigenous center. These efforts reflect a conscientious practice to maintain Indigenous worldviews through diverse yet unified approaches aimed at serving Indigenous peoples and places.

“The luminous Indigenous scholarship contained here comes to us as a rare gift. The voices of Pueblo intellectuals speak to the profoundly innovative Indigenous doctoral cohort model they co-developed with Liz Sumida Huaman and Bryan Brayboy of Arizona State University. They also instruct us in the richness of their contemporary, community-based research, rooted in the ‘creative genius of our ancestors,’ as Karuk scholar Julian Lang evocatively described Indigenous epistemologies.”
– K. Tsianina Lomawaima, Professor & Distinguished Scholar of Indigenous Education, School of Social Transformation, Arizona State University

“The editors and writers reveal identity and sense of place as indigenous people from their own native perspectives rooted in both their spirit and in their place in the academy. As indigenous people, we strive for the academy to belong to us without the definitions and framework of colonization. This book contributes to our ownership of the academy as a place where we belong with all the knowledge of our ancestors and the promises of the future embedded in what we learn and what we teach.”
– Cheryl Crazy Bull, President & CEO, American Indian College Fund

“The depth and breadth of knowledge of the editors in Indigenous education and their ability to apply the knowledge to produce practical outcomes and benefits to our Indigenous communities on the ground comes through in this book. It transforms ideas into action and demonstrates the ‘blisters on the authors’ hands’ based experiences that delineate Indigenous Leaders from Indigenous Academics in my view. Indigenous Leaders enact their research into real outcomes for the people on the ground and don’t just write about the issues challenging our peoples.”
– Bentham Atirau Ohia, President AMO-Advancement of Maori Opportunity & and AIO-Americans for Indian Opportunity Board member
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SERIES FOREWORD

The present book, *Indigenous Innovations in Higher Education: Local Knowledge and Critical Research* is the fourth volume in the series Advances in Innovation Education (AIIE), and co-incidentally heralds the fourth year of the series. The series was founded in 2013 with the purpose of bringing to the community the conceptual foundations of innovation from historical, socio-political, economic, scientific and ethical perspectives, as well to apply these foundations towards issues confronting education, science and society in the 21st century. The first volume, *Raising the Alarm* (Robert Este) presented a philosophical basis for a discussion of innovation and science; the second volume, *Indigenous Innovation: Universalities and Peculiarities* (Sumida Huaman & Sriraman) examined Indigenous perspectives to innovation through the lens of different Indigenous communities in the world; the third volume, *The Road to Independence* (Gunnarsdóttir & Jónsdóttir) laid the foundation for practical work on innovation – namely the building blocks and steps to pursue entrepreneurship from an idea to a viable, marketable product in a grassroots fashion applicable to poorer communities that constantly innovate to survive!

The present volume by Elizabeth Sumida Huaman and Bryan McKinley Jones Brayboy addresses Indigenous innovations in higher education by reporting on a collaborative project focused on Indigenous graduate education, and specifically on a partnership between an institution of higher education and tribal education. The book features the work of Pueblo Indian peoples writing from within their own communities, who were part of one of the largest graduate education cohorts in the United States, earning terminal degrees at Arizona State University. The lead editor of the book, Elizabeth Sumida Huaman also edited the second volume in this series, with me as the co-editor. Her work is innovative because it examines critically the relationship between Indigenous lands and natural resources, languages, cultural practices, and educational development, policy and practice, through both small scale and large scale collaborative partnerships with Indigenous communities in North and South America. While the previous edited volume brought into attention local knowledge systems from different parts of the world, this book draws specifically on the Pueblo Indian peoples of New Mexico. The innovative aspect of this book lies in ways the local knowledge of Pueblo Indians were supported by an institution of higher education leading to diversity in critical research applicable to their communities, and resulting in knowledge sanctioned by the academy. Although the project is geographically located in the South-western part of the United States, its innovative aspects serve as an example that is worth emulating in other regions of the world.

The series also welcomes numerous new members into the editorial board – namely Rósa Gunnarsdóttir and Svanborg Rannveig Jónsdóttir both from the University of
SERIES FOREWORD

Iceland; Andrew Penaluna, University of Wales – Trinity Saint David, UK; Larisa Shavinina, University of Quebec, Canada, and last but not least Elizabeth Sumida Huaman, Arizona State University, USA.

I am hoping the series will continue to bring volumes that push a diversity of notions of “innovation” to relevant contexts and situations we are collectively facing in an increasingly polarized world governed by inhumane corporations and institutions. In doing so, we challenge dominant perceptions and ways of thinking that permeate the notion of “innovation” – beyond the marketing of a product to a gullible public.

Bharath Sriraman (Series Editor)
Missoula, Montana
April 4, 2017
Does it matter how one uses language and for what purpose?
(Cook-Lynn, 1996, p. 74)

FOREWORDS/ FORWARD/ FORWARD/ FOUR WORDS

Complexity and multiplicity are emblematic of Pueblo worldview and consciousness. To provide a foundation to engage and address the work of the Pueblo doctoral scholars presented in this book, I employ the complexity and multiplicity of English homonyms. Drawing on different meanings of foreword, forward, and four words, I explore the deep roots from which, and for whom, Pueblo scholars emerge and write.

This book features the writings of members of the first Pueblo doctoral cohort emerging from Arizona State University’s School of Social Transformation. This first cohort produced doctors in Justice Studies in May 2015 trained in Pueblo and Indigenous theoretical frameworks, broader discourse analysis of imperialism and globalization, critique of historical inequalities, and building Indigenous justice through domestic and internationally relevant research.

The expression of Pueblo intellectualism through the English language brings to mind the preference many Indigenous language speakers have for communicating in their native tongue. Robert Cruz, a Tohono O’odham speaker and linguist, says he prefers his native language because “…when I use English, I feel as if I am lying because there is no feeling in my utterances in the colonists’ languages” (2012, p. 97). Orality and literacy in the colonists’ languages by Indigenous Peoples are at once, challenging and profound. Profound because they bridge the divide between primary oral cultures and literate ones and allow Indigenous Peoples to express and exchange ideas across multiple Indigenous language groups. They are challenging precisely because of the struggle in matching feelings and profound understandings across primary oral cultures and literate ones whether in speech or in writing.
FIRST, A WORD ON FOREWORDS

Anishinabek scholar Professor John Borrows selected four words to organize his memorable “fourword” for the inaugural issue of the Indigenous Law Journal (Borrows, 2002). Similarly, I have selected four homonyms as the organizing device for this foreword. From Elizabeth Hill Boone’s foreword to Indigenous Intellectuals: Knowledge, Power, and Colonial Culture in Mexico and the Andes, I consider the connections between the precolonial definition of the Aztec intellectual and the modern work of Pueblo scholars.

Boone’s foreword begins with a “description of [the] sage in the Preconquest society of the Mexico Aztecs” (p. ix). Of especial significance is that the Nahuatl term tlamatini for the sage is gendered neutral.1 Likewise, Pueblo peoples have always possessed male and female intellectuals. The tlamatini is wise, exemplary; possesses writings, owns books; the tlamatini is the tradition, the road; a leader, a rower, a companion, a bearer of responsibility, a guide. The description of the tlamatini as “the road…” is particularly meaningful (p. ix): Knowing the good road, and to lead along a bright path are apt roles for, and descriptions of, Pueblo Indigenous intellectuals.2

Scholarship of Indigenous Peoples, particularly scholarship reflective of the Indigenous knowledge frames is of immense importance to Indigenous Peoples and to all humanity. One of the benefits of diversity (as opposed to homogeneity of all types, i.e. race, gender, age, and yes, tribal affiliation) is the cognitive diversity and group thinking that enriches any space as a result of bringing diverse peoples together (Page, 2008). We see this reflected in the scholarship of the diverse group of the first cohort of Pueblo men and women. All are at different stages in their careers, in different disciplines, and from different Pueblo communities, including Isleta, Laguna, Tesuque, San Ildefonso, Jemez, and Cochiti.

Whether called an intellectual, tlamatini, sage, or wise one (Boone, 2014), in the past or in the present, Indigenous intellectuals existed, exist, and will continue to exist. Two decades ago, Indigenous scholar Elizabeth Cook-Lynn called out the challenges for the modern Indigenous intellectual, including stereotypes and invisibility. She commented that “American Indian intellectual” to many people, is a “bizarre phrase” and that no image of an American Indian intellectual exists amide predominant stereotypes, including the “primitive figure…[or] worse, the drunk” (Cook-Lynn, 1996, p. 57). Akimel O’Odham scholar David Martinez further recognizes that “intellectual” is inadequate, evocative of ivory towers, scholarly culture, an intelligentsia, all of which are non-Indigenous, yet “necessary for affirming that Indigenous writers are as capable as their European or American counterparts of profound insights expressed in eloquent prose” (2010, p. 30).

Pueblo knowledge is ensconced in orality and in an oral tradition. The tlamatini is described as one “possessing writings and owning books” (Boone, 2014, p. ix). It is a description that fits the tlamatini with their pictographic script and the Pueblo intellectual schooled in the modern university. Indeed, the relationship between
orality and literacy is worthy of deep reflection (Ong, 2002). However, writings and books of symbolic or syllabic recordings of words need not be thought of as the only “texts” with which Indigenous scholars are familiar. Of importance to any Indigenous knowledge frame is an understanding of other alter/native “texts” (Zuni Cruz, 2006, p. 898)—the land, the cosmos, the patterns, the weather, animals, plants, relationships, the ecosystem (Cajete, 2000). For example, stories are embedded in place and in the landscape itself. Of equal significance in the Indigenous knowledge frame is the embedded meaning in symbols, colors, story and narrative, and performance (Hibbetts, 1992). Cook-Lynn observed that Indian scholars suggest that, “ideas, in general…are to be generated from the inside of culture, not from the outside looking in” (1996, p. 70). This is a hallmark of the contributors to this book. What they have in common is the understanding of their place within, and their connection to, Pueblo peoples. As Cook-Lynn warned Indigenous intellectuals, if that work becomes too far removed from what is really going on in Indian enclaves, there will be no way to engage in responsible intellectual strategies in an era when structures of external cultural power are more oppressive than ever. Moreover, no important pedagogical movement will be made toward those defensive strategies which are among the vital functions of intellectualism: to change the world, to know it, and to make it better by knowing how to seek appropriate solutions to human problems. (Cook-Lynn, 1996, p. 71)

Represented here are Pueblo writers aware of “what is really going on,” engaging in responsible intellectual strategies, and moving toward defensive strategies. Each contributes to the functions of intellectualism – to change, to know, to make the Pueblo world better.

SECOND, ON BEING FORWARD

Possessed of voice, made louder, more prominent, and permanent by print and electronic reproduction, Indigenous intellectuals and scholars can be viewed as being forward within their own communities. Boldness is required of the intellectual to assert a position, a thought, or an idea. Boldness can conflict with community expectations of modesty and humility from leaders. Yet we need the strident, the ardent, and the eager to stir consciousness. It takes strength and perseverance to state the unpopular, to sound the alarm, and to get others to take action. This is an aspect of leadership. The tlamatini was described as “a leader” (of “men,” in the English translation), a “bearer of responsibility” and a “companion” (Boone, 2014, p. ix). A leader and bearer of responsibility, who is also a companion, must balance boldness with continued relationship.

The tlamatini was also known as “the tradition” (Boone, 2014, p. ix). Addressing tradition, in the present and moving into the future, takes boldness. Cook-Lynn describes Indigenous intellectuals as exploring traditional values, revealing truth and falsity about those values from a framework of tribal realism. It is diametrically
opposed to fantasy, which often evades or suppresses moral issues (Cook-Lynn, 1996, p. 72). As such, the Indigenous intellectual must also possess courage. Tribal realism recognizes the paradox of tradition as connected to the past, yet not rigid in past form. Tradition exists in the present. A living tradition requires constant alignment to true values, as pressures shift or sway tradition from true values over time. As Lorenzo asserts in respect to Pueblo women, the comparison of historical-contemporary analysis helps to appreciate the process of negotiation between Pueblo peoples and Spanish colonists when [their] two legal traditions met and is helpful in understanding the past. As Pueblo peoples move into the future, “comparison can assist in determining traces of the Spanish colonial, often patriarchal systems that may exist, to our detriment, among our Pueblos (Lorenzo).”

AND *FORWARD* – AS IN BEING AT THE FORE OR FRONT

Related to *being* forward, Indigenous intellectuals often find themselves in front, literally or figuratively, at the head, scouting, forward looking. They are to help us understand our future (Cook-Lynn, 1996). Cook-Lynn poses a series of questions about Native intellectualism and intellectuals, specifically poets and novelists, but equally applicable across all disciplines.

[Are they] articulating the real and the marvelous in celebration of the past… presenting ideas, moving through those ideas and beyond? Are they the ones who recapture the past and preserve it? Are they thinkers who are capable of supplying principles which may be used to develop further ideas? Are they capable of the *critical analysis* of cause and effect? (Cook-Lynn, 1996, p. 74, my emphasis)

With these questions, Cook-Lynn probes not only who Indigenous intellectuals are, but also what they are doing. Her questions capture the work and the purpose of the Pueblo cohort—as senior scholar Dozier Enos writes in this volume, “looking into the past is part of looking forward, and that research, like time, is not really linear,” because the future is connected to the past and the past to the future.

**FOUR WORD(S) TO GUIDE INDIGENOUS SCHOLARS AND INTELLECTUALS**

In answering the question as to whether a traditional Pima knowledge bearer, is an Indigenous intellectual in comparison to his contemporaries in the progressive Indian community, Martinez considers four principles “one ought to bear in mind” in defining an Indigenous intellectual (2010, p. 2). Based on these principles, I suggest four words that mark or define the understandings and characterize the work of the Indigenous intellectual that are present in the Pueblo authors’ work – *mental sovereignty, Indigeneity, humility, and narrative*. These key words capture the attitudes, characteristics, and positionality of Indigenous intellectuals *in relationship to* their communities (Martinez, 2010).
Mental Sovereignty

To knowingly engage in the war of words and ideas, is to assert mental sovereignty (Zuni Cruz, 2008). Martinez’s first principle recognizes that “each indigenous community in its own way [is] capable of addressing the most poignant issues of the human condition: life and death, human nature, origins, community, and the like” (Martinez, 2010, p. 2). Understanding this is to recognize the existence of a distinct Pueblo mentality, knowledge system, and intellectual tradition. To value it as the starting place in research and analysis and to seek to preserve it are exercises of Pueblo mental sovereignty.

Pueblo mental sovereignty exhibits itself as the authors in this book speak of Pueblo worldview, Pueblo core values, Pueblo cultural terms, and strengthening Pueblo tribal self-determination and sovereignty (Lorenzo, Sanchez, Luarkie, and Abeita). It asserts itself as a push against convention to explore why mainstream research is problematic from a Pueblo Indian standpoint, so that relevant research and educational approaches grounded in Pueblo thinking can emerge (Suina).

Indigeneity

Indigenous identity and relationship to community are crucial aspects of indigeneity. Martinez’s second principle describes an Indigenous intellectual as “an indigenous person first and foremost, which includes valuing one’s people and their relationship with their homeland, language, kinship, and sacred history (Martinez, 2010, p. 2).” Authors in this book also address valuing Indigeneity and its relational ethic of care. Chosa speaks of migration and youth engagement and re-engagement with their Pueblo communities. Ericson identifies as critical to cultural and “ecological survivance” the engagement of Indigenous youth in establishing place based solutions to environmental and social problems “outside of, and in spite of, external state impositions or interference.”

Humility

Third is the principle of humility, which recognizes “being an intellectual is not limited to being college educated and speaking and writing in a European language (Martinez, 2010, p. 2).” Humility rejects the elitism of the academy and proficiency in non-Indigenous languages and turns Indigenous intellectuals inward to the knowledge bearers proficient in the alter/native “texts” and the mother tongue. The third principle instructs humility and reminds us of the limitations of western knowledge. In her chapter, Naranjo describes the knowledge bearers who transmit core values and practices to illustrate how life was lived and to explain the reasons we lived our lives as we did, reminding us of the critical work of intellectual forebears. Further, to underscore the need to engage Indigenous knowledge bearers...
directly, Dozier Enos explains that there are very traditional Indigenous people whose research will never be included in publication.

**Narrative**

Narrative is at the core of oral tradition (Ong, 2002). The fourth principle asserts, “while indigenous communities possess an intellectual tradition, they do not have a theoretical one; instead, philosophical and religious ideas and insights are conveyed primarily through narrative, be it in the form of a story, song, or speech (emphasis added) (Martínez, 2010, pp. 2–3). Naranjo highlights the messaging in everyday speech. She states:

To the generation in which I grew up, the community was the whole world, and Tewa, the language spoken at Santa Clara Pueblo, captures the core values held dear in that world. For example, everyone in the community was your ko-o, your aunt, your mae-mae, your uncle. In other words, we are all related.

Likewise, Sanchez, drawing largely from Tewa oral tradition, including story-sharing, describes Tewa Women United’s methodological framework in both research and practice and Suina, in her effort to understand her own relationship to research employs autoethnography. The authors’ use of narrative in its different forms: to convey principles, as a frame, and as a method of study demonstrate its centrality to the conveyance of ideas and insights.

**A FINAL THOUGHT ON “FOR/E/FOUR”**

The prefix of foreword is also a homonym, with homophones and homographs: for/fore/four. These homonyms provide powerful connections between the writers and their Peoples and to core Pueblo principles. The work in this book is for the community, emerging from the work of intellectual forebears, for those to come, arising from four critical principles: mental sovereignty, Pueblo indigeneity, humility, and narrative.

And
ah’um, Elder Sister (Elizabeth),
how
and
for what purpose
one
uses language
does matter.

*Her’kem*

C.Z.C.

University of New Mexico
FOREWORD

NOTES

1 In Nahuatl, “tlamatini-In tlamatini tauilli ocutly, tomaoa ocufl apocio, texteatl, coiaoa texcatl, necoe xapo, tille, tlapale, amuxoa, amoxe, tilli, tlappali, utli, teiacanqui, tlanelo, teuicani, tlauicani, tlile, tlapale, amuxoa, amoxe, tlilli, tlapalli, utli, teiacanqui, tlanelo, teuicani, tlauicani.” (italics removed) In a Spanish to English translation, the tlamatini becomes “The Wise Man-The wise man [is] exemplary. He possesses writings; he owns books. [He is] the tradition, the road; a leader of men, a rower, a companion, a bearer of responsibility, a guide” (Boone, 2014, p. ix).

2 In Tiwa, Pae kui. The good road. “Once we are born into this world, we have a chance to make it back to our Creator, but whether we do or not depends on the choices we make in life. Thus, we set upon our life journey…As we travel the road of life; we come upon a place where the road goes in opposite directions. The horizon in one direction appears to be cool and shady while the horizon in the other direction is bright and sunny. The road that goes in the direction of the cool and shady horizon gets darker and darker as one travels until it is completely dark. So dark that the traveler must open the eyelids with the fingers to make sure the eyes are open. As one travels in the other direction, the road gets brighter and brighter as one goes on until one sees the brilliant glory of our Creator. The traveler steps right into that brilliance and the spirit is reunited with the Creator. That is the good road. (Tiwa translation and commentary by Edward Fernando Lucero)”

3 From here forward, I reference the essays in this book by the author’s last name parenthetically or in text.

4 Cook-Lynn specifically asks, “If it is true that writers are the intellectuals of any nation…Is anyone doing the intellectual work in and about Indian communities that will help us understand our future? (Cook-Lynn, 1996, p. 74)
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SECTION I

ESTABLISHING LOCAL CONTEXT
AND LOCAL KNOWLEDGE
1. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND ACADEME

Building Learning Spaces through Innovative Educational Practice

**INTRODUCTION**

In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* first published in 1968, Brazilian educator-scholar Paulo Freire discussed what he referred to as the “absolutizing of ignorance,” among other myths invented and perpetuated by oppressors for the purposes of maintaining power over the conquered, the colonized, “the oppressed.” Freire argued that the inhumanity of oppressors and revolutionary humanism, which are—on their surface—contradictory, both made use of science and technology that would either reduce the oppressed to subjects of scientific interest if the former, or promote humanization in the case of the latter (2005, p. 133). Freire (2005) claimed that the very definition, categorization, and certification of knowledge by those in power elevated the perceived intellectual superiority of the oppressors who would ultimately come to believe completely in the ignorance of others. He wrote:

This myth implies the existence of someone who decrees the ignorance of someone else. The one who is doing the decreeing defines himself and the class to which he belongs as those who know or were born to know; he thereby defines others as alien entities. The words of his own class come to be the “true” words, which he imposes or attempts to impose on others: the oppressed, *whose words have been stolen from them.* (pp. 133–134, our emphasis)

While the absolutizing of ignorance is applied to science, where Indigenous peoples have indisputably been constructed as subjects (Deloria, 1997; LaDuke, 2005; Smith, 1999; Whitt, 1998) this myth applies widely to diverse fields that make up higher education today, including the social sciences and humanities. In academe, knowledge tends to remain situated by—and through—Western traditions and rigidly defined and managed by dominant society shaped through colonialism (Brayboy, 2005; Dei, 2002; Leonard & Mercier, 2016). Similarly, education as the method of knowledge transfer (and validation) is rooted in Eurocentrism and accepted only as schooling, despite the myriad ways societies teach and learn. However, over the past several decades, Indigenous researchers have challenged dominant definitions of knowledge and mechanisms of transmission and their colonial underpinnings while bringing...
to the forefront Indigenous knowledges from diverse regions around the world as crucial for human, intellectual, and ecological diversity and survival (Aikenhead & Ogawa, 2007; Cajete, 2000; Johnson, 2012; Kawagley, 1995; McGregor, 2004; Pierotti & Wildcat, 2000). Indigenous peoples have engaged these conversations by using approaches to research and discourses that transcend characterizations of our peoples, homelands, and ways of knowing as victims of colonization rather than as actors who have disrupted, resisted, negotiated, adapted, and innovated subjugating agendas and oppressive conditions. In this regard, Mi’qmaq scholar Marie Battiste reminded us of not only our abilities, but also our responsibilities to push limiting characterizations as scholars who “move beyond the existing Indigenous experience of colonization by liberating Indigenous thought, practices, and discourses rather than relying on existing Eurocentric or colonial theory” (2000, p. xix).

Our responsibility in this chapter is to therefore share work we chose to do with our students and to situate this work in a broader context across space and time. We expose pervasive myths regarding dominant constructions of knowledge and education and interrupt them by highlighting local Indigenous knowledges and epistemologies reflected in the work of the authors in this volume. Drawing from Indigenous scholarship and with explicit conscientiousness of ourselves as Indigenous community members, we hope to contribute to the iterative (re) framing of education by describing our experiences within academe that address resistance in and through education, including discussion of anti-colonialism (Dei, 2002; Simmons & Dei, 2012) and mental colonization (Zuni Cruz, 2008). We revisit the conscientious uplifting of Indigeneity through education redefined and co-constructed by Indigenous peoples (Lomawaima, 1999; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). We discuss the power of Indigenous narratives in education while underscoring Indigenous presence and scholarly contributions in higher education before introducing the authors and the significance of their work independently and as a collective to Indigenous and local discourses of self-representation and giving (Romero, 1994; Smith, 1999). In this way, guided by the work of Ojibwe scholar Scott Lyons (2000), we seek to re-set “the terms of the debate” (p. 452).

As educational researchers, we aim to follow Battiste’s example to continually work alongside our community members, Indigenous colleagues, and allies to identify and create spaces where Indigenous knowledges and epistemologies can be cultivated—including those where they have not been seen as valid or welcomed. As educators, we also take up Freire’s call to consider how our interactions with multiple knowledges and the rich and varied sources from which they come can be used for humanistic purposes, such as rebuilding educational opportunities towards Indigenous self-determination (Brayboy, 2004; Brayboy & Sumida Huaman, 2016) and where “stolen words” are reclaimed by their rightful speakers. Moreover, as Indigenous peoples, we have an obligation to hold close and defend our Indigenous communities, knowledges and epistemologies, which remind us of where we come from, who we are, and what we bring to this world.
Indigenous educational systems—in and out of school—are consciously and often elegantly designed to perpetuate peoplehood in very focused and particular ways. Resistance to authority that threatens individual and group autonomy, cultural ways of being, and knowledges are necessarily precipitated by a quest for survival. To not resist is to acquiesce to forces of an assimilationist agenda, whether through formalized schooling, federal policy, or societal norms that have become normalized. And yet resistance is only one part of survival because the strength and motivation to persevere are fed by the desire and need to move toward. To become stronger in the fight, we need to understand what it is we are fighting for and where we will be as a people when we succeed. (Brayboy et al., 2007, p. 233)

In higher education, we have been besieged with statistics focused on “deficiencies”—mostly quantitative figures that demonstrate low percentages of Indigenous peoples attending and graduating higher education programs. Based on a clear understanding of imperialism and colonial (exploitative and extractive) histories, we expect to see marginalization, silencing, and subjugation of Indigenous and colonized peoples. But we also understand that this is not our only story. And, we need to understand that there are multiple destinations possible; failure or deficiency is not the only choice or outcome. In considering alternative stories, less popular and in some ways more challenging to do, is comprehensive, collaborative, transparent, and participatory research that focuses on Indigenous strengths in facing dominant institutions and structural violence. Thus, our task here is not to cite statistics on the scarcity of Indigenous peoples in higher education and more specifically at graduate degree levels, but rather to offer what we, as Indigenous education stakeholders, are moving toward. We do not deny that much of what we envision today responds to generations of colonial experiences that appear to intensify or slow based on broader policy impacts du jour; however, in our resistance and envisioning work, we remain continually informed by the knowledges, cultural practices, languages, fears, priorities, and hopes held by tribal community members of all ages and that are communicated to us.

Of Indigenous knowledges in academe, Ghanaian-born scholar George Sefa Dei wrote that his tasks included challenging normative definitions of knowledge while expanding critical approaches towards knowledge and knowledge acquisition, critiquing false binaries (i.e. Indigenous knowledges as “good,” Western knowledges as “bad”), and questioning how prevailing imperial ideologies and colonialism continue to inform knowledge production evident in current educational practice (2002, p. 4). He also put forward ideas regarding anti-colonial education as a theoretical framework for rebuilding educational practice that “allows us to dialogue with important questions of identity affirmation, yet at the same time
bring to the discussion relevant issues specifically concerning interconnections of power, difference, and resistance as augured in colonial geographies” (Simmons & Dei, 2012, p. 68). Anti-colonial education is particularly significant as we consider the ways in which colonial ideologies, institutions, and other assertions of power have not disappeared over time; however, they have been reconfigured for current dominant purposes and contemporary mainstream desires (Simmons & Dei, 2012).

Historically, policymakers external to Indigenous communities shaped what education at all levels has become for Indigenous people—formalized systems almost completely foreign to the Indigenous environment, cultural practices, and languages. Dominant schooling contains what Fuller (1991) referred to as “sacred rules” and “sacred knowledge” based on Western standards and ideals, silencing the potential for a rich diversity of alternative ways of constructing education and understanding one’s world. So powerful is the Western system that mass schooling has spread throughout the globe and is often viewed as synonymous with mass opportunity. Schools in Indigenous communities continue to be established upon a basic, and now taken-for-granted premise—that a Western education will provide access to social and economic benefits for Indigenous peoples that previous generations have not enjoyed. As much as there is a need to address overarching policies and their linkages with historically oppressive ideologies, there is also a need to address local Indigenous agency and policymaking, which has strong influence on the direction of educational design both in and out-of-school for Indigenous community members. We believe there is urgency to establish new and participatory educational systems that directly address issues in local knowledge, define cultural practices clearly, and innovate educational structures and pedagogies while also advocating at social, political, environmental, and economic levels for those elements that make up who we are as distinct Indigenous peoples. Our feelings of urgency became a focus of action.

In 2011, we entered into formal discussions with The Leadership Institute at the Santa Fe Indian School in New Mexico in order to work with tribal partners to build a framework for doctoral education—one model that we hoped to grow as part of our felt responsibility to Indigenous peoples and not just our own community members. While we view our part in this work, from within academe, as adopting an anti-colonial stance, we did not necessarily believe that all knowledge must serve to challenge colonial imposition (Simmons & Dei, 2012). Rather, our work and the work of our students does question colonial underpinnings of knowledge production and validation while also maintaining reflexivity regarding the channels through which knowledge flows (i.e. our own experiences in educational systems) and that Indigenous knowledges also refer to knowledges and learning practices that stand on their own within the tribal communities that are responsible for them without need for validation by the outside world. In other words, we can also delineate appropriately between spaces of knowledge (re)production and transmission by deferring to Indigenous peoples and communities. Likewise, the work of our students is not necessarily to explicate all of areas of Indigenous knowledges and related cultural practices but is motivated by community-minded priorities for developing educational
experiences and research skills in order to protect knowledges at home while creating opportunities for community members themselves to take on the work of examining them critically. Our work as educators and learners alongside our students in higher education (Sumida Huaman & Abeita, forthcoming) is then to deconstruct binaries between the traditional/modern and Indigenous/Western and to employ pedagogical approaches that encourage empirical observation and cultivation of Indigenous theories that are dependent upon/related to/respectful of Indigenous knowledges and epistemologies. What this also means is at times pushing our thinking regarding “the invocation of the ‘traditional’ or ‘community’ realm” that “brings a regime of knowledge authorization tied to the assertion of ancestral, spiritual, authentic, and distinct Indigenous identities grounded in claims to time-tested, collectively agreed-upon forms of truth-making” that are “assumed as evidence of emancipation from Western inscriptions and practices but do not provide methods for critical examination of such assumptions or their limits in the contemporary space, which remains circumscribed by ongoing intrusions of Western meaning and logic” (Nakata et al., 2012, p. 127). These are tough conversations, but part of our engagement and exploration of our own participation within higher education requires us to consider what we know and want to know in relation to our accountabilities as Indigenous community members.

RISKS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Sovereignty involves the idea of absolute authority within separate spheres and autonomy or freedom from outside control. Mind or mental sovereignty is a powerful concept; it takes the concept of sovereignty inward where it operates internally and is personal. Mental sovereignty speaks to me of the ability to be able to think in a different manner; it is more than thinking independently, though that is a part of it. It represents the idea of being able to maintain an autonomous way of “knowing,” without having that way eradicated or compromised, even in the face of constant bombardment or immersion in another way of thinking, while maintaining the ability to operate accordingly. (Zuni-Cruz, 2008, p. 632)

We cannot emphasize enough our regard for Indigenous nations that are pushing back against colonial configurations evident in educational institutions today—fighting for culturally responsive schooling, for example. We believe that this very spirit and energy towards cultivating multiple educational processes within formal institutions that speak to Indigenous lands, cultures, languages, issues and priorities is effective in higher education as well. The presence of Indigenous peoples as a historically underrepresented population in graduate education, for example, demonstrates opportunities built by many people, Indigenous and non-Indigenous, who champion access, equity, and equality in relation to social justice driven by Indigenous peoples. The persistence of Indigenous peoples in graduate
education also speaks to individuals working to maintain an autonomous way of knowing, their mental sovereignty, as put forth by Isleta/Ohkay Owingeh legal scholar Christine Zuni Cruz. In this dynamic there are important roles for Indigenous stakeholders—faculty, students, community members, family members, tribal leaders, administrators, and others—to build partnerships with each other and across learning spaces, in and out of Indigenous communities. Importantly, there is an exercise of power when these processes in higher education move toward creating self-determined (the operationalization of the concept of sovereignty) futures.

In our own experience working with the first of two iterations of a program of Indigenous doctoral training in the School of Social Transformation at Arizona State University and partnered with Pueblo peoples, we considered our own roles carefully. As bridges between a tribal institution and academe, we became faculty advisors, Principal Investigators, dissertation committee chairs and members, liaisons to the university, and colleagues to our students who entered the program with extensive leadership and community-based experience. In many ways, our work became that of first learning from our students—learning about their prior knowledge and rich epistemological and ontological heritages—and then facilitating training and guidance through a program of doctoral education that we co-created with tribal partners within an evolving Justice Studies and Indigenous Justice framework. We were conscientious about forging a new pathway that would not force Indigenous students to “fit into” and accommodate themselves to a system of dominant education even (or especially) at the graduate level. Based on prior research in this area (Brayboy, 2003) and perhaps more importantly, our own graduate education training at different elite institutions and our experiences of being one of the few Indigenous peoples represented with fewer (if any) Indigenous faculty—let alone having our communities consulted for what would be most beneficial to them through our training—we knew we wanted to support distinct classroom and overall doctoral education experiences.

I maintain that within Euro-American institutions of learning conventional/traditional paradigms, differential social locations and the relative positioning of intellectual subjects constrain many of us from being subversive, resistant and challenging of dominant and/or ‘stable’ knowledge. Thus, to speak about Indigenous knowledges and the decolonization of the Western/Euro-American academy is to take personal and collective risks. (Dei, 2002, p. 3, our emphasis)

Social sciences training like Justice Studies makes sense in educational and community development. We built a curriculum and its concomitant preparation to establish and strengthen critical thinking, theoretical and global knowledge acquisition towards action, as well as hands-on research skills in order to meet the need for informed and intellectual leaders. While we stand by the training we offer in our teaching, we also acknowledge that the usefulness and purposes of education for historically marginalized populations, ethnic minorities, and Indigenous peoples served by colleges and universities has not routinely been explored with
our peoples. Part of building programs like ours therefore involves engaging these conversations with students, educators, Indigenous community stakeholders, and policymakers wherein we seek to name and deconstruct the troubling and complex relationship between educational institutions and the forces that historically governed them (and those that drive them today) and Indigenous peoples. We also think it is important to interrogate what educational institutions currently represent and enact; that is, we think it is crucial to acknowledge that our institutions continue to uphold Western knowledge and standards of achievement fixed in Eurocentric design. In this process, we all “take risks.” In our case, risks involved negotiating our social capital within the university in order to advocate for approaches to doctoral education that involved sustaining caring relationships with our students, faculty continuously traveling to New Mexico where our students live and work, and working with faculty to rethink core courses as culturally responsive, sensitive, and meaningful. Perhaps most importantly, we exercised our respect for tribal sovereignty and student mental sovereignty by acknowledging that there are different ways of knowing and by advocating for space in our school that was consistently mindful of Indigenous purposes of research and education, where higher education seeks to give back to tribal communities and asks for nothing more.

Generating these kinds of programs in academe reshapes academe, perhaps if only for a time. But in that time, we can capture a glimpse of what a future where Indigenous presences, knowledges, and the commitment to sustain and protect Indigenous ways of life—whatever that is for students and communities—is clear and advances transformation within historically closed spaces. Leonard and Mercier (2016) delved into this vision with regards to Indigenous knowledges in coursework. While theirs was a study of the scientific and ecological aspects of Indigenous knowledge systems in a comparative classroom setting between Alaska and New Zealand, we find their assertions useful—that Indigenous knowledge has a “rightful home” in Western academy. We extend this to say that Indigenous peoples have a rightful place in Western academe and agree with their statement that, “If institutions are to meet their goals in terms of Indigenous recruitment, retention and improved graduation rates, additional reforms and adaptations in program philosophies and pedagogies, as well as power sharing in collaborative ventures will be necessary” (p. 113). They moreover argue that some important ideological and practical considerations on the part of academe need to take place, including the following,

1. The entire academy is potentially a space for reclamation: our point that universities were built on Indigenous lands reminds us of that spatial continuity;
2. In spite of uni-versal epistemological tendencies, the academy has (albeit sometimes begrudgingly) allowed Indigenous peoples to carve out space, and considering current strategic planning statements, the university appears to be moving to a stated position of active support for increasing numbers of Indigenous students, and inclusion of Indigenous content and teaching;
3. Kaitiaki/Indigenous stewards must continue to occupy and claim space in the academy, and to inform and decide upon how initiatives such as “1000 more Māori students” can be achieved in practice (pp. 113–114).

This type of work across the globe and in different learning contexts builds hope. We also think it is important to name the fact that for many of us, our institutions sit on the ancestral homelands of the original inhabitants of the land. To suggest then, that Native peoples have a place in our institutions is imbued with a deeper sense of responsibility and thoughtfulness.

In our own program throughout their doctoral studies, students engaged in intensive coursework, partnered with research sites where they had long-term relationships (including their own communities), and produced work meaningful to Indigenous peoples for its potential practical application. We also observed that the following aspects characterized this program:

- Direction and instruction by Indigenous faculty and support and advocacy from non-Indigenous faculty allies and administrators;
- A program linked with Justice Studies core curricula but embedded in unquestionable regard for Indigenous knowledges and epistemologies and critical anti-colonial debates—interested in building a model for Indigenous Justice pedagogy and research;
- Faculty situated in different spaces that were made Indigenous-friendly spaces (expanding the ASU campus beyond state borders in order to recognize the intellectual and tribal confluence that is the Southwestern U.S.);
- Encouragement of crucial questions in classroom and through research that challenge trajectories of colonization and their current reconfigurations while also considering questions that challenge our own constructions of Indigeneity—who we believe ourselves to be and why;
- Creative class formats with hours and personal attentiveness based on our shared experiences as Indigenous scholars having come through our own programs of study, provoking the question of what it means to have a doctoral seminar dominated by Indigenous students;
- Purposes of work situated in service to community—students and faculty always concerned with how this work can be viewed from multiple angles and how (not if) it will serve tribal communities locally and beyond.

We present these characteristics in order to demonstrate that we not only take ideological and practical individual and collective risks in shaping experimental programs of graduate study, but we also take ideological and practical leaps with tribal institutions, students, and our colleagues in order to move us all closer towards our own equivalent of “1000 more” Indigenous students comfortable and confident in their roles within academe as a site that recognizes them and their communities on their own terms, how they desire to be seen and heard. In the process, space for Indigenous students is created, acknowledged, enacted,
and nurtured in what has traditionally been a hostile, colonizing space for our ancestors.

**THE POWER OF NARRATIVES: CONTEXT AND CONTINUITY**

I am part of the people of my concern and research interests. (Medicine, 2001, p. 3)

Reflecting on her work spanning several decades, renowned Lakota anthropologist Beatrice Medicine reviewed some of the conundrums she had faced throughout her career as a “student of my own culture.” In 1978, she had written in “Learning to be an anthropologist and remaining ‘Native,’”

For example, how much could I write that would pass my own people’s scrutiny without casting me (in their eyes) as an “informant” to anthropologists. Addressing that dilemma caused me to clarify in my thinking and orientation to my life’s work. The problem is common to those who have been subject to studies by European and Euro-American anthropologists for generations. (2001, p. xxiv)

As an Indigenous anthropologist working within academe and on behalf of her people, Medicine challenged scholars and researchers to do work of benefit to Indigenous peoples while sharing her own internal conflicts. She wrote of “reciprocity, responsiveness, and responsibility” in research and talked about learning these in different settings, including during some time spent in a New Mexico Pueblo: “There I learned to eat hot, spicy foods and to leave the pueblo along with the non-Native teachers on special ceremonial occasions. I learned, too, that I would never write about this pueblo” (2001, p. 5). She was admirably conscientious about how her own work was presented—for example, in her selected writings, she devoted each of the three sections of the book to diverse audiences: Indigenous non-academics, academics in a wide range of disciplines, and policymakers. This structure is similar to what our tribal institutional partners and faculty purposefully identified and negotiated as dissertation work for our students, demonstrating the like-minded processes that community-driven scholars and researchers as change agents have with regards to accessibility of their work to wider audiences. Like Medicine, as a whole, we collectively provoke examination of critical issues being experienced today by Indigenous peoples, and we do so in different ways. And, like Medicine, we seek to work toward the strengthening (as defined by them) of communities for whom we work.

For each of the Indigenous authors in this volume, the conditions under which they write are pivotal to their scholarship: They live and/or work in and for their ancestral home communities. They participate actively in community ceremonial, daily, or special cultural activities. Their proximity to their lands and their peoples makes them ideally connected to the needs and priorities of their communities,
privey to discussions not typically shared with non-community members, but also
vulnerable to a community gaze that like Medicine’s tribal members, can be viewed with skepticism through publications and research deemed inappropriate. They need to be careful with how research is conducted and designed, meticulous with the types of questions that are asked, and protective with the data they cultivate and receive, yet transparent with tribal leadership and fellow community members.

Mindful of an overtly exploitative past where Indigenous informants were created by anthropologists extracting information from communities, the warning signs and potential dangers for Indigenous peoples are arguably ongoing. In Indigenous communities, research and dissemination of so-called findings by outsiders seeking to explore our peoples as subjects rather than intellectuals, change agents, collaborators or beneficiaries of research was viewed through the Western non-Indigenous academic lens. For example, photos and collection of archival materials were tools through which our people were partially defined, understood, and preserved as fixed objects rather than dynamic individuals and communities. Thus even the use of photos in this volume by Pueblo authors and their choice to allude to their languages and some cultural practices represents a critical departure from historical academic oppression and subjugation by providing space for Pueblo people to determine where and how they will use resources like publications and photos to illustrate what they believe is important about their home communities—taking accountability and responsibility for their lenses.

This volume is divided into four sections: I. Establishing local context and local knowledge; II. Re-examining local histories, Indigenous research, and policy; III. Reconceptualizing local political identities; and IV. Envisioning hope through local knowledge application. In section I, local Tewa scholar, Tessie Naranjo, describes the importance of place in Pueblo communities—both community as a whole and especially culturally significant landmarks. She provides detailed examples of place stories focused on her own northern Pueblo of Santa Clara and recalls lessons learned and experiences shared with her Gia and Gia Khun, while also paying homage to her sister, the beloved Rina Naranjo Swentzell, one of the first Pueblo women scholars. She draws narratives from community members in order to situate living, learning, and storytelling—which she calls “life lived like a story”—in the Pueblo where values were nurtured and responsibilities to the land and to fellow family and community members were routinely exchanged and enjoyed. She offers her own memories of learning in comparison with the experiences of community members who were forced to attend government schooling towards assimilative goals and ultimately reminds us that, “Storytelling helps us move from one generation to the next, carrying the stories of our past with us...Through stories, there is always the hope that the young ones will become responsible for and carry on the cultural knowledge of the elders.” Through her work, we are able to step into the community momentarily and to journey with her through time and across the places she so loves.
Also in Section I, Anya Dozier Enos is tasked with laying the foundation for Pueblo research—its definitions, practices, history, and hopes. In “With respect,” she uses the metaphor of a spider web to skillfully craft a rich description of Pueblo researchers and their work, which she affirms contributes to expressions of Pueblo identities and always with respect to Pueblo ways of life. She writes, “That the spider creates and modifies her web in response to environment and need demonstrates relationships—human and other—is embedded in this framework, which also becomes flexible and adapts to the research need. As one thinks about how even the empty spaces create form, one becomes aware of the importance of what is visible and explicit and what is invisible and implicit. Thus the web is simultaneously a theoretical framework, a tool to organize the research process, an approach to analysis, and a way to display/share findings.” As a researcher ever balancing her own reflexivity, she is honest about the “messiness” of research and with the tensions complicated by Western education and expressions of knowledge and Pueblo being. Using different points of entry into a discussion of Pueblo methodologies, she is able to reify space, language, and education in Pueblo research all while drawing from personal experience and memories of Pueblo researchers, including her own father, renowned Pueblo anthropologist, Dr. Edward Dozier. In the evolving tradition of considering local epistemologies, methodologies, and place-based research, Dozier Enos offers an exquisite tapestry of these that easily compliments and enriches the vital work on Indigenous research methodologies being done around the world. We are grateful to the work of Tessie Naranjo, Anya Dozier Enos, and Christine Zuni-Cruz (Foreword) who as senior Pueblo scholars took the responsibility of setting the tone for the research and writing of newer Pueblo scholars and establishing the significance of people, place, and the history of local research.

Section II of this volume begins with the critical analysis of June Lorenzo, Laguna Pueblo/Diné attorney, tribal judge, and United Nations consultant whose research on Pueblo chthonic law is compared and contrasted with the impacts and legacies of Spanish colonial law in New Mexico’s Pueblos. Lorenzo makes clear the distinctions between subtle and overt impacts of law on the daily lives of Pueblo people, thus challenging Pueblo and Indigenous community members to consider historical data in order to consider both colonial oppressive laws and those carefully crafted for the well-being of Indigenous peoples and emerging from within Indigenous communities. Of major significance to this work is her ability to formulate questions that deserve attentiveness from all Indigenous populations attempting to ask “what is ours” and what may have been adopted from the colonial and to the detriment of our populations today. She challenges the impact of colonial ideologies of patriarchy on the status of Pueblo women and notions of the female and states, “What is evident today is that patriarchy, based on value systems and legal systems not our own, has privileged some members of our Pueblo societies over others, to the detriment of all community members.” Her work provokes us to rethink what we have been handed and what we have learned by seeking to better understand the sources while diligently remembering the power of our own knowledge and governance systems.
In “Research is a pebble in my shoe,” Michele Suina of Cochiti Pueblo draws from an autoethnographic study to provide an account of her journey through discomfort with research in the health sciences rooted in positivism. She offers a frank account of observations and fears regarding research and its potential impacts in the Pueblos and writes, “The thought of being associated with the exploitation of Pueblo knowledge or harm caused by research terrifies me. I would rather be blacklisted within academia for being perceived as uncritical or uncooperative than from my own Pueblo for breaking a sacred trust.” She also introduces the notion of “Pueblo thought” as a response to labels of Pueblo people as “colonized,” which she rejects: “The colonized label commonly attached to Pueblo people is questionable as it implies something done or completed, yet we still maintain our connection to ancestral life ways which include what I refer to as our ‘Pueblo thought’—that is knowledge and use of heritage languages, traditional ceremonies and traditional governance, and connection to place.” Her findings indicate some important considerations for those interested in conducting useful and respectful research with Pueblo peoples that moves away from histories of harm while also asking Pueblo people themselves to identify and defend their own standpoints while building Pueblo research methodologies grounded in Pueblo thought.

The final chapter in Section II is authored by Corrine Sanchez of San Ildefonso Pueblo. Drawing from her professional work and research with Tewa Women United (TWU), a community-based organization in northern New Mexico working on interrelated issues affecting women, children, and the environment, Sanchez outlines the A’gin project. By describing the innovation and Pueblo epistemology required to build a healthy sexuality and body sovereignty project with and for Indigenous youth, Sanchez is also able to outline a foundation for how we must reshape the language of evidence-based research and its approaches. She provides important local context regarding conditions of women and children in New Mexico while powerfully weaving in her own story as a community member, daughter, and relative. Using language common to TWU—as in “beloved” individuals, families, and communities—she structures her work simultaneously as narrative, research description, story, and prayer. She writes, “I ask critical questions that relate to culturally-based program development and standards, individual and social transformation, and a return to using Tewa/ Pueblo epistemology as a foundation in sovereignty…I believe we must challenge dominant institutions and ourselves to ask more pressing questions that (a) critique dominant assumptions…I believe we must challenge dominant institutions and ourselves to ask more pressing questions that (a) critique dominant assumptions…(b) revisit local cultural ideologies…and (c) consider practical application of our culture as a strength.” As an equitable leader of TWU in her role as Executive Director of the organization, she is mindful of the invaluable essential voices and participation of the co-founders of the organization, her staff, and of their beloved communities, and this comes across clearly in the philosophies of knowledge that she shares with us.

Starting Section III in a chapter entitled, “Pueblo Interpretations of Data,” former Governor of Laguna Pueblo, Richard Luarkie, examines the relationship between data and Pueblo peoples bringing together historical, cosmological, and cultural
perspectives. He calls for a reclaiming of “Pueblo data,” which is directly related to Pueblo knowledge and the survival and well-being of Pueblo peoples on the one hand, and on the other hand, serves as a response to the positioning of Indigenous peoples as subjects of statistical analysis. Merging his background in economics with his leadership role in Pueblo governance and his own ideals of Indigenous justice, Luarkie discusses Pueblo peoples’ ways of collecting, processing, analyzing, and utilizing information from the world around them. Describing Indigenous relationships with data as comprising a “holistic world data-view,” he writes, “Indigenous nations across the Americas and globally have cultural teachings, political histories, and their own ancestral technologies that may be recorded and passed from generation to generation using oral-based data sets, most commonly referred to as the oral tradition, which is distinct from the primarily European-introduced written or literary tradition. What I refer to here as Indigenous data sets are bodies of information held in stewardship by Indigenous peoples themselves. These sets can be physically situated and identified in the oral tradition and located in Indigenous languages, natural sites, and stories.” He ultimately argues that Pueblo control over the definition and use of their own data can both address historical injustices while also serving as a tool for Pueblo advancement on multiple fronts.

Section III also features Shawn Abeita’s work on the relationship between economic development and citizenship. A tribal member from the Pueblo of Isleta, he problematizes dominant notions of membership and citizenship while outlining the trajectory of Western-based practices and ideals of economic development in Pueblo and Indigenous communities. His work grows out of a concern for the ways in which tribal policies (and federal restrictions) deal with Indigenous peoples resulting at times in internal identity tensions felt intensely by vulnerable community members, including women and youth. He writes, “I do not speak for all Pueblos or Pueblo people but only offer a reflection on meanings of tribal citizenship in today’s local and global economically-driven environment where federal policies that are tribally regulated, including blood quantum, drastically changing the makeup of Pueblos and compromising Pueblo worldviews.” Woven into his discussion are Pueblo narratives, analysis of historical and more current policy pieces, and one international example of how Pueblo nations might consider the balance between cultural sustainability and protection, economic viability, and citizen “happiness.”

Section IV is launched by Carnell Chosa of Jemez Pueblo. Chosa’s work on “Pueblo community engagement” offers culturally and linguistically-based ways of thinking about the connection between individuals and their Pueblos, despite distance and migration away from community places. Chosa also draws from his research on a summer youth employment program implemented in Pueblo communities in order to bring to bear Pueblo youth perspectives on community and opportunity and in their own words. He provides an example of organic Indigenous theorizing by citing a commonly spoken Towa phrase about participation in community and cultural events in Jemez—“attaching my heart.” He exemplifies the compelling nature of storytelling by sharing his narrative of family and migration away from
his Pueblo for the purposes of higher education. He writes, “Migration has only grown, and in my own experience leaving for college and finding work nearby my Pueblo has me contributing from outside the community. This reflection has ignited my interest in expanding what it means to be ‘home’ and to broaden how we think of engagement; that is, how youth and others contribute to our Puebos while physically away from community. My intentions have further motivated me to create opportunities for youth to engage through new means facilitated by innovative programming. Throughout my undergraduate and graduate work, I was intentional about exploring how community shapes an individual and how an individual has the potential to shape community. This chapter is a small and ongoing exploration into this relationship.”

The second chapter in Section IV is authored by Tesuque Pueblo scholar Anthony Dorame. In a memorializing narrative about family and place, Dorame depicts learning in the Tewa world. He expands on epistemology, ontology, and axiology, but distinguishes this work clearly through a Tewa-languaged perspective and includes pedagogy. He cultivates comparison between decisive Tewa philosophies and Western concepts in order to carve out space where both intellectual stances can view each other. In this work, the intricacy of Tewa language and worldviews is shared. He writes: “Although posing a difficult exercise to describe the values of all Pueblo Indian peoples and communities due to variation among individuals and from community to community, I believe that there are some fundamental similarities between what we are taught and the basic principles that are defined in Western academic settings as epistemology. As a Pueblo educator, my constant work is to examine those similarities, particularly among concepts of land, Indigenous language, notions of stewardship, Pueblo spirituality, and the relationships between these and to Pueblo people. My goal as a scholar has also been to identify how all these things that are important to Pueblo people relate directly to the creation and sustainable growth of an educational foundation that can benefit Pueblo students and their communities.”

The final chapter in Section IV is authored by long-time teacher at the Santa Fe Indian School, Mark Ericson. Ericson has devoted over thirty years of his life’s work to Pueblo Indian and tribal students at the Santa Fe Indian School as a sciences teacher specializing in environmental studies. Based on his collaborative, co-constructed, and co-pioneering work in community-based education and drawing from analysis of historical and scholarly work, Ericson proposes “Indigenous ecological survivance” whereby youth in particular engage in “the sustainable protection, preservation, and promotion of their lands and waters and through the nurturing and practicing of respectful relationships with co-inhabitants of the natural environment that are integral to culture.” He establishes evidence regarding current environmental crises, as well as the educational, societal, and self-described needs for youth to be recognized and provided opportunities as change agents. He writes, “In response to this crisis, my work seeks to (1) explore watershed and landscape
assessment and management as an epistemological and pedagogical framework that bridges important western educational objectives with Indigenous cognitive systems; (2) strives to honor, support and strengthen Indigenous values while empowering Indigenous youth to play active roles in aspiration-based forward planning and preparation towards long-term cultural and environmental survival in a rapidly changing world; and (3) addresses youth agency that prioritizes learning from and honoring communities that hold inherited knowledge and wisdom manifested from generations of adaptation and survival in unique and beautiful landscapes.” Through his work, Ericson advocates for the synthesis of Western and Indigenous knowledges towards solutions that engage youth with communities towards sustainable environmental futures.

CONCLUSION

Originally published in 1955 in his *Discourse on Colonialism*, Cesaire argued for a systematic defense of societies destroyed by imperialism, asserting that these societies “were the fact, they did not pretend to be the idea” (2000, p. 44). In this volume, we bring forward examples of “our fact”—the stories and experiences of local scholars who recall what they were taught as Indigenous peoples raised in their own communities, providing insight into Pueblo communities and “Pueblo thought” and how and where this knowledge operates, including its “rightful” place in academe. Authors demonstrate knowledge and epistemology drawn from family and community life, which can inform innumerable ways of thinking about education—using both Western and Indigenous/local knowledge. At the same time, we also explore how Pueblo people in graduate education have accessed Indigenous knowledge or the desire to nurture their knowledges in order to reclaim educational practice for Indigenous purposes through experimentation, collaboration, innovation, and creativity.

Collectively, as Indigenous peoples writing, we take the opportunity explore why and how Indigenous peoples are working to reframe—to reset the terms of the debate, as Lyons argued—dominant limits of our power and to shift educational efforts from the colonial back to an Indigenous center. These efforts reflect a conscientious practice to maintain Indigenous worldviews, which involves valuing Indigenous knowledge for the sake of maintaining Indigenous mental sovereignty, thus combating the conviction that the colonizer is superior (Zuni-Cruz, 2008). These efforts also reflect diverse yet unified approaches towards giving back within Indigenous contexts. In her research on the relationship between the Keres language and giftedness in southern Pueblo students, Cochiti scholar Mary Eunice Romero described the first places of learning that Pueblo peoples encounter—within Pueblo communities. She and her research collaborators and participants found that gifts in individuals are multi-dimensional and multi-faceted, but that they are always situated in the ideal of giving back to community, for the sake of the whole. Romero’s work
offered refreshing ways of thinking about how Pueblo peoples live in community in relationship with each other. We believe that this volume exemplifies gifts that Pueblo scholars share with each other, with their communities, with the world. Furthermore, they do this while redefining academe by caring for knowledges that make us better human beings. Like other scholars before us and community members who have worked to preserve, grow, promote, and protect the knowledge systems from which we come, we strive to serve those who create and sustain spaces that honor Indigenous knowledges and epistemologies (Oliveira & Wright, 2016). We are immensely heartened by the work in this volume and hope that you will be too.

NOTES

1 One way that this is commonly addressed is by noting the differences as schooling and education. Schooling is institutionalized in a particular place, guided by the Eurocentric frameworks. Education is broader; it happens both in and out of schools. We recognize, of course, that some may see education as somehow inferior to schooling; we fundamentally disagree with this assertion. “Education,” Inupiak scholar Leona Okakok (1987) notes, “means equipping [children] with the capability to succeed in the world he or she will live in” (p. 253). And, while we understand that schooling is often viewed as the norm, we believe that this concept should be contested.

2 And, these sacred rules and sacred knowledges are very different than the ways that our relations think about “the sacred.” In Fuller’s sense, sacred indicates rigid, free of questioning ideals, whereas, our notions of the sacred include cosmologies that are embedded in our values.

3 We are grateful to Dr. Naranjo for sharing her photo of Gia Khun, which serves as the cover photo for this volume.

REFERENCES


INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND ACADEME


