

A GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE OF INDIGENOUS EDUCATION

“By indigenous,” W. James Jacob, Sheng Yao Cheng, and Maureen K. Porter explain, “we refer to that which is local, original, or native to a geographic region.” They note that “many things can be considered indigenous to a land— for example, foliage, fruits, vegetables, animals, insects, birds, fish, and people,” but that “migrations, acts of God or nature (e.g., weather, climate changes, and natural disasters such as hurricanes, tsunamis, earthquakes, and volcanic explosions), explorations, war, and intermingling and intermarriages have helped spread seeds and heirs across multiple geographic regions,” emphasizing that: “Humans are part of this web of life.”¹ Continuing, Jacob, Cheng, and Porter characterize “people” as “spiritually sophisticated beings who actively seek out ways of spreading, revising, and forging new modes of cultural expression,” adding that “language, identity, and culture all elevate indigenous people to agents who have sovereignty, voice, and integrity.”²

“Indigenous education” the authors define as “holistically nurturing future leaders who will be able to speak and act on behalf of their people,” leadership that may follow “matrilineal” or “patrilineal” lines, a fact that encourages recognition of the “great diversity which exists among indigenous peoples across the earth,” diversity decoded as “robust forms of adaptability” that “unite indigenous people across space and time.”³ Jacob, Cheng and Porter define “Indigeneity” as referencing “the cultural identity politics of the First Peoples who inhabit a geographic location, island, or nation,” a “noun or state of being” that would seem to undercut their earlier emphasis upon the diversity of First Peoples, but which, like their earlier assertion of Indigenous peoples being “united,” serves I suppose a political purpose, as the homogenizing noun “brings together the purposeful and strategic enactment or invocation of the rights and norms that go along with being recognized as belonging to a geopolitical region.”⁴ So, we’re diverse in fact but vis-à-vis political opponents we’re the same, in solidarity.

Jacob, Cheng and Porter regard education as “not only as deeply tied to formal schooling but also as a greater process that extends far past the schoolroom door,” in the case of First Peoples no cosmopolitan undertaking but instead focused more narrowly on “gain[ing] knowledge and meaning from their indigenous heritages.”⁵ In their understanding, “indigenous education is communal and communitarian, gaining potency as it is shared and reshaped across generation and geography,” indeed a “life-long process” that is “spiritual as well as a physical or mental.”⁶ Sounds like non-Indigenous education, at least in theory. Indigenous education simultaneously “embodies and transcends both the “world of the present as well as the spiritual or metaphysical world,” including “life before birth and life after death of the mortal body.”⁷ Now there’s a distinction between Indigenous and non-Indigenous education, except perhaps in certain forms of religious education.

Jacob, Cheng, and Porter note that “Indigenous education has prehistoric roots that date back to times when groups of indigenous peoples first came together in intentional, sustainable communities,” roots of not only Indigenous education but the very “foundation upon which all education systems worldwide exist has historical roots in multiple indigenous peoples’ pasts.”⁸ Consequently, “we all share aspects of language, culture, and identity that help bind us together, while at the same time allowing for the celebration of differences,”⁹ surely an aspirational statement given the ongoing misery humanity inflicts and undergoes, much of it animated not by “celebration” but by hatred of “differences.” Jacob, Cheng and Porter do acknowledge the “existence of tensions,” but they are referencing not the human condition, but Indigenous struggles for “recognition.”¹⁰ They postulate “a continuum in which indigenous peoples become ‘ethnic’ members of a region, of a larger national cultural dialogue, or even become essential to the mainstream sense of self. Whether romanticized through nationalistic folklore, commodified in popular culture, or essentialized in nostalgic dreams for autonomy, indigenous peoples are the lifeblood of regional identity, languages, and cultures.”¹¹ In Canada’s case, the First Peoples are more than the “lifeblood of regional identity”; if John Ralston Saul is right Canada itself is a Métis nation.¹²

Jacob, Cheng and Porter allow that the “influence of globalization on indigeneity and indigenous education has both positive and negative consequences,” but critique is nowhere in sight when they follow-up with “emergent technologies allow indigenous and non-indigenous peoples to share ideas and knowledges like never before.”¹³ No doubt, even if McLuhan overstated the case when he asserted the medium is the message,¹⁴ although surely it influences it, as the celebrated orality of Indigenous cultures depends, at least in part, upon physical presence, not an image on a screen. From globality to nationality the authors move, allowing: “It is difficult to provide an accurate count of indigenous peoples in many countries and certainly the entire world,” so they retreat to asserting the obvious: “Too often national education policies tend to smother indigenous learning and knowledge acquisition. This education stifling process is often for the sake of the broader societal goal of helping to unify nations and instill patriotism amongst citizens regardless of their ethnic background.”¹⁵

Ignored is the more vexed question concerning Indigenous insistence on the term “First Nations,” adopting the non-Indigenous concept of “nation”¹⁶ and encouraging their “citizens” to take pride in it, reminiscent of the nationalism that in part propelled settlers to commit cultural genocide, as Jacobs, Cheng and Porter observe: “Formal education was often used as the means by which governments would mainstream, assimilate, and systematically destroy indigenous ways of knowing and learning. These formal education initiatives often had long-lasting negative impacts on indigenous languages, cultures, and identities.”¹⁷ Given the genocide residential schools committed – including in British Columbia¹⁸ – “negative” seems insufficient as an adjective. The authors affirm “the need for indigeneity and indigenous education to stand on their

own,” adding: “In apologetic fervor, we argue that indigenous education should be able to flourish unabashed, unbridled, and independent of other ways of knowing.”¹⁹ That affirmation of independence seems undermined when they then assert that: “Curricular design and implementation for and on behalf of indigenous peoples must be reflective by nature and ensure that it is relevant to local needs and contexts,”²⁰ a potentially patronizing statement unless such a “reflective” and “relevant” curriculum – two buzzwords of non-Indigenous educators - is requested by Indigenous elders.

Apparently shifting from independent Indigenous schools to comprehensive public ones, Jacobs, Cheng and Porter caution that “without a proactive effort to include indigeneity in the curriculum, the inevitable loss of indigenous knowledge will occur over time,”²¹ a statement that ignores the fact that Indigenous knowledge has already been lost, certainly among the non-Indigenous. They call for a “hybrid” model of “pedagogy and school governance that is flexible and responsive to both cultural context and community modes of formal and non-formal learning across the generations,” a model that is “dialogical, with the teachers and administrators working in partnership with stakeholders who can share collective wisdom and understandings of their sense of place.”²² That incalculably complex challenge, “rather than (further) excluding and penalizing the divergent, inclusive education within the regular school system seeks a proactively multicultural approach, located conceptually within a framework of universal values, as the key to full citizenship and effective exercise of rights.”²³ Such an “inclusive” and “multicultural” model – based on recognition of difference - is precisely what Indigenous theorist Coulthard rejects:

I argue that instead of ushering in an era of peaceful coexistence grounded on the ideal of *reciprocity* or *mutual recognition*, the politics of recognition in its contemporary liberal form promises to reproduce the very configurations of colonialist, racist, patriarchal state power that indigenous peoples’ demands for recognition have fought to transcend.²⁴

Inclusivity constitutes incorporation into the same colonialist settler state that committed – for some still commits – cultural genocide.

It is exactly that pretension at an aerial universality that Jacob, Cheng and Porter (perhaps unwittingly) express as “a global perspective” – what used to be derided as a God-like perspective -unwittingly because there can be no doubt of the good will toward Indigenous Peoples the authors want to express. But – from Indigenous theorists like Coulthard’s perspective – “highlighting the great diversity in indigenous pedagogies that exist worldwide” presumes a position outside those “pedagogies,” one that presides over the moves one’s subjects make, even when those moves amount to “Indigenous research [that] enables and empowers indigenous researchers to document their own histories, test theories, and find solutions to their own problems and challenges through evidence-based studies,”²⁵ a conception itself antithetical to the “gift”²⁶ that spiritually animated mythic mindset associated with “Indigeneity” offers. Also problematic is Jacobs, Cheng, and Porter’s instrumentalization of “Indigenous

learning,” calling it “crucial at the global level, as it emphasizes the many ways in which indigenous peoples gain wisdom,” enabling us non-Indigenous peoples to “recognize the reciprocal and interactive nature of the learning process,” as “Indigenous learning is both individual and communal, idiosyncratic and contextualized.”²⁷

In “Africa” – like “Indigenous,” an inadvertently homogenizing term – Jacob, Cheng, and Porter continue their “fly-by,” noting that the “continent of Africa is host to a wealth of diverse geopolitical regions, nearly unfathomable linguistic and cultural diversity, and nation states both ancient and among the youngest in the world” where “Indigenous inhabitants ... share similarities with other traditional, tribal, and transnationally displaced native peoples.”²⁸ They add: “Indigenous knowledge about agriculture, husbandry, stewardship, and other forms of economic wisdom are seldom reflected in the hierarchical textbooks and lessons that prioritize Western, European modes of doing business.”²⁹ Still today, the authors contend, “Indigenous groups in Africa are divided from upper echelons of society—and from one another—by gulfs of geography, the lack of equitable access to higher education and hence policy positions, and lack of confidence and wisdom about what they and their ancestors could bring to the table,” divisions that have a “direct impact on who ascends to powerful policy-making positions in education and other fields.”³⁰ I think we knew that.

Arriving in “Asia,” Jacobs, Cheng, and Porter note that “indigenous education specially focuses on teaching indigenous knowledges, models, methods, and content within the contexts of daily life,”³¹ something surely the case in Indigenous education elsewhere, including in North America. Again, their panoramic perspective dissolves into pointlessness when they write: “Along with the dynamic progression of modernity, colonialism, and globalization, multicultural education and culturally responsive teaching have begun to be representative of major education reform trends throughout the region.”³² Then we read that “a renaissance of indigenous education awakening began region-wide around 1990 and has continued to the present,”³³ a development did not present itself during my study of curriculum studies in China and India.³⁴ “During this time period,” the authors continue, “many Asian indigenous peoples emphasized the need to preserve and celebrate diversity that is often at odds with hegemonic national education systems and the pervading influence from the West,”³⁵ a curious assertion given that “diversity” has circulated so commonly in the “West” that it is now reduced to slogan status. “The central focus of this renaissance period,” they summarize, “resides in the notion that indigenous ways of knowing, learning, instructing, teaching, and training are potentially beneficial for students, teachers, and other societal members in a culturally sensitive manner beyond the standard Western curriculum and learning experiences.”³⁶ Once again the authors instrumentalize “indigenous ways of knowing, learning, instructing, teaching, and training,” deeming them as “potentially beneficial” for non-Indigenous peoples, i.e. “other social members,” a patronizing perspective at best, a problematic cultural appropriation at

worst. Whether “beneficial” to the non-Indigenous or not, Indigenous ways of life are important, intrinsically so. And what on earth are “the standard Western curriculum and learning experiences”? We learn that:

Because the region is so huge—and each national context often differs substantially from others within the region—the unique circumstances that indigenous peoples find themselves is worth noting. Conflict contexts position political and economic interests ahead of indigenous peoples’ needs in Afghanistan and Syria. Post-war contexts are at the forefront of helping to shape formal and non-formal indigenous education initiatives in Sri Lanka and Vietnam.³⁷

National “contexts” differ but apparently Indigenous peoples do not, as only “circumstances” change.

Or so it seemed from the passage just quoted. Certainty disappears in the Jacob-Cheng-Porter fly-by of “Europe,” as they ask: “Who are the indigenous peoples of Europe?” They answer: “As elsewhere in the world, the definition of European indigeneity is a relative one.”³⁸ Relative to what, one wonders, and to whom? The sentence that follows provides no clarification, instead claiming that the “expanding discourse on the rights of indigenous peoples across the European Union and beyond its ever-widening borders has shifted along with, and sometimes in direct conjunction with, discourse about the rights of other minorities and special needs groups within the general population,”³⁹ leaving one to wonder: if the discourse of Indigenous rights is “expanding” how can it also be shrinking, evidently subsumed in an apparently larger “discourse” about “other minorities and special needs groups”?

Jacob, Cheng, and Porter report that the “broadening concept of who can be an EU member and on whose terms these rules are negotiated spotlight at least three issues of particular significance for European indigenous peoples—mobility, sovereignty, and resource allocation.”⁴⁰ They note that “not all migrants have equal access to newly-permeable borders or to the advantages conveyed by the top gatekeepers,” also noting that: “Indigenous peoples have long transcended cycles of short-lived national boundaries, created their own long-distance exchanges of goods and services, and developed niche markets and vivid material culture,” concluding: “Distinctiveness and cultural coherence across transient state boundaries, as well as freedom of movement, define the politics of indigeneity in Europe.”⁴¹ “A second trend that directly impacts indigenous people is the matter of sovereignty,” adding: “If mobility is the currency of life in the new EU, sovereignty is its right arm,” another abstract assertion absent concrete illustration. “Recognizing the rights of indigenous groups for self-preservation, both linguistic and cultural, is key to successful identity politics and to prosperity,” they continue, noting that: “This plays out differently for indigenous groups that are, by definition, in a severe minority in any one country.”⁴² A “severe” minority?

“Questions of sovereignty in Europe raise interesting dilemmas,” an observation also disclosing the aerial self-positioning the authors assume, asking if

Indigenous peoples were conferred political power, would it “strip them of their pseudo-privileged status?”⁴³ Surely that last phrase implies more than the authors intend: few if any Indigenous scholars would recognize their “status” as “privileged,” even if falsely so. The surprises continue, as Jacobs, Cheng and Porter provide something akin to an illustration: “Thus, if the native people of Iceland or Greenland suddenly shift from being dispossessed, colonial subjects to citizens of their own sovereign nation, are they less legitimately indigenous?” The question would seem entirely tautological, but the authors run with it, imagining that “Indigenous groups could become key players in brokering talks, showing *modes of convergence*, and offering new forms of self- governance.”⁴⁴ No doubt.

Still surveying Europe, Jacobs, Cheng, and Porter propose that: “Re-centering the discourse in Europe to an indigenous-centered ethic of care and ecology” could slow, if not reverse, the planet’s destruction, adding: “An integrated focus on stewardship of natural resources links together concerns about mobility (as it applies to seasonal migrations and the viability of subsistence lifestyles) as well as sovereignty (as it impacts the ownership of land and mineral rights and the authority to preserve the integrity of territories).”⁴⁵ Perhaps, but, the authors continue, “economies, especially cash economies, are highly dependent on boom and bust cycles of demand characteristic of extractive industries such as gas, oil, and minerals.”⁴⁶ “Adding to this volatility,” they continue, “have been externally imposed *international treaties* in Europe and beyond that, use non-indigenous ethical stances about animals and hunting to curtail or prohibit whaling and seal hunting.”⁴⁷ In one of the most pleasing sentences in their text Jacobs, Cheng, and Porter allow that: “Questions about resource allocation need to shift beyond essentializing European native peoples as natural resources themselves or even beyond discourses about who has claims to what. They have more to do with owing than owning, about providing the means to enable different modes of living that cover the spectrum from subsistence to profit-driven.”⁴⁸ Such word play – “more to do with owing than owning” - makes precise a provocative point.

Next Jacobs, Cheng, and Porter engage in time travel as they move from the nineteenth-century German cultural crisis to present planetary problematics, referencing German sociologist, economist, and philosopher Ferdinand Tönnies (1855-1936) who distinguished between *Gemeinschaft* (community) and *Gesellschaft* (society). “The former,” the authors explain, “describes a collective ecology grounded in interdependence wherein people recognize the importance of place, continuity, and the spiritual oneness among humans and all life,” and “the latter describes the newer sense of rationalism, individuation, alienation, and stratification.”⁴⁹ Community is what we want, as “global sustainability is deeply tied to meaning-making and collective action that balances rather than denies diversity.”⁵⁰ Unsurprisingly we learn that: “Indigenous peoples know how to integrate multiple realms, living as they do at the converging crossroads of movements to redefine mobility, sovereignty, and the stewardship of natural resources.”⁵¹ That solves that.

Next stop, Latin America, where, we're told once again what we knew already, namely that there is "a predominance of indigenous peoples and those of mixed heritage," yet "indigenous needs, unique skills, agricultural acumen, and perspectives are seldom reflected in major national policies."⁵² But our authors look on the bright side, regarding "Native peoples' major challenges" as concurrently "point[ing] to unique opportunities and resources that could inform school reform at all levels."⁵³ That optimism doesn't last for long, however, as the author then reports that "politicians pose with Andean farmers or rainforest dwellers in order to assert their solidarity with indigenous citizens and perhaps their own heritage" while "indigenous peoples, while numerically present, even dominant, in some Latin American countries, almost disappear when formal decision-making bodies assemble."⁵⁴ Moreover, "students who fully identify as indigenous are underrepresented among the top colleges and universities that feed into positions of power."⁵⁵ But – upbeat again - "against this backdrop of marginalization, there are interesting trans-national initiatives that transcend borders and narrow definitions of education," by which they mean that "universities with special missions to bring together students from different countries work to build community around commonalities and a shared appreciation for indigenous regional contributions to world knowledge systems," universities that are also "places [where] important work has been done to write out indigenous languages and to ethnographically document heritage forms of indigenous wisdom."⁵⁶ Still, "indigenous groups fight for cultural survival, formal recognition, and free exercise of their internationally, if not locally, recognized human rights."⁵⁷

Next, north to Canada and the United States, both nations "marred by a history of colonization," yet still somehow capable of influencing "the new colonists' democratic visions of post-monarchy modes of government," little formal acknowledgment of which can be found "in today's textbooks," as "assimilation policies put education at the forefront of the reconciliation periods that followed treaties and land relocations and restrictions."⁵⁸ Also unacknowledged are the significant differences between the two countries: after all, there has been no Truth and Reconciliation Commission convened in the United States, no reparations paid. Instead Jacob, Cheng and Porter treat the two countries as one, reporting that "since the early twentieth century, tribes have begun to deal with conflicts through governing and judicial means," with "representatives who meet directly with the governments of Canada and the United States."⁵⁹ Since "smaller tribes do not always enjoy equal representation and educational opportunities as much as larger tribes do," they "often must form a coalition with other tribes in order to fully exercise influence on education policies."⁶⁰

That the authors are actually focused on one country becomes crystal clear when they write: "Although some tribes have been granted sovereignty, like those living on many reservation lands in the United States, the governing ability of these tribes varies greatly," adding: "Who maintains the ability to set standards for indigenous learning

and education in formal school curricula is a matter of ongoing debate in the United States and Canada,”⁶¹ statements that obscure significant differences between the two countries. Additionally, their aerial perspective discloses very general patterns only, absent detail or insight: “The role indigenous education plays in the preservation of American Indian culture varies greatly from tribe to tribe,” explaining that: “Some tribes continue to perform traditional rituals and ceremonies, whereas others have assimilated into mainstream society and have lost these traditions.”⁶² Apropos that last fact, Jacobs, Cheng, and Porter note that “accurate histories and information about indigenous peoples are often lost or misunderstood by indigenous and non- indigenous peoples alike,” thereby creating “a vicious cycle of perpetuating negative stereotypes through the education system.”⁶³ “Rather than succumbing to standardization and invisibility,” we’re told, “some indigenous people have engaged in purposeful push-back and active reclamation of words, practices, and educational cultural activities,” citing, as an example, the “powwow,” in which “dancers and participants dress in their regalia representing their cultural heritage and tradition.”⁶⁴

Jacobs, Cheng, and Porter head next across the Pacific, where, they inform us, “Indigenous education in ancient Oceania helped to transmit and refine technologies and inventions that were adapted to the local contexts,” considering “the great Pacific Ocean as a highway rather than a barrier,”⁶⁵ “highway” an understandable yet odd choice of metaphors given that the authors are so obviously aerially observing “ancient Oceania” from a great distance, no “rubber on the road” for these three. We are told that “navigation instruments” included the “Micronesian stick charts (or maps) that displayed locations of islands, wind patterns, and ocean currents,” concluding that: “Past and present technologies are fundamental to sustaining indigenous ways of life in Oceania.”⁶⁶ No “outlier region, Oceania could be argued to be a nexus between many indigenous peoples,” as “migrations, wars, natural disasters, and trade helped spread the languages, cultures, and knowledges of these peoples.”⁶⁷ Not only a nexus for Indigenous peoples, but for European peoples as well, as “with the exception of the Kingdom of Tonga, all other Oceania islands were under predominantly European control for centuries,” control that “included the establishment of education systems to help maintain and support colonial superpowers,” as “European languages were taught in schools and examinations required mastery of the colonizing languages.”⁶⁸ Specifically, Jacobs, Cheng, and Porter name “the British [who] held onto their island territories several decades following World War II; France and the United States continue to hold onto their island territories to the present,” the authors’ point being: “Regardless of the location, European pedagogies and systems of school organization continue to play a decisive role throughout the region.”⁶⁹

Staying the present, the authors acknowledge that “contemporary indigenous education policies differ across Oceania.”⁷⁰ They note that “indigenous Australians have a long history of suffering discrimination, including in the formal education system,” being granted citizenship not until 1967; evidently “indigenous Australians

participated in multiple government education integration programs.”⁷¹ For many “integration” connotes assimilation, as “preserving indigenous languages, cultures, and identities in Oceania is particularly difficult where urbanization continues to expand and diaspora groups of Pacific Islanders living in Australia, New Zealand, and the United States often outnumber the indigenous peoples in their home island nations.”⁷² Those “Pacific Islanders who migrate to other countries often find their languages, cultures, and identities looked upon as inferior and irrelevant,” a trend resisted by Kaupapa Maōri theory and research,” whereby “scholars and practitioners are actively trying to preserve the local heritages of Pacific Islanders.”⁷³ While “Kaupapa Maōri theory originates from New Zealand,” the authors deem it “applicable to all indigenous peoples.”⁷⁴

COMMENTARY

The research assistant who provided this summary – Allan Michel Jales Coutinho –noted that many “national education policies attempt to install patriotism, and that global education, which may not necessarily be aligned with some strands of cosmopolitanism, can put indigenous education in jeopardy because they attempt to unify difference.” That is my critique of the piece, that the authors’ “global perspective” – itself a unifying-of-difference term - isn’t actually one but a continental one, even that expansive sphere spied from high above the ground, an aerial view that discloses very broad patterns but no particularities, despite the occasional and still very general example (like “Kaupapa Maōri theory,” itself abstracted to be “applicable” everywhere.) To be eligible for being briefed, articles or chapters or books must be authored by Canadians or by scholars working in Canada or be about Canada. This one squeaks through as there is a section on Canada (and the United States), but it does seem focused on the latter.

REFERENCES

- Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Jacob, W. James, Cheng, Sheng Yao, and Porter, Maureen K. 2014. Global Review of Indigenous Education: Issues of Identity, Culture, and Language. *Indigenous Education* (pp. 1-35). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9355-1_1
- Kuokkanen, Rauna. 2007. *Reshaping the University: Responsibility, Indigenous Epistemes, and*

the Logic of the Gift. University of British Columbia Press.

Pinar, William F. Ed. 2014. *Curriculum Studies in China: Intellectual Histories, Present Circumstances*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Pinar, William. Ed. 2015. *Curriculum Studies in India: Intellectual Histories, Present Circumstances*. Palgrave Macmillan.

ENDNOTES

¹ 2014, 1-2.

² 2014, 2.

³ Ibid. Indigenous peoples may be united today, but they were not always, even during pre-contact times: <https://www.canada.ca/en/departement-national-defence/services/military-history/history-heritage/popular-books/aboriginal-people-canadian-military/warfare-pre-columbian-north-america.html>

⁴ 2014, 2.

⁵ 2014, 3.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ 2014, 4.

¹¹ 2014, 5.

¹² <https://reviewcanada.ca/magazine/2009/04/are-we-a-mtis-nation/>

¹³ 2014, 5.

¹⁴ https://video.search.yahoo.com/yhs/search?fr=yhs-tro-freshy&ei=UTF-8&hsimp=yhs-freshy&hspart=tro&p=mcLuhan%27s+medium+is+the+message&type=Y219_F1_63_204671_071321#id=3&vid=cf4f921015dc67da8e7454aa068113c3&action=click

¹⁵ 2014, 6.

¹⁶ <https://www.britannica.com/topic/nation-state>

¹⁷ 2014, 6.

¹⁸ <https://www.cnn.com/2021/07/01/americas/unmarked-graves-human-remains-british-columbia/index.html>

¹⁹ 2014, 7. “Unabashed, unbridled, and independent” of course, but there will be a price to pay by Indigenous children who want to live and work among non-Indigenous peoples. For such children, a more cosmopolitan education will be required, one preserving Indigenous knowledge and wisdom while becoming acquainted with non-Indigenous knowledge and wisdom.

²⁰ 2014, 7.

²¹ Ibid.

²² 2014, 8.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ 2014, 3.

²⁵ 2014, 8.

²⁶ Central to Indigenous experience, Rauna Kuokkanen (2007, 32) asserts, is a sense of “the world as a whole [that] comprises an infinite web of relationships, which extend and are incorporated into the entire social condition of the individual. Social ties apply to everyone and everything, including the land, which is considered a living, conscious entity.” There is no “outside” this web, no “global perspective.” For more on the “gift,” see research brief #4.

²⁷ 2014, 8.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid. Not sure what a “hierarchical textbook” might be – a book shaped like a pyramid? Probably the adjective references Eurocentricity in colonial textbooks, a phenomenon that has surely diminished if not disappeared since independence.

³⁰ 2014, 10.

³¹ Ibid.

³² 2014, 11.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Pinar 2014, 2015.

³⁵ 2014, 11.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ 2014, 12.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Ibid. Such generalizations necessarily exclude exceptions; examples would be welcomed.

⁴² 2014, 12-13.

⁴³ 2014, 13.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ 2014, 14.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ 2014, 15.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ 2014, 16.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ 2014, 17-18.

⁵⁹ 2014, 18.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ 2014, 19.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ 2014, 19.

⁶⁶ 2014, 19-20.

⁶⁷ 2014, 20.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ 2014, 21.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ Ibid.