

Mapping the Terrain of Struggle: From Genocide, Colonization, and Resistance to Red Power and Red Pedagogy

Sandy Grande

“The War for Indian Children will be won in the classroom.”

—Wilma Mankiller

“The right to be indigenous is an essential prerequisite to developing and maintaining culturally appropriate and sustainable education for indigenous peoples.”

—The Coolangatta Statement
on Indigenous Peoples’ Rights in Education (1.5)

The miseducation of American Indians precedes the “birth” of this nation. From the time of invasion to the present day, the church and state have acted as coconspirators in the theft of Native America, robbing Indigenous peoples of their very right to be Indigenous.¹ In terms of education, the thievery began in 1611 when French Jesuits opened the first mission schools expressly aimed at educating Indian children “in the French manner”² (Noriega, 1992, p. 371). Not to be outdone, Spanish and British missionaries soon followed, developing full-service educational systems intent on “de-Indianizing” Native children. By the mid-eighteenth century Harvard University (1636), the College of William and Mary (1693), and Dartmouth College (1769) had all been established with the charge of “civilizing” and “Chris-

tianizing" Indians as an inherent part of their institutional missions. The American school was therefore a well-established weapon in the arsenal of American imperialism long before the first shots of the Revolutionary War were ever fired.

While it falls outside the bounds of this book to provide a thorough history of American Indian education, its importance is duly noted.³ The following brief review of some significant moments in American Indian education is meant only to provide a rudimentary template from which to theorize the contemporary landscape. We begin with an examination of the historical relationship between American Indians and schooling, followed by a brief review of the literature on critical pedagogy. The reviews of the history of American Indian education and critical pedagogy are then interrelated, mapping the tensions and intersections between these analyses as a means of developing the framework for a Red pedagogy.

THE HISTORICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SCHOOLING AND AMERICAN INDIANS

Though the history of Indian education is mapped in a variety of ways (e.g., chronologically, thematically), it is delineated here in terms of eras that reflect the prevailing systems of power: (1) the period of missionary domination, from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries; (2) the period of federal government domination from the late nineteenth to the mid-twentieth centuries; and (3) the period of self-determination from the mid-twentieth century to the present (Szasz, 1999; Thompson, 1978).

Perhaps at no other time in U.S. history did the church and state work so hand in hand to advance the common project of white supremacy as it did during the period of missionary domination. During this era, missionary groups acted as the primary developers and administrators of schools while the federal government served as the not-so-silent partner, providing economic and political capital through policies such as the Civilization Fund.⁴ In 1819, Secretary of War John Calhoun declared it was the duty of all employees in government-funded missions, particularly teachers, to promote U.S. policies aimed at "civilizing" Indians. In Calhoun's words, it was their job to "[i]mpress on the minds of the Indians the friendly and benevolent views of the government . . . and the advantages to . . . yielding to the policy of the government and cooperating with it in such measures as it may deem necessary for their civilization and happiness" (Layman, 1942, p. 123, cited in Reyhner and Eder, 1992, p. 40). Indeed, the work of teachers, church leaders, and missionaries were hardly distinguishable during this era, saving souls and colonizing minds became part and parcel of the same colonialist project.

While missions retained control well into the late nineteenth century, the period of federal government domination ideologically commenced with the passage of the Indian Removal Act in 1830.⁵ The fallout from removal necessitated the appointment of a commissioner of Indian affairs, tellingly positioned in the U.S. Department of War. The collateral damage levied by removal, namely, the decimation of Indian economies via displacement, required a systematic effort to "reeducate" Indians to live "domesticated" lives. Thus, in addition to dealing with the removed tribes, the commissioner was charged with overseeing a retooled system of Indian education, one which emphasized vocational training as the new panacea for assimilating Indians to industrial society.

In the following decades, the church and state conspired in the development of a variety of "manual labor schools." In addition to providing vocational training, such schools introduced the concept of forced labor as part of Indian education, transforming the ostensibly "moral" project of civilizing Indians into a for-profit enterprise. Under this experiment, churches were endowed with hundreds of acres of land for Indian children to plow, maintain, and harvest. Many dioceses yielded high profits from the "free" labor, creating a windfall that ignited increased competition for federal funding. Ironically, the ensuing friction and discord among rival churches contributed to the repeal of the Civilization Fund (1873), bringing their reign of power to an end. The federal government stepped in to fill the void, ushering in a new era of federal control over Indian schools (Reyhner and Eder, 1992).

Building on the models established by manual labor and earlier boarding schools (e.g., Dartmouth and the Choctaw Academy), the government looked to define its own system of Indian education. Federal planners were weary of the established day school model, which "afforded Indian students too much proximity to their families and communities." Such access was deemed detrimental to the overall project of deculturalization (Noriega, 1992, p. 380), making the manual labor boarding school the model of choice. The infamous Carlisle Indian School (1879–1918) was the first of its kind in this new era of federal control.

By the turn of the century, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) was operating twenty-five such boarding schools in fifteen states. Administering the entire apparatus was the newly created education division of the BIA (Reyhner and Eder, 1989). Like earlier models, the "new" boarding schools were designed, first and foremost, to serve the purposes of the federal government and only secondarily the needs of American Indian students. Such imperialistic purposes were reflected in curriculums that included teaching allegiance to the U.S. government, exterminating the use of Native languages, and destroying Indian customs, particularly Native religions (Spring, 2001).

Though the above aims for Indian education were all integral components of the colonialist curriculum, perhaps the most important feature of boarding

schools was the inculcation of the industrial or "Protestant" work ethic. In his annual report in 1881, Commissioner of Indian Affairs Hiram Price argued that previous attempts to civilize Indians failed because they did not teach "the necessity of labor" (Spring, 1997, p. 173). He maintained that this ethic could only be taught by making Indians responsible for their own economic welfare, achievable through the cultivation of a proper appreciation for private property. Price specifically advocated for an allotment program that conferred Indians "a certain number of acres of land which they may call their own."⁶ Richard Pratt, founder of the Carlisle Indian School, echoed the sentiments of the commissioner, attacking the tribal way of life as socialistic and contrary to the values of civilization. Indeed, Pratt laid the "failure" of Indian assimilation at the feet of missionary groups and their failure to "advocate the disintegration of tribes." In a letter to the commissioner of Indian affairs, he wrote: "Pandering to the tribe and its socialism as most of our Government and mission plans do is the principal reason why the Indians have not advanced more and are not advancing as rapidly as they ought to."⁷ As such, Pratt made indoctrination to capitalist logic an explicit aim of Indian education.

The era of Indian boarding schools reigned from the nineteenth century through the early twentieth century. Such schools worked explicitly with the U.S. government to implement federal policies (i.e., allotment) servicing the campaign to "kill the Indian and save the man." The process began with the (often forcible) removal of young children from their homes and communities and transporting them to a geographically and ideologically foreign place. Upon arrival, children were subjected to English-only and Anglo-centric curricula and to a curriculum that incorporated paramilitary structures of forced labor and "patriotic" propaganda. In addition, children were often undernourished and subjected to overcrowded living spaces that encouraged "the spread of tuberculosis and trachoma." Moreover, compulsory attendance laws made it virtually impossible for children to escape, exposing a hidden curriculum that not only advocated the termination of Indian-ness but also of Indians (Spring, 1997, p. 175).

By the turn of the century, the combined effects of rapidly increasing enrollments (due to compulsory attendance laws), a decrease in federal funding, a changing political tide, and a growing resistance among tribes began to encumber the boarding school experiment, rendering it too unwieldy for federal officials to maintain. Not only did the schools become political and economic liabilities, but also proved to be an ineffective means of achieving the government's aim of complete assimilation. As Noriega (1992, p. 383) reports, "despite the efforts of BIA officials, missionaries, and teachers to stamp them out, Indigenous languages, spiritual practices, and sociopolitical forms were not only continued by tribal elders, but transmitted from generation to generation." The century thus ended with a pervasive sense of futility

and failure regarding Indian education and with the government continuing to search for the next best solution to the "Indian problem." Despite the growing litany of failed experiments, belief in the virtue of forced assimilation persisted, continually compelling new strategies and tactics.

In 1906, Commissioner of Indian Affairs Francis Leupp initiated the next grand plan—the wholesale transfer of Indian students into public schools. In addition to saving the government from the ever-increasing cost of Indian education, the immersion of Indian children into public and predominantly white schools was seen as a strategic means of propelling the process of "Americanization." By 1912, there were more Indian children in public schools than government (BIA) schools, and by 1924, the "Committee of One Hundred Citizens" officially sanctioned Leupp's assessment of public education as the most efficient means by which to train Indians to "think white."⁸

The transition from boarding schools to public education was mounted in the wake of the Meriam Report in 1928, which not only dealt the final blow to the boarding school experiment but also levied the decisive political spark that launched the next era of "reform." Among other things, the report not only harshly criticized the existing educational policies of removing Indian children from their homes and communities, but criticized the institutional practices of forced manual labor and severe discipline as well. The report summarily states that the most fundamental need in Indian education was a "change in government attitude" (Spring, 1997, p. 176). In 1933, leading reformer and advocate of Indian "rights" John Collier became the commissioner of Indian affairs. He oversaw the implementation of many recommendations iterated in the Meriam Report, including the end of allotment, increased Indian religious freedom, and greater tribal self-government⁹ (Reyhner and Eder, 1992). Also passed during Collier's tenure was the Johnson-O'Malley Act, which authorized payments to states or territories for the education of Indians in public institutions. Such reforms were prominent features of Collier's "Indian New Deal," the net impact of which significantly increased the number of Indian children being served by both federal (BIA) and public educational institutions.

Over time, the notion of reform popularized by Collier's "New Deal" fueled liberal sentiments to "free" the Indian from government control, particularly from the reservation system. During the so-called termination period (1945–1968),¹⁰ the government sought to relocate Indians to urban areas, turning the responsibility for Indian education over to individual states (Reyhner and Eder, 1992). Despite its "liberatory" rhetoric, however, Margaret Connell Szasz (1999, p. 137) contends that the aim of termination was to support "any action that would assimilate the Indian into urban society."

Along with other aspects of termination, the educational implications of relocation were devastating. Hildegard Thompson, director of the branch of

education, criticized the lack of foresight in educational planning. For instance, in reference to the "termination" of the Paiutes, she stated, "We all recognize that the [termination of the Paiute] was enacted without too much preplanning with the Tribe" and that in the future "such programs and contracts should come in the preparation stage with the Tribe instead of at the termination time" (Szasz, 1994, p. 138). The experience of the Paiutes was not an isolated one, as the vast majority of tribes were ill-informed and unprepared for the myriad and pervasive effects of termination. Therefore, it was not long before this program was added to the pile of failed government experiments, brought down by its own inherent deficiencies and a growing tide of Indian resistance.

While resistance took many forms, Indians implicitly expressed their antipathy toward termination by refusing to enroll in the associated ill-conceived vocational training programs ostensibly designed for their benefit (read: ready labor exploitation). By the dawn of the civil rights movement, American Indians were more directly voicing their opposition to termination and other oppressive government policies. Such displays of resistance psychologically marked the beginning of the era of self-determination.

By the 1960s, tribes had developed a core leadership capable of articulating Indian rights and concerns (Reyhner and Eder, 1992, p. 54). In addition to their protests of existing federal policies, the new Indian leadership advocated an agenda of self-determination or the idea of "letting Indian people . . . determine their own destiny." The spirit of self-determination gave rise to a number of Indian organizations, including the National Indian Education Association in 1967, the Coalition of Indian Controlled School Boards in 1971, and the American Indian Movement in 1972. The political energy of such organizations helped galvanize efforts to establish tribally controlled schools such as the Rough Rock Demonstration School and Navajo Community College, founded in 1966 and 1968, respectively.

The efforts of Indian educators and leaders also prompted the publication of two major studies in Indian education: "Indian Education: A National Tragedy—A National Challenge" (U.S. Senate, 1969), commonly known as "The Kennedy Report" and "The National Study of American Indian Education" (Havighurst, 1970). These reports helped secure passage of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Act in 1975, which provided American Indians increased control over their children's education. Among other measures, the act authorized special funding for programs in reservation schools and, for the first time, off-reservation, urban schools. It also advocated for parent involvement in program planning, for the establishment of community-run schools, and for culturally relevant and bilingual curriculum materials (Reyhner and Eder, 1992, chapter 3; Szasz, 1999). A number of seminal political documents were also published during the era of self-determination, including the "Indian Nations at Risk" report in 1991, the "White House

Conference on Indian Education" report in 1992, the "Comprehensive Federal Indian Education Policy Statement" in 1997, and the "Executive Order on American Indian and Alaska Native Education" in 1998. In general, these reports indicate that while the past thirty years witnessed much progress in Indian education, the road ahead was replete with challenges, providing a litany of statistics that portend a grim picture for Indian education. Specifically, in addition to exhibiting the highest dropout and lowest achievement rates, American Indian and Alaska Native students were reported to endure Euro-centric curriculums, high faculty and staff turnover rates, underprepared teachers, limited access to relevant cultural library and learning resources, limited access to computers and other technologies, and overt and subtle forms of racism in schools. Such conditions were exacerbated by a general decline in federal spending, particularly for BIA schools and tribal colleges.

Above all, however, the reports testify to the fact that centuries of genocidal and assimilationist policies cannot be undone in a matter of years. The voices of prominent American Indian scholars, educators, and leaders are registered throughout, collectively asserting that systematic oppression, levied at the hands of the federal government, requires an equally systematic federal plan of affirmative action. In other words, an education for decolonization. The "Comprehensive Federal Indian Education Policy Statement," in particular, reflects the virtual consensus among leaders that school reform must be systematic and inclusive of all aspects of tribal life. The relationship between educational reform and the struggles to "preserve tribal homelands, governments, languages, cultures, economies, and social structures" is made explicit (National Indian Education Association and National Congress of American Indians, 1996, p. 3).

Ironically, though the Comprehensive Federal Indian Education Policy Statement is often referred to as a revolutionary document in the history of American Indian education, it ultimately states little that is either new or revolutionary. Rather, it merely rearticulates the scope of federal responsibility as defined in existing laws, treaties, and policies. Beginning with a directive for the "recognition and support of tribal sovereignty," the report details the responsibilities of various federal agencies to assist tribes in assuming "control of education programs and governance of Indian education" (National Indian Education Association/National Congress of American Indians, 1996, p. 4). It covers everything from the "support of native languages and cultures" to provisions for "Indian education outside of Indian country," and is contextualized in language that makes it definitively clear that the federal government must act in consultation with, and in service to, the tribes. Furthermore, it stipulates that this "government-to-government" relationship should be heeded as an inherent aspect of tribal sovereignty and not as a delegated privilege.

Due to its comprehensive nature, the Comprehensive Federal Indian Education Policy Statement served as the model for "The Executive Order on American Indian and Native Alaskan Education" issued in 1998 by the Clinton administration. Much of its original, somewhat strident, language was, however, lost in the translation from political statement to federal policy. In particular, the importance placed on the need for broad-based educational reform, institutionalized recognition of Indian sovereignty, and accountability of federal agencies to uphold their moral, legal, and fiscal responsibility to support Indian education was noticeably diminished. Nevertheless, the issuance of this executive order was a historic moment, symbolizing the efforts of contemporary American Indian leaders to not only insist on self-determination but also on the government's acknowledgment of this inherent right.

Indian Education in the Twenty-First Century

While at the beginning of the twenty-first century it is important to recognize that progress has been made, Indian students, in comparison to all others, are still the most disproportionately affected by poverty, low educational attainment, and limited access to educational opportunities (Beaulieu, 2000, p. 33). Their severely marginalized status is perhaps most evident in the overrepresentation of Native youth engaging in high-risk behaviors. A study conducted by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services in 2001 (cited in Clarke, 2002) reported the following data regarding American Indian/Alaska Native youth aged twelve to seventeen:

- Illicit drug use is more than twice (22.2 percent) the national average (9.7 percent).
- Binge alcohol use is higher (13.8 percent) than the national average (10.3 percent).
- Heavy alcohol use is higher (3.8 percent) than the national average (2.5 percent).
- Motor vehicle and other accidents are the leading cause of death among American Indian/Alaska Native persons aged fifteen to twenty-four, whose death rate due to accidents is higher than the rate for the total U.S. population.
- Suicide is the second leading cause of death for American Indian/Alaska Native youth aged fifteen to twenty-four, and the overall suicide rate is 2.5 times higher than the combined rate for all races in the United States.

In recognition of the seeming sociocultural nature of these behaviors, some educators have advocated multicultural education for American Indian students (Butterfield, 1994; Hamme, 1996; Reyhner, 1992; St. Germaine, 1995;

Wilson, 1991). According to Nieto (1995), multicultural education can be defined as "a process of comprehensive school reform and basic education for all students."

It challenges and rejects racism and other forms of discrimination in schools and society and affirms the pluralism (ethnic, racial, linguistic, religious, and gender, among others) that students, their communities, and teachers represent. Multicultural education permeates the curriculum and instructional strategies used in schools, as well as the interactions among teachers, students, and parents, and the very way that schools conceptualize the nature of teaching and learning.

While acknowledgment of the relationship between education and culture is important, unless the relationship between culture and the socioeconomic conditions within which it is produced is recognized, the so-called at-risk conditions common to peoples living under siege will persist. With regard to American Indians, this means understanding that "the Indian problem" is not a problem of children and families but rather, first and foremost, a problem that has been consciously and historically produced by and through the systems of colonization: a multidimensional force underwritten by Western Christianity, defined by white supremacy, and fueled by global capitalism.

Indian education was never simply about the desire to "civilize" or even deculturalize a people, but rather, from its very inception, it was a project designed to colonize Indian minds as a means of gaining access to Indian labor, land, and resources. Therefore, unless educational reform happens concurrently with analyses of the forces of colonialism, it can only serve as a deeply insufficient (if not negligent) bandage over the incessant wounds of imperialism. The call to engage Indian education reform from a macroerspective—one that emanates from a historical-material analysis of the relationship between U.S. society and Native communities—is not new. One of the more eloquent and passionate entreaties issued on behalf of the need for comprehensive reform was delivered by Mike Charleston (1994, p. 15) in the draft report of the Indian Nations at Risk task force entitled, "Toward True Native Education: A Treaty of 1992." ¹¹ He begins:

It is time for a new treaty, a Treaty of 1992, to end a shameful, secret war. For five hundred years, our tribal people have been resisting the siege of the non-Native societies that have developed in our native land. The war is over the continued existence of tribal societies of American Indians and Alaska Natives. We inherited the conflict from our ancestors. Our children face the consequences of this war today. Every tribal member has felt the bitter pangs of this relentless siege. It dominates our lives. It is killing our children. It is destroying our Native communities.

Charleston's piercing language, particularly the use of such metaphors as "war" and "siege" to describe the imperialistic relationship between the Unit-

ed States and tribal societies, indicates his understanding of the systemic and unrelenting nature of colonialism. In addition, while he rightfully places liability in the hands of the U.S. government, Charleston also acknowledges that change will only occur when Native and non-Native societies make the commitment to work together, referencing the importance of political solidarity and coalition-building.

Though the final published report of the task force is an obviously tempered version of Charleston's impassioned plea, it still manages to identify colonization as the central culprit in creating and maintaining the marginalized "at-risk" status of Native nations. Specifically, it begins from the standpoint that Native nations are at risk because:

- Schools have failed to nurture the intellectual development and academic performance of Native children.
- Schools have discouraged the use of Native languages in the classroom.
- Indian lands and resources are constantly besieged by outside forces interested in further reducing the original holdings of the Indians.
- Political relationships between tribes and the federal government fluctuate with the will of the U.S. Congress and decisions by the courts.

Though the relationship between schools and colonialist forces is only implied, the tacit correlation remains both pointed and powerful. In the end, both documents generated by the task force deliver the resounding message that school reform is merely one battleground in the "war" against colonialism. The central implication is that the struggle for self-determined schools must be engaged alongside other revolutionary struggles, specifically those that seek to end economic exploitation, political domination, and cultural dependency. Consequently, such are the aims of critical pedagogy.

CRITICAL PEDAGOGY AND ITS DISCONTENTS

Simply stated, critical pedagogy is that discourse that emerged when "critical theory encountered education" (Kincheloe and Steinberg, 1997). Typically envisioned as leftist or *beyond* multicultural education, the "theoretical genesis" of North American critical pedagogy is traced back to the work of Paulo Freire, John Dewey, and other social reconstructionists writing in the post-Depression years (McLaren, 2003a). According to Peter McLaren, leading exponents have always "cross-fertilized critical pedagogy with just about every transdisciplinary tradition imaginable, including theoretical forays into the Frankfurt School . . . [with] the work of Richard Rorty, Jacques Lacan, Jacques Derrida, and Michael Foucault" (2003, p. 66). With such transdisciplinary beginnings, it is not surprising that critical pedagogy has emerged, in

more recent years, as a kind of umbrella for a variety of educators and scholars working toward social justice and greater equity (Lather, 1998). As such, postmodern, post-structuralist, feminist, postcolonial, Marxist, and critical race theorists have all developed their own forms of critical pedagogy. Even so, there is a core of unifying principles and salient features that constitute the heart of the discipline.

According to McLaren (2003a), critical pedagogy is first and foremost an approach to schooling—teaching, policymaking, curriculum production—that emphasizes the political nature of education. "The antagonistic terrain of conflicting and competing discourses, oppositional and hegemonic cultural formations, and social relations linked to the larger capitalist social totality" forms the foundation of schooling (McLaren, 2003a, p. 66). As such, critical pedagogy aims to understand, reveal, and disrupt the mechanisms of oppression imposed by the established order, suturing the processes and aims of education to emancipatory goals.

Leading critical scholar Henry Giroux (2001, p. 3) emphasizes the emancipatory nature of critical pedagogy, asserting that, at base, critical pedagogy must be envisioned as "part of a broader ethical and political project wedded to furthering social and economic justice and making multicultural democracy operational." In terms of the pedagogical implications of such a project Giroux (2001, p. 20) writes:

Critical pedagogy must address the challenge of providing students with the competencies they need to cultivate the capacity for critical judgment, to thoughtfully connect politics to social responsibility and expand their own sense of agency in order to curb the excesses of dominant power, to revitalize a sense of public commitment, and to expand democratic relations. Animated by a spirit of critique and possibility, critical pedagogy at its best attempts to provoke students to deliberate, resist, and cultivate a range of capacities that enable them to move beyond the world they already know without insisting on a fixed set of meanings.

Though such aims are often dismissed as idealistic, critical scholar Glenda Moss (2001, p. 11) found that "real" teachers, in "real" classrooms, are able to employ critical pedagogy. Specifically, she found that such teachers used "reflective-reflexive" skills to institute "changed practices that work for authentic participation of all members of the broader society." Buttressed by the work of others, Moss (2001) identified the following pedagogical practices to be common among critical educators: (1) they question whose beliefs, values, and interests are served by classroom content and practices, challenging the hidden curriculum that socializes students into the dominant culture; (2) they address social oppression as tied to race, gender, and class; and (3) they challenge the "banking" or transmission style of teaching as a learning ritual that maintains the status quo.

Though a modicum of consensus has been achieved among critical practitioners, the multifarious nature of critical pedagogy's theoretical foundation has bred intellectual tensions among critical scholars. Indeed, Patti Lather (1998, p. 487) maintains that "an ensemble of practices and discourses with competing claims of truth, typicality, and credibility" among critical scholars have always been present, especially between (postmodern/post-structuralist) feminist and (Marxist) critical scholars. Though at times petty and unproductive, the publicly aired differences and ongoing interchanges between such scholars—commenced by Elizabeth Ellsworth's critique (1989) of critical pedagogy as a white, male discourse—has helped to articulate one of the central fissures in the field. That is, whether the struggle for educational equity is primarily cultural or economic. The fulcrum upon which the conflict turns is Marxist theory.

Advocates of liberal forms of critical pedagogy—postmodernists, post-structuralists, and (liberal/postmodern) feminists—are suspicious of Marxism and indeed of any "grand narrative" that invokes the "masculinist voice" of abstraction and universalization (Lather, 1998, p. 488). They reject the extension of what they view as positivistic macrotheories or "grand narratives of legitimation" in favor of a microtheory and politics that deals with the nature of "difference" (Lyotard, 1984). The general cadence of such theories signals a movement away from the certainty and totalizing effects of grand narratives toward what Lather (1998, p. 488) refers to as "Jacques Derrida's 'ordeal of the undecidable' and its obligations to openness, passage and non-mastery." In such a theoretical space, writes Lather (1998, p. 495) "questions are constantly moving and one cannot define, finish, or close. . . . [It] is a praxis of not being so sure" (1998, p. 488). The aim of such postmodern/post-structural theories is to trouble and disrupt the masculinist or patriarchal presumptions of modernist theories and their universalizing projects, embracing instead a "praxis that moves away from the Marxist dream of 'cure, salvation, and redemption'" (Lather, 1998, p. 495).

Insofar as they theorize against "certainty," postmodernists tend to advocate a negative pedagogy, one more identifiable by what it stands against than what it stands for. The discomfort with asserting any one affirmative and universal claim stems from a (postmodern) sense of the world as being "too complex, the range of views too wide, and the diversity of concerns too differentiated to imagine that there can, any more, be some simple unanimity of goals or interests that unites [us all]" (Shapiro, 1995, p. 20). The implications of such a world for critical educators, according to Svi Shapiro, is to struggle "for a public discourse that privileges no one group of people; one that tries to speak to and include the experience, needs and hopes of a broad spectrum of people in our society" (1995, p. 32). In other words, postmodernists argue that the multiplicity of the millennial world necessitates a political imaginary that is as reflexive and indeterminate as the social imaginary.

As such, it isn't that postmodernists reject the validity of grand narratives (e.g., the anti-capitalist agenda of Marxist theories), but rather that they perceive them as too narrow and therefore insufficient for imagining a new social reality. As Shapiro writes: "[T]he politics that emerge from the fluidity and complexities of identity in contemporary America do not, it must be emphasized, negate those historically important struggles. . . . [O]ur goal is however, to offer an educational language—and later an agenda—that can be as inclusive as possible, to recognize the fullest possible range of human struggles and concerns" (1995, p. 29–30). In other words, postmodernists presume a "praxis of undecidability." That is, one that resists modernist impulses to privilege "containment over excess, thought over affect, structure over speed, linear causality over complexity, and intention over aggregate capacities" (Lather, 1998, p. 497). In so doing, they seek to replace the "one right story" of universalist discourses with a "nonreductive praxis that calls out a promise of a practice on shifting ground" (Lather, 1998, p. 497).

Despite the potential allure of theories that valorize difference and heterogeneity—particularly for peoples marginalized by the modernist project of white supremacy—not all critical scholars embrace the marriage of critical pedagogy to postmodern and post-structural theories. Marxist scholars have been especially critical of what they perceive as the abandonment of emancipatory agendas, in general, and of the struggle against capitalist exploitation, in particular. As McLaren (2003, p. 67) notes, in their effort to try to be everything to everyone, postmodern theorists have (re)cast the net of critical pedagogy so wide and so cavalierly that it has come to be associated with everything from "classroom furniture organized in a 'dialogue friendly' circle to 'feel-good' curricula designed to increase students' self-image." Moreover, insofar as postmodern and other progressive scholars have distanced themselves from the labor/capital problematic, they are construed by radical educators as advocating pro-capitalist forms of schooling. The central argument is that while post-al theories of education have undoubtedly advanced knowledge of the hidden trajectories of power, particularly within processes of representation and identity, they have been "woefully remiss in addressing the constitution of class formations and the machinations of capitalist social organization" (Scatamburlo-D'Annibale and McLaren, 2002, p. 4). In short, revolutionary theorists argue that postmodernism has been used to substitute the project of radical, social transformation with a politics of representation.

In the wake of the relentless march of capitalism, Marxist and other radical scholars view such a stance as grossly insufficient, if not negligent. They contend that to ignore the "totalizing effects" of capitalism and to reduce class to just another form of "difference" is to act as an accomplice to capitalist imperatives and desires. In other words, to remain "enamored with the 'cultural' and seemingly blind to the 'economic'" in this moment of late capitalism is not simply an act of ignoring, but one of complicity (Scatam-

burlo-D'Annibale and McLaren, 2002, p. 4–5). It requires turning a blind eye to the roughly 2.8 billion people (nearly half the world's population) living on less than two dollars a day (McQuaig, 2001, p. 27) and the 100 million people in the industrial world living below the poverty level (Scatamburlo-D'Annibale and McLaren, 2002).¹² Radical educators view such statistics as clear indicators that the inherent contradictions of capitalism are “taking us further away from democratic accountability” and closer toward what “Rosa Luxemborg referred to as an age of ‘barbarism’” (McLaren and Farahmandpur, 2001, p. 277). Thus, from the vantage point of revolutionary critical scholars, we do not simply need an education for equity and social justice, but rather an anti-capitalist education for economic democracy.

Advocates of radical forms of critical pedagogy thus insist on a theory and praxis of schooling with an unabashed emancipatory intent, one that is future-centered and forward looking to a time when “wage labor disappears with class society itself” (McLaren, 2003a, p. 80). In accordance with these aims, critical scholars have developed a “revolutionary critical pedagogy” (Allman, 2001)—the synthesis of contemporary Marxist scholarship with a rematerialized critical pedagogy. Leading advocates of revolutionary critical pedagogy include Paula Allman (who penned the term) and Peter McLaren, as well as Mike Cole, Terry Eagleton, Ramon Farahmandpur, Dave Hill, Jane Kenway, Helen Raduntz, Glen Rikowski, and Valerie Scatamburlo-D'Annibale. Others whose work has greatly influenced the formation of revolutionary critical pedagogy include Teresa Ebert, Paulo Friere, Martha Gimenez, Antonio Gramsci, Henry Giroux, Rosemary Hennessy, Chrys Ingraham, Karl Marx, and Ellen Meskins Wood.

While each of these scholars emphasizes different aspects of the discourse, they all remain committed to a core of abiding principles that formulate the foundation of revolutionary critical pedagogy: (1) to recognize that capitalism, despite its power, is a “historically produced social relation that can be challenged (most forcefully by those exploited by it)” (McLaren and Farahmandpur, 2001, p. 272); (2) to foreground historical-materialist analysis that “provides critical pedagogy with a theory of the material basis of social life rooted in historical social relations” and assigns primacy to uncovering the structures of class conflict and the effects produced by the social division of labor (McLaren, 2002, p. 26)¹³; and (3) to reimagine Marxist theory in the interests of the critical educational project. As McLaren and Farahmandpur write, “Marxist revolutionary theory must be flexible enough to reinvent itself . . . [and] is not set forth here as a universal truth but as a weapon of interpretation” (2001, p. 301–02).

Beyond the theoretical commitments of revolutionary critical pedagogy, some practical implications have also been established. In order to prepare students “to glimpse humanity’s possible future beyond the horizon of capital” (Allman, 2001, p. 219), McLaren and Farahmandpur (2001, p. 299)

submit that revolutionary students and educators must “question how knowledge is related historically, culturally, (and) institutionally to the process of production and consumption,” and ask: How is knowledge produced? Who produces it? How is it appropriated? Who consumes it? How is it consumed? With such questions formulating the base, McLaren (2003, p. xvii) defines the following foundational principles of revolutionary critical pedagogy that parallels Deborah Brandt’s (1991) five pillars of popular education.¹⁴

1. A revolutionary critical pedagogy must be a *collective process*, that involves utilizing a Frietian dialogical learning approach.
2. A revolutionary critical pedagogy must be *critical*; that is, by locating the underlying causes of class exploitation and economic oppression within the social, political, and economic infrastructure of capitalist social relations of production.
3. A revolutionary critical pedagogy is profoundly *systematic* in the sense that it is guided by Marx’s dialectical method of inquiry, which begins with the “real concrete” circumstances of the oppressed masses and moves toward a classification, conceptualization, analysis, and breaking down of the concrete social world into units of abstractions to get at the essence of social phenomena. It then reconstructs and makes the social world intelligible by transforming and translating theory into concrete social and political action.
4. A revolutionary critical pedagogy is *participatory*, involving building coalitions among community members, grassroots movements, church organizations, and labor unions.
5. A revolutionary critical pedagogy is a *creative process* incorporating elements of popular culture (i.e., drama, music, oral history, narratives) as educational tools to politicize and revolutionize working-class consciousness.

Whereas McLaren (2003) outlines the academic principles of revolutionary critical pedagogy, Allman (2001, p. 177–86) defines the more visceral, motivating principles or “vital powers” necessary in the struggle for social justice. McLaren (2002, p. 31) recounts these principles as those of:

mutual respect, humility, openness, trust and co-operation; a commitment to learn to “read the world” critically and expending the effort necessary to bring about social transformation; vigilance with regard to one’s own process of self transformation and adherence to the principles and aims of the group; adopting an “ethics of authenticity” as a guiding principle; internalizing social justice as passion; acquiring critical, creative, and hopeful thinking; transforming the self through transforming the social relations of learning and teaching; establishing democracy as a fundamental way of life; developing critical curiosity;

and deepening one's solidarity and commitment to self and social transformation and the project of humanization.

Such principles are clearly relevant to American Indian students and educators and their need for pedagogies of disruption, intervention, affirmative action, hope, and possibility.

Insofar as the project for colonialist education has been imbricated with the social, economic, and political policies of U.S. imperialism, an education for decolonization must also make no claim to political neutrality and engage a method of analysis and social inquiry that troubles the capitalist, imperialist aims of unfettered competition, accumulation, and exploitation. Beyond an approach to schooling that underscores the political nature of education, American Indian students and educators also require a praxis that enables the dismantling of colonialist forces. They need a pedagogy that cultivates a sense of collective agency, both to curb the excesses of dominant power and to revitalize Indigenous communities.

These aims and imperatives of American Indian education not only illuminate the deep deficiencies of off-the-shelf brands of multiculturalism, which espouse the empty rhetoric of "respecting differences" and market synthetic pedagogies that reduce culture to the "celebration" of food, fad, and festivals, but also point to the relevance and necessity of critical pedagogies of Indigenous education. Indeed, revolutionary critical pedagogy's conception of culture as conditioned by material forces and of schooling as a site of struggle offers great potential for Indigenous peoples working toward pedagogies for self-determination.

AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION AND REVOLUTIONARY CRITICAL PEDAGOGY: TOWARD A NEW RED PEDAGOGY

In the end, though the history of American Indian education and, more broadly, the history of the relationship between the U.S. government and American Indian nations is often characterized as being one of cultural domination, a critical examination reveals the principal relationship as one of exploitation—that is, the imposed extraction of labor and natural resources for capital gain. For example, while the Indian Removal, Dawes, and Termination Acts can all be viewed as legislated attempts to destroy Indian culture, in the end they all provided greater access to Indian lands and resources and, as such, proffered the federal government a windfall in capital gains. Similarly, while manual labor and boarding schools attempted to extinguish Indian-ness by imposing culturally imperialistic curriculums, they also profited from child labor as well as helped to establish a permanent Indian proletariat.

Though the federal government is no longer as explicitly connected to schooling as it once was, exploitative relations between the U.S. government

and American Indian nations persist. As such, the unambiguous anti-capitalist aims of revolutionary critical pedagogy make it more applicable to the imperatives of American Indian education than liberal/progressive forms. That being said, there are significant points of tension between the structures of revolutionary theory and the concerns of American Indian schools and communities.

The central tension is that revolutionary theorists, like other Western scholars, often fail to consider, and thus, theorize, the fundamental "difference" of American Indians and their dual status as U.S. citizens and members of sovereign "domestic dependent nations." Indeed, the myriad implications of this basic failure form the foundation of each subsequent chapter in this book. For instance, in chapter 2, this tension is discussed in terms of the implications of Marxist pedagogies (still contingent on Western notions of democracy) for Indigenous schools and communities. The question is, do Marxist pedagogies of emancipation sustain a geopolitical landscape any more receptive to the notion of Indigenous sovereignty than capitalist pedagogies? In chapter 3, the failure of radical scholars to consider that even in the socialist-democratic imaginary, the end game remains human liberation: a profoundly anthropocentric notion, rooted in a humanist tradition that presumes the superiority of human beings over the rest of nature. In other words, both Marxists and capitalists view land and natural resources as commodities to be exploited, in the first instance, by capitalists for personal gain, and in the second, by Marxists for the good of all.

In chapter 4, the tension is discussed in terms of its implications for the construction of American Indian subjectivity. Specifically, while the theorizations of feminist, postmodern, and post-structural scholars are essential to understanding the complex layers of American Indian subjectivity, their displacement of a "politics grounded in the mobilization of forces against the material sources of political and economic marginalization" is deeply problematic (Scatamburlo-D'Annibale and McLaren, 2002, p. 7). Indeed, the historical-material realities of American Indian schools and communities require emancipatory pedagogies that retain clear and explicit emancipatory agendas. Finally, in chapter 5, the failure of "mainstream" feminists to recognize that most American Indian women view their lives as shaped, first and foremost, by the historical-material conditions of colonization and not some "universal" patriarchy is discussed. By insisting on gender as the primary conceptual framework from which to interpret inequality, such theorists not only blur the actual structures of power but also obfuscate feminism's implication in the projects of colonization and global capitalism. Thus, as previously stated, it is critical to question how the experiences and historical-material realities of Indigenous peoples are reshaped and transformed when articulated through the epistemic frames of Western theory, whether liberal or revolutionary. As American Indian scholar and educator Greg Ca-

jete (1994, p. 3) notes, Indian people must question the effects of contemporary educational theories on the collective cultural, psychological, and ecological viability of Indigenous communities.

Further examination of the tensions and intersections between American Indian education and revolutionary forms of critical pedagogy unfolds in the subsequent chapters. This analysis takes seriously the assertions of McLaren and Farahmandpur, who note, "no theory can fully anticipate or account for the consequences of its application but remains a living aperture through which specific histories are made visible and intelligible" (2001, p. 301). The quest for a new Red pedagogy is, thus, at base, a search for the ways in which American Indian education can be deepened by its engagement with critical educational theory and for critical theory to be deepened by Indian education. While a Red pedagogy privileges "revolutionary critical pedagogy" as a mode of inquiry, it does not simply appropriate or absorb its language and epistemic frames, but rather employs its vision as one of many starting points for rethinking Indigenous praxis. The aim is "to diversify the theoretical itineraries" of both Indigenous and critical educators so that new questions and perspectives can be generated (McLaren, 2002, p. 29).

Finally, what distinguishes Red pedagogy is its basis in hope. Not the future-centered hope of the Western imagination, but rather, a hope that lives in contingency with the past—one that trusts the beliefs and understandings of our ancestors as well as the power of traditional knowledge. A Red pedagogy is, thus, as much about belief and acquiescence as it is about questioning and empowerment, about respecting the space of tradition as it intersects with the linear time frames of the (post)modern world. Most of all, it is a hope that believes in the strength and resiliency of Indigenous peoples and communities, recognizing that their struggles are not about inclusion and enfranchisement to the "new world order" but, rather, are part of the Indigenous project of sovereignty and indigenization. It reminds us that Indigenous peoples have always been peoples of resistance, standing in defiance of the vapid emptiness of the bourgeois life.

This is the spirit that guides the ensuing engagement between critical theory and American Indian education. The hope is for a Red pedagogy that not only helps sustain the lifeways of Indigenous peoples but also provides an explanatory framework that helps us understand the complex and intersecting vectors of power shaping the historical-material conditions of Indigenous schools and communities. A logical place to begin this journey of understanding is at the point of "encounter," examining the various dimensions of conflict and contradiction between the sovereign peoples of the Americas and the colonizers, asking the question: Can democracy be built upon the bloody soils of genocide?

NOTES

1. I use the phrase "right to be Indigenous" with the same intent and manner as it is used in the "Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Education" that is, a right that embraces Indigenous peoples' language, culture, traditions, and spirituality, including the right to self-determination.
2. Specifically, the Jesuits provided academic instruction in French language and customs, and vocational training in the areas of animal husbandry, carpentry, and handicrafts.
3. Perhaps as a reflection of the relegated role of Native Americans, the literature is replete with histories of Indian education. For example, see Szasz (1998, 1999), Reyhner and Eder (1989), and Fuchs and Havighurst (1972), among numerous other seminal articles.
4. According to Szasz (1999, p. 270), in 1819, the first year in which Congress voted for a fund for "civilization" of the Indian, total expenditures did not exceed \$10,000; by 1880, congressional appropriations reached \$130,000 and continued to rise exponentially through the following decade. Also, in addition to congressional funding, many treaties incorporated "provisions" for such educational and civilization purposes, with some incorporated at the request of tribes who began to associate survival with access to Anglo education (Reyhner and Eder, 1992).
5. The Indian Removal Act (chapter 48, 4 Stat. 411), passed May 26, 1830, by the Twenty-first Congress, provided for "an exchange of lands with any of the Indians residing in any of the states and territories, and for their removal west of the river Mississippi." Passage of this act set in motion the mass forced relocations of the Creek, Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Seminole, among other Eastern nations. In the words of Churchill and Morris (1992), "the idea was to 'clear' the native population from the entire region east of the Mississippi, opening it up for the exclusive use and occupancy of Euroamericans and their Black slaves."
6. "Indian Commissioner Price on Civilizing Indians, October 24, 1881," in *Documents of United States Indian Policy*, as quoted in Spring (2001, p. 173).
7. Quoted in Joel Spring's *The American School: 1642-2000* (1997, p. 173).
8. U.S. House of Representatives, Committee of One Hundred, *The Indian Problem: Resolutions of the Committee of One Hundred Appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and Review of the Indian Problem*, as cited in Nortegra (1992).
9. Such reforms were implemented as part of the Indian Reorganization Act, commonly known as the Wheeler-Howard Act.
10. The termination policy was embodied in House Concurrent Resolution No. 108, passed August 1, 1953. It reads: Whereas it is the policy of Congress, as rapidly as possible, to make Indians within the territorial limits of the United States subject to the same laws and entitled to the same privileges and responsibilities as are applicable to other citizens of the United States, and to grant them all of the rights and prerogatives pertaining to American citizenship; and Whereas the Indians within the territorial limits of the United States should assume their full responsibilities as American citizens; Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That it is declared to be the sense of Congress that, at the earliest possible time, all of the Indian tribes and the individual members thereof located within the States of California, Florida, New York, and Texas, and all of the following named Indian tribes and individual members thereof, should be freed from Federal supervision and control and from all disabilities and limitations specially applicable to Indians. (U.S. Congress, 1953, 67 Stat. B132)
11. According to Deputy Project Director of the Task Force Gaye Leia King, Dr. Charles-ton's version was not submitted as the final report as "the majority of the (task force) members believed that Mike's preliminary draft was too harsh and would offend most people." Moreover, she notes that the political climate of the times determined the "need to critically strategize on the content of the report" in order to ensure its release to the public (King, 1994).
12. Even more problematic is the fact that casualties continue to mount. For example, in 2001, there were 1.3 million more poor people in the United States than in 2000.
13. Unlike other contemporary narratives that focus on one form of oppression or another, Scantamburlo-D'Annibale and McLaren (2002, p. 14) note that the power of historical materialism resides in "its ability to reveal (a) how forms of oppression based on categories of differ-

ence do not possess relative autonomy from class relations but rather constitute the ways in which oppression is lived/experienced within a class based system and (b) how all forms of social oppression function within an overlapping capitalist system.”

14. These principles are articulated by Farahmandpur (2003, p. xvii) in the foreword of McLaren’s seminal text *Life in Schools*.