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The Dakota Access Pipeline protests raised the visibility of Native peoples in the United States to levels not seen since the takeover of Wounded Knee in 1973. But a profound lack of awareness of the unique, sovereign, and central role that Native Americans play in the United States persists; and there is little recognition of how the knowledge of Indigenous people can contribute to a better shared future.

The Spring 2018 issue of Dædalus, “Unfolding Futures: Indigenous Ways of Knowing for the Twenty-First Century,” offers Native and non-Native voices on subjects ranging from political movements, adaptive leadership, and representational politics to the production of scientific knowledge, the ethics of bioculture, and language preservation. The essays in the volume are informed by the authors’ shared goal of addressing two questions: What have we learned from the past? And how can we better the future?

The issue is guest edited by Philip J. Deloria (Harvard University), K. Tsianina Lomawaima (Arizona State University), Bryan McKinley Jones Brayboy (Arizona State University), Mark N. Trahant (Indi

In the introduction to the volume, guest editors Philip J. Deloria, K. Tsianina Lomawaima, Bryan McKinley Jones Brayboy, Mark N. Trahant, Loren Ghiglione, Douglas Medin, and Ned Blackhawk describe how, despite being written out of much of contemporary life, Indigenous peoples are crafting a new environmental-social-political alliance and new strategies for political action. The editors note that the Dædalus issue, begun at the height of the protests at Standing Rock, aims to understand the contemporary dynamics of this modern racism; to create positive change in academia, the legal system, the intellectual and cultural life of the nation, and among government and nonprofit actors; to make “unknown unknowns” visible to non-Native audiences; and to speak to the unique status, honest challenges, and achievements of contemporary Indian people.

In “Nenabozho Goes Fishing: A Sovereignty Story,” Heidi Kii

Amy E. Den Ouden (University of Massachusetts Boston), in “Recognition, Antiracism & Indigenous Futures: A View from Connecticut,” notes that the early 1970s were a moment of particular historical significance in Connecticut’s tribal nations’ centuries-long struggles to assert sovereignty and defend reservation lands. The racialization of Native peoples in Connecticut informed the state’s management of “Indian affairs,” and its antirecognition policy reflects a long history of institutionally embedded racist policies and practices. Den Ouden uses Connecticut as a case study to call for politically engaged, antiracist research that is concerned with understanding the complexities of tribal sovereignty in local contexts in which governmental control of Indian affairs reproduces and validates White-supremacist ideology.
Indigenous peoples are crafting a new environmental-social-political alliance and new strategies for political action.

In the last century, Native nations, communities, parents, and students have fought to maintain heritage languages and cultures through Indigenous education.

Goodyear-Kaʻōpua and Kuwada situate testimonies from these hearings within a longer genealogy of Kānaka assertions of ea (sovereignty, life, breath) against the prolonged U.S. military occupation of Hawai‘i.

Genetic ancestry tests have been used to verify or dispute family stories about ancestors, to seek belonging with a particular tribe or community, and to identify genetic variants across populations in medical research. But assumptions about genetic testing – and the very idea of a “genetic” identity – pose challenges for communities defined in terms of political, social, and cultural identities. In “Genetic Ancestry Testing with Tribes: Ethics, Identity & Health Implications,” Nanibaa’ A. Garrison (Seattle Children’s Hospital and Research Institute; University of Washington) explores the potential implications of ancestry tests for Native American tribes and communities and concludes that, while their scientific and recreational use continues to increase, limitations of consistency across platforms and the generalizability of knowledge remain.

Arianne E. Eason (University of Washington), Laura M. Brady (University of Washington), and Stephanie A. Fryberg (University of Washington), in “Reclaiming Representations & Interrupting the Cycle of Bias Against Native Americans,” note that representations of Native Americans are largely negative, antiquated, and limiting. The prevalence of such portrayals and a comparative lack of positive ones foster a cycle of bias perpetuating disparities among Native Americans with respect to other populations. The authors illustrate how the legal system, the media, and education can be leveraged to promote positive conceptions of Native Americans, creating more equitable outcomes. The actions of some contemporary Native Americans to reclaim their Native American identity and create accurate ideas of who Native Americans are and what they can become provide a blueprint for leveraging cultural change to interrupt the cycle of bias and to reduce disparities.

In “Why Don’t More Indians Do Better in School? The Battle between U.S. Schooling & American Indian/Alaska Native Education,” Bryan McKinley Jones Brayboy (Arizona State University) and K. Tsiánína Lomawaima (Arizona State University) argue that American Indian/Alaska Native education has been locked in battle for centuries with colonial schooling. Brayboy and Lomawaima demonstrate that contemporary models of educators braiding together Indigenous education and Indigenous schooling better serve Native peoples to provide positive ones foster a cycle of bias perpetuating disparities among Native Americans with respect to other populations. The authors illustrate how the legal system, the media, and education can be leveraged to promote positive conceptions of Native Americans, creating more equitable outcomes. The actions of some contemporary Native Americans to reclaim their Native American identity and create accurate ideas of who Native Americans are and what they can become provide a blueprint for leveraging cultural change to interrupt the cycle of bias and to reduce disparities.
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suring graduation rates, cost per student, job placement rates, and income. But Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs) are indebted to and inspired by the revolutionary vision of their founders, who believed that higher education rooted in tribal sovereignty, identity, systems, and beliefs would ensure the survival and prosperity of their people. Cheryl Crazy Bull and Justin Guillory assert that TCUs are advancing Native student access and completion, developing community-based research, and promoting economic and entrepreneurial development in tribal communities.

In “The New World of the Indigenous Museum,” Philip J. DeLoria (Harvard University) argues that museums have long offered simplistic representations of American Indians, even as they served as repositories for Indigenous human remains and cultural patrimony. He indicates two critical interventions—the founding of the National Museum of the American Indian (1989) and the passage of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (1990)—that helped transform museum practice. The decades following this legislation saw an explosion of tribal museums and an increase in tribal capacity in both repatriation and cultural affairs. The National Museum of the American Indian, for one, explicitly argues for Native peoples’ centrality in the American story and insists not only on survival narratives, but also on Indigenous futurity.

Mark N. Trahant (Indian Country Today), in “The Story of Indian Health is Complicated by History, Shortages & Bouts of Excellence,” observes that one of the primary goals of the United States’ entry into health care was to protect soldiers by isolating and inoculating tribal populations from infectious disease. When tribes signed legally binding treaties, the United States promised doctors, nurses, facilities, and basic health care. Yet this promise has never been fully funded by Congress. Trahant asserts that the Indian Health Service, which includes tribal and nonprofit health agencies, has largely failed American Indian and Alaska Native patients; yet it has also achieved remarkable innovation and excellence, offering a model for other resource-starved health systems.
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“The Unfolding Futures: Indigenous Ways of Knowing for the Twenty-First Century” Spring 2018 issue of Daedalus
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In “Indigenous Leadership,” Gary Sandefur (Oklahoma State University) and Philip J. Deloria (Harvard University) note that non-Native conceptions of Indian leadership are often marked by positive misunderstandings, negative misunderstandings, and general ignorance. Sandefur and Deloria discuss the challenges surrounding American Indian leadership in the contemporary world, considering leadership issues in institutional settings such as academia, tribal governments, pan/inter-Indian organizations, public interest and NGO groups, and global Indigenous structures, and suggest ways in which non-Native organizations can better recognize, respect, and partner with American Indian leaders.

In his essay, “Critical Investigations of Resilience: A Brief Introduction to Indigenous Environmental Studies & Sciences,” Kyle Whyte (Michigan State University) discusses that Indigenous peoples are among the most active environmentalists in the world, working through advocacy, educational programs, and research. The emerging field of Indigenous Environmental Studies and Sciences (iESS) is distinctive, investigating social resilience to environmental change through the lens of how moral relationships are organized in societies. Whyte examines iESS research across three of these moral relationships—responsibility, spirituality, and justice—and argues that iESS can support Indigenous peoples’ struggles with environmental justice and political reconciliation; make significant contributions to global discussions about the relationship between human behavior and the environment; and speak directly to Indigenous liberation as well as justice issues that impact everyone.

In “If Indigenous Peoples Stand with the Sciences, Will Scientists Stand with Us?” Megan Bang (University of Washington), Ananda Marin (University of California, Los Angeles), and Douglas Medin (Northwestern University) argue that Indigenous sciences—based in relationships, reciprocity, and responsibilities—constitute distinct perspectives on and practices of knowledge creation and decision-making that not only have the right to be pursued on their own terms, but may also be vital in solving twenty-first-century challenges. “Science,” and Western science in particular, is often treated as if it were a single entity, free of cultural influences and value-neutral. Bang, Marin, and Medin argue for engagement with multiple perspectives on science and share empirical examples of how Indigenous sciences, sometimes in partnership with Western science, have led to new discoveries and insights into human learning and development.

Teresa L. McCarty (University of California, Los Angeles), Sheilaah E. Nicholas (University of Arizona), Kari A. B. Chew (University of Arizona), Natalie G. Diaz (Arizona State University), Wesley Y. Leonard (University of California, Riverside), and Louel-lyn White (Concordia University), in “Hear Our Languages, Hear Our Voices: Storywork as Theory & Praxis in Indigenous-Language Reclamation,” show how storywork—first-hand narratives through which language reclamation is described and practiced—provides data and insight on the meaning of language reclamation in diverse Indigenous communities. They argue that language reclamation is about voice, encapsulating personal and communal agency and the expression of Indigenous identities, belonging, and responsibility to self and community.

Language reclamation is about voice, encapsulating personal and communal agency and the expression of Indigenous identities, belonging, and responsibility to self and community.