Diné Decolonizing Education and Settler Colonial Elimination

A Critical Analysis of the 2005 Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act

by

Waquin Preston

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Master of Science

Approved April 2015 by the Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Myla Vicenti Carpio, Chair Elizabeth Sumida Huaman John Tippeconnic III

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2015

ABSTRACT

In 2005 the Navajo Nation Tribal Council passed the Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act (NSEA). The NSEA has been herald as a decisive new direction in Diné education with implications for Diné language and cultural revitalization. However, research has assumed the NSEA will lead to decolonizing efforts such as language revitalization and has yet to critically analyze how the NSEA is decolonizing or maintains settler colonial educational structures. In order to critically investigate the NSEA this thesis develops a framework of educational elimination through a literature review on the history of United States settler colonial elimination of Indigeneity through schooling and a framework of decolonizing education through a review of literature on promising practices in Indigenous education and culturally responsive schooling. The NSEA is analyzed through the decolonizing education framework and educational elimination framework. I argue the NSEA provides potential leverage for both decolonizing educational practices and the continuation of educational elimination.

DEDICATION

To my Family and Diné People

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis would never have been written if not for the help of my mentor Myla Vicenti Carpio and the following: Elizabeth Sumida Human, John Tippeconnic, Leo Killsback, James Riding In, Eunice Romero-Little, Eric Hardy, Madison Fulton, Jerome Clark, Tom Greyeyes, Joyce Martin, Naomi Tom, and Cliff Kaye.

CHAF	PTER Page
1	INTRODUCTION 1
	Statement of the Problem
	Theoretical Framework
	United States Settler Colonialism11
	Significance of Study16
	Literature Review17
	Organization of Study19
	Terminology21
2	EDUCATIONAL ELIMINATION
	Civilization, White Supremacy, and Settler Colonialism25
	Indian Education Formation and Mission Schooling27
	Formation of Indian Boarding Schools
	Self-Rule
	Termination41
	Self-Determination
	Self-Determination and Self-Governance
	Discussion64
3	DECOLONIZING EDUCATION
	Shifting the Discourse: Frameworks of Decolonization70
	What is Indigenous Education?
	Indigenous Education Practices and Culturally Responsive Schooling.88

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

	Lessons and Principles that Inform a Decolonized Education95
	Indigenous Theorizing in Education101
	Sa'ah Naaghai Bik'eh Hozhoon Framework103
	Discussion107
4	ANALYSIS: 2005 NAVAJO SOVEREIGNTY IN EDUCATION ACT 110
	Policy Analysis118
	Elimination and Containment119
	Decolonization
	Discussion134
5	CONCLUSION 139
REFE	RENCES 145
APPE	NDIX
А	2005 NAVAJO SOVEREIGNTY IN EDUCATION ACT

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In 2005 the Navajo Nation Tribal Council passed the Navajo Nation Sovereignty in Education Act (NSEA) as part of what Lee (2014) states is a "step toward achieving more control and authority over the education of Diné children" (175). Then president of the Navajo Nation, Joe Shirley, after the passage of the bill stated, "We are a sovereign nation and we need to conduct ourselves as such. These changes now head us in that direction, getting back to standing on our own two feet and being a true sovereign" (Norrell 2005). The NSEA supports a vision of "sovereignty in education" by placing an emphasis on an inherent right for Diné people to determine and control their own education system. Currently, the respective education departments of the states of Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah, control public schools on the Navajo Nation which the majority of Diné students attend (Lee 2014). Through the language and deployment of sovereignty the NSEA places the states of Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah on stand by for the Navajo Nation to take full control over public schools on the Navajo Nation (Roessel 2011). By establishing a comparable education system to state education departments the Navajo Nation is attempting to gain direct access to federal funding that has traditionally gone through states, eliminating state funding requirements such as specific standards and curriculum that orient schools to marginalize Diné language (Lee 2014). In order to facilitate the process of Diné control and authority over public schools, the NSEA establishes a Department of Diné Education (DODE) comparable to a state education department invested with similar powers, authority, and responsibilities, further explored in chapter three. The NSEA has the potential to disrupt the current status of

education that I call Diné eliminatory education by shifting state and federal authority to determine academic standards and curriculum toward Diné people. In doing so Diné people may privilege the Diné language and world view by gaining control over public schooling budgets (Lee 2014).

The conflict between American Indian nations and the federal and state governments over the right and ability for American Indian communities to control education has been one of the defining characteristics of American Indian education history (Lomawaima and McCarty, 2006). At stake in the power struggle over Indian education is the survival of American Indian people. Indian education has historically been deployed as a vehicle of assimilation by the United States federal government to break up tribal formations and land holdings under the guise of a self-proclaimed benevolent project of "civilizing" Indian people (Adams 1995; Deloria and Wildcat 2001; Lomawaima 1999; Lomawaima and McCarty 2002; Grande 2004, Reyhner and Eder 2004). Scholars have pointed out American Indian education policies of assimilation worked parallel and in conjunction with policies of Indian land allotment and tribal termination to break up tribal communal landownership for white American settlement (Grande 2004; Reyhner and Eder 2004). Although the most overt practices of assimilation have been eliminated from official policy, the spirit of assimilation and the effects of eliminating Indigeneity and sovereignty remain in contemporary state run middle class schooling. From the lens of colonization theory "Indian education was never simply about the desire to 'civilize' or even deculturize 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 land, labor, and resources" (Grande 2004, 19).

Statement of the Problem

Diné Bikéyah, or the Diné homeland is situated in what is now known as the Southwest United States between the four sacred mountains of Tsisnaasjini,' Tsoodzil, Doko'oosliid, and Dibé Nitsaa. Today the political and legal boundaries of the Navajo Nation comprise roughly half of Diné Bikéyah between Northeastern Arizona, Northwestern New Mexico, and Southwestern Utah comprising 25,000 square miles of land (Iverson 2002a) with a population of 173,667 (US Census Bureau 2010). Due to trust relationship with the federal government and the boundaries of the Navajo Nation falling within three states the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE), Arizona public schools, New Mexico public schools, Utah public school, federally funded grant, and tribal controlled charter schools form a patch work of schools authorities and operators with varying standards, curriculum, and teacher certification requirements (Hearing on Indian Education 2014).

The Navajo Nation and local Diné communities do not control the vast majority of schooling within the political and legal boundaries of the Navajo Nation. According to the Department of Diné Education Office of Educational Research and Statistics during the 2012-2013 school year there were 17 school districts and139 schools serving 38,109 students on the Navajo Nation. 23,056 of Diné Students or 60.5% of or total students attend public schools with 15,019 in Arizona public and charter schools, 7,010 in New Mexico public schools, and 1,027 in Utah Public Schools. The Bureau of Indian Education operates thirty one schools with 8,079 students and eight resident halls with 879 students. 6,974 Diné students attend twenty-nine federally funded grant schools (Hearing on Indian Education 2014).

Since the 1970s Diné communities and the Navajo Nation government has attempted to gain further control over the schooling of their children. In reviewing the various schooling authorities, their standards, and curriculum Robert Roessel (1979) argued for Diné control over schooling in order to systematically end the cultural genocide that resulted from non-Diné policy makers. Roessel (1979) also noted the confusing and inconsistent nature of Diné schooling due to the patch work of various schooling authorities. As a result the Navajo Nation has attempted to coordinate between the various state and federal schooling departments to unify standards and curriculum that are more suitable to the needs of Diné students. Specifically the need to address language shift and acculturation through Diné language instruction and Diné studies (Navajo Tribal Code 1987; Navajo Division of Education 1984).

The eliminatory educational problem the Navajo Nation and local Diné communities face is a result of the lack of local community control of Diné education and the eliminatory nature of the current status quo of non-Diné controlled schooling on the Navajo Nation. As I will argue, federal and state control of Diné schooling has and continues to result in the elimination of Diné-ness. The elimination of Diné-ness results in the erasure of Diné permanence from the land by altering Diné perceptions and relationship with the land through capitalist values. Therefore schooling serves the settler colonial project of eliminating Diné permanence from the land in order to establish settler permanence.

The purpose of this research is to investigate the potential of the NSEA to be utilized as a tool for decolonizing Diné education and contribute to the shifting discourse of Indian education from an "achievement paradigm" to a paradigm which takes into

account a settler colonial analysis. I offer an analysis of American Indian education and Diné education through the lens of settler colonialism theory. A historical analysis of Diné and American Indian education offers insight into the process and mechanisms of elimination within the context of education, although I contend that the concept of education has become conflated with a concept of schooling. In other words to be educated is to be schooled. Therefore, I analyze settler schooling policy and practice as a vehicle of settler colonial elimination as American Indian education scholars have pointed out schools have been one of the most effective sites to disrupt Indigenous ways of being (Deloria and Wildcat 2001; Grande 2004). Through a historical analysis on settler colonial schooling, markers of settler colonial elimination and containment emerge. These markers highlight policy and practice of elimination and containment that can be traced through the history of United States settler colonialism from the overtly hostile language of "civilization" to the coded economic language of development.

This paper also promotes a decolonizing education strategy to disrupt in a decolonizing project. I also provide an analysis of Indigenous education models and culturally responsive schooling (CRS) models that provide markers and principles for a decolonizing project. By establishing an educational eliminatory framework and a decolonizing education framework the NSEA can be analyzed and better understood as a mechanism and tool to continue the legacy of the elimination and containment of Diné language, values, principles, and beliefs through schooling or disrupt elimination and containment to provide for a truly Diné vision of what education is and can be.

Although this study argues schooling significantly contributes to the weakening of American Indian Indigeneity and sovereignty it is important to acknowledge education is only one of the mechanisms that contributes to settler colonialism. Although schooling plays a large role in the development of- and caring for American Indian adolescence, it is only one of the factors that contribute to settler colonialism. I do not propose decolonizing Indian or Diné education will solve all the issues which challenge American Indian communities nor will decolonizing Indian education result in the complete decolonization of American Indian or Diné communities. However, the concept of education plays a significant role in the social and political realities of American Indian nations, communities, and individuals. Considering the social reality of compulsorily schooling in the United States, schooling plays a significant role in American Indian youths' daily lives.

This research recognizes the identity of Indigenous peoples is contested as there is no universally recognized definition of who is Indigenous (Maaka and Fleras 2005). The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples develops a framework of identifying Indigenous peoples based on an established existence on lands and place prior to struggles against colonizing societies, with deep roots that connect Indigenous peoples to land but refrains from providing an exact definition (Anaya 2004). A complete discussion on the Indigenous identity is beyond the scope of this paper but I define Indigenous peoples for the purpose of this study through the concept of Indigeneity. Hamilton (2009) recognizes that the term Indigeneity is contextual and fluid depending on the context and the positionality of those deploying the term. Hamilton (2009) illustrates this point by identifying Indigenous peoples as defining Indigeneity through specific ontologies and epistemologies while settler court systems in the United States

and Canada have defined Indigeneity to meet the needs of context specific cases to produce difference.

Building off of Hamilton's (2009) definition of Indigeneity as emerging out of Indigenous peoples ontologies and epistemologies I define markers of Indigeneity as Indigenous language, access to Indigenous knowledge systems, and Indigenous world view and core values, principles, and beliefs of Indigenous peoples related to kinship and a deep relationship to land and place. In particular I place an emphasis on the connection to land and place as essential to defining an Indigenous identity as I will describe earlier, settler colonialism is a land based project which seeks to eliminate Indigenous permanence from the land.

Indigenous identity has also been framed through the politicization of Indigenous peoples by way of their resistance to colonialism and settler colonialism (Maaka and Fleras 2005). In this framing of Indigenous identity Indigeneity arises from Indigenous resistance to colonial projects and links Indigenous communities around the world in solidarity. In this context the identity of Indigenous peoples is deployed to make claims to land and claims against settler colonial institutions and structures based on a continual habitation of ancestral home lands, inherent sovereignty, and political and cultural autonomy (Maaka and Fleras 2005). It is important to note however that Indigenous peoples are not defined only in relation to settler society but when talking about settler colonialism as a concept there is an established relationship between Indigenous peoples and settlers. In other words Indigenous peoples exist as "Indigenous" if there exists no settlers but settlers only exist in relation to Indigenous peoples by settling on Indigenous land.

For a specific Indigenous community such as the Diné, the markers of Indigeneity are defined by the world view of that people. Diné identity is defined in this research through what Begay's (2014) identifies as a Diné worldview on identity: *Ke*, the Diné clan system, Diné language, interconnectedness of individuals to community and land, and Diné core values. Roessel (1979) also offers other useful markers of Diné-ness as knowledge, understanding, and respect for the *Diyin Diné 'eh* (Holy People) and knowledge of the sacred history of the Diné. By understanding what comprises Indigeneity or Diné-ness, the concept of settler colonial elimination can be expounded upon as eliminating the markers of Indigeneity I have defined here.

Theoretical Framework

Patrick Wolfe (2006) defines the concept of settler colonialism as first and foremost a land based project that requires the elimination of Indigenous permanence in order to establish, maintain, and strengthen the invading settler's permanence on Indigenous land. When the settler colonialism is framed as a land based project Indigenous people's physical presence and intimate connections to land present a critical barrier to the settler colonial project. Wolfe (2006) develops the "logic of elimination" as a concept which describes the "negative" and "positive" aspects of elimination. The negative component of elimination are those acts which attempt to remove Indigenous presence such as forced physical removal found in the Cherokee Trail of tears of the Diné Long Walk. In both cases Indigenous peoples were forced through physical violence or the threat of violence to leave their ancestral home lands to make room for American settlement. The positive component of settler colonialism is the establishment of settler structures and institutions in place of the former Indigenous institutions and structures

that symbolizes settler permanence on land. Place names are changed from their Indigenous meanings to settler names, in some cases after "colonial heroes" such as "Indian fighters."

Wolfe's (2006) concept of elimination is not limited to physical violence against Indigenous bodies but also violence against Indigenous language, culture, epistemologies, knowledges, and all other aspects of Indigeneity. As discussed earlier, it is in markers of Indigeneity that intimate relationships that connect Indigenous people to land and place are formed. As the physical frontier representing settler advancement on Indigenous land disappears, a new frontier represented by markers of Indigenous difference (Indigeneity) and settler colonial society becomes the new frontier (Wolfe 2006). As American Indian scholars have argued, the settler colonial project of boarding school to assimilate American Indian children into middle class settler society disrupted the American Indian communities' ability to speak their Indigenous languages, pass down ancestral knowledge, and child rearing skills (Adams 1995). In the example of American Indian boarding schools settler colonialism had eliminatory effects on Indigenous practices and institutions of social reproduction.

Wolfe (2006) also advances the theory that settler colonialism is a structure, not an event. As a structure settler colonialism can be understood as a historical and ongoing process and avoids the theoretical pitfall of post-colonial theory (Byrd 2012). As Smith (2012) argues, post-colonialism theory is an inappropriate concept in the settler colonial context because colonialism never ended, the settlers remain. As a structure Settler Colonialism also pervades throughout the various arms of the settler society, and everyday practices, a phenomenon Fujikane (2008) terms "settler practices" (8).

Goodyear-Ka'opua (2013) draws upon Lomawaima and McCarty's (2006) "safety zone theory," which describes the vacillation between federal "erase and replace" American Indian education policy and Indian education practices that allowed a "safe" measure of Indigeneity within class rooms, to develop the settler logic of containment. Goodyear-Ka'opua (2013) and Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) highlight the contradictory polices of "erase and replace" and elimination with settler support of certain markers of Indigeneity. In the Hawaiian charter school context Hawaiian language and ways of knowing the world persist despite what should be state attempts to eliminate Indigeneity. To account for this contradiction Goodyear-Ka'opua (2013) theorizes the settler colonial logic of containment. Despite Hawaiian language immersion and other mechanism that disrupt elimination, these projects remain contained to spaces that do not disrupt the mainstream public education system (Goodyear-Ka'opua 2013). They are exceptions and the norm. Also, Hawaiian charter schools are still subject to the constraints of federal and state education policies and standards such as mandatory standardized testing and accountability. Through these mechanisms Hawaiian charter schools remained constrained in what they can accomplish within the settler structures of schooling.

Settler colonialism is defined for the purpose of this paper as a land based project that positions Indigenous peoples as a presence that must be eliminated or at the least contained, whether physically or through assimilatory means, in order for settler society and the settler state to establish settler permanence. The United States, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand are examples of settler colonial nation states (Wolfe 2006). In each case the settlers established institutions and structures as permanent markers of settlement, primarily the state and concepts of political sovereignty over Indigenous territory, at the expense of the Indigenous peoples who had previously established a relationship with land and place. In this paper I analyze the United States as a settler state and American society as a settler society that is in an ongoing process of American Indian and Diné elimination through mechanism such as federal American Indian policy and settler schooling practices.

United States Settler Colonialism

One of the most effective tools of settler colonialism in the United States context has been federal American Indian policy. US Indian policy has its roots in Papal Bulls which divided "discovered" land of non-Christian peoples between Spain and Portugal before becoming fully developed with the multiple conflicting land claims European empires made over what is now known as the Americans. In order to prevent armed conflict between competing European nations over their "discoveries," the Document of Discovery (DOD) organized several principles regarding how land could be claimed. Disregarded in the decisions over what land belonged to whom and even the fundamental concept of land ownership were the Indigenous peoples who had lived in the "discovered" territories. What the DOD did provide was a framework to eliminate Indigenous presence based on the diminishment of Indigenous rights to land when discovered by "superior" Christian nations (Miller 2006). The Marshall Trilogy, three Supreme Court cases that directly cite and draw upon the DOD to diminish American Indian land rights and claims to land, developed a legal fiction to legitimize the theft of American Indian peoples' lands and establish American Indian political status as quasisovereigns (Williams 2005).

American Indian political sovereignty was only recognized to the extent that it provided a buffer between European rivals encroaching on land claims by other rivals and to the extent American Indian bodies could be leveraged for war making. British policies toward Indian which would later become United States policies after the civil war positioned American Indian as a vanishing race that would eventually be ousted with by British western expansion (Williams 2005).

American Indian nations however were and continue to be recognized as sovereign entities by European powers and the United States. As such the United States faced the political quandary of justifying the taking of American Indian land. The justification for the taking of Indian land composed of the dehumanizing of American Indian people as "savage" and "uncivilized" which facilitated the creation of a legal fiction regarding the rights of American Indians (Williams 2005). As "uncivilized" and therefore incomplete human beings, American Indians were politically positioned as a "problem" to be "fixed" through the civilizing forces of white middle class Euro-American values, principles, and beliefs. US federal policy placed American Indians in a "protectorate" status due to perceived incompetency. The ideology of American Indians being "uncivilized" and therefore incompetent to run their own affairs established the legal justification for diminishing American Indian nation's sovereignty and claims to land by positioning the legal and political mechanism of the colonies and eventually the United States as superior guiding forces that should be imposed on American Indian peoples (Williams 2005).

The stated objective of "civilizing" American Indian people was the breaking up of tribal social formations and communal land ownership in order to assimilate American Indians into white middle class American society. Both of which had impacts on American Indian Indigeneity and sovereignty, weakening claims to land and justice. The concept of "colonization of the mind" promoted by Alfred (2009) as the shifting of Indigenous epistemologies, cosmologies, and ways of life are imposed upon by settler societies. Schooling plays a role in the colonization of the mind through what Deloria and Wildcat (2001) frame as socialization, Grande (2004), describes as habitualization and Smith (2012) refers to as disciplining. Each concept is similar in that it explains the mechanisms of how the colonization of the mind occurs through daily practices of schooling that immerse Indigenous and American Indian people within the settler worldview. From the perspective of critical theorist, schooling produces a "hidden curriculum" of values, principles, and beliefs that are transferred to students through everyday class room practices such as the hierarchal teacher student relationship, isolation from the larger community, and the framing of knowledge in a "formal and impersonal relations associated with market societies" (Smith 1992 cited in Grande 2004).

Grande (2004) provides a framework for understanding the specific values that influences the development of a colonial consciousness as: Independence, achievement, humanism, detachment from sources of local and personal knowledge, and detachment from knowledge. As a result children are encouraged to develop as progressive, competitive, rational, material, consumerist, and anthropocentric individuals" (Smith 1992 cited in Grande 2004).

Contemporary framing of United States education through No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and Common Core State Standards (CCSS) produce what Winstead, Lawrence, Brantmeier, and Frey (2008) term "contestable culture themes" of standardization and progress that eliminate Indigenous languages, values, and principles by legitimizing the English language and Western forms of knowledge and knowing the world in the sphere of schooling. Hush and Martina (2003) contend the voucher school system, charter schools, and NCLB policies align with market logic. In the context of NCLB which effects American Indian and Diné students, Hursh and Martina (2003) frame standardization and accountability as neoliberal strategies which focus on the development of marketable skills in an increasingly competitive globalized economy. The CCSS have been developed with the same markers of neoliberalism Hursh and Martina (2003) highlight, the development of marketable schools, college and career readiness, international bench marking, standardization and accountability.

The implications for American Indian and Diné peoples is the continuation of federal eliminatory education polices that continue to immerse American Indian and Diné children in values, principles, and beliefs that contribute to the elimination and containment of Indigeneity and sovereignty. Schooling becomes a mechanism of elimination through the socialization of American Indian children in ways of knowing the world that devalue connections to land and place. Land becomes a commodity in the economic rationale of settler society. American Indian and Diné people are not eliminated physically in the context of schooling but through the colonization of the mind. Indigenous ties to the land are weakened as ancestral knowledge and values which intimately connect Indigenous peoples to land are disrupted.

The United States federal report, the Kennedy report made the connection between projects of allotment and tribal termination which broke up tribal ownership of land and imposed Western ways of land ownership on American Indian people with the assimilationist projects of American Indian federal polices (Reyhner and Eder 2004; Szasz 1999). Wolfe (2006) also argues that as the physical frontier that represented the expansion of settler permanence into Indigenous territory vanished, the eliminatory project of settler colonialism turned inward on Indigenous ways of being. I advance the theoretical relationship between the assimilationist schooling projects to the settler colonial land project. In doing so I connect the settler logics of "civilization" with the economic framing of "development" which similarly frames American Indian and Diné peoples as deficient.

It is within the educational, elimination framework that I argue the NSEA has the potential to provide a means for the Diné people to disrupt the elimination of Diné language, knowledge, and world view. The passage of the 2005 Sovereignty in Education Act comes at a time when Indigenous education and culturally relevant schooling (CRS) is beginning to be taken seriously by policy makers and enacted by Indigenous communities (Brayboy and Castagno 2009). The Maori and Hawaiian examples of Indigenous education in particular present strong examples of schooling that is a part of a decolonizing agenda (Goodyear-Ka'opua 2013) while culturally relevant schooling models in the United States is demonstrating the benefits of American Indian culture and language facilitating learning (McCarty 2009; Brayboy and Castagno 2009). When viewed through the lens of decolonization CRS acts to strengthen and defend Indigeneity and sovereignty by reproducing Indigenous values, principles, and beliefs that have often been viewed as deficient. If the 2005 Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act can harness

the principles of promising practices modeled by Indigenous education and CRS the NSEA has potential to disrupt settler colonial educational eliminatory practices. *Significance of Study*

I focus my analysis on Diné and American Indian education in this study for several reasons. The first is the power the concept of "education" has come to hold in Diné and American Indian communities while little discussion is given to how education is framed, defined, and its purpose and goals. The concept of education has been deployed Diné politicians as a tool for nation building in a neoliberal framing. An example of the conflation of Diné concepts of education and settler schooling for the purpose of elimination is illustrated through an analysis of Diné headmen, Chief Manuelito's quote, "My grandchild, the whites have many things which we Navajos need. But we cannot get them. It is as though the whites were in a grassy canyon and there they have wagons, plows, and plenty of food. We Navajos are up on a dry mesa. We can hear them talking but we cannot get to them. My grandchild, education is the ladder. Tell our people to take it" (Quoted in Moore 1994, 12-13).

Although skepticism has arose regarding whether Manuelito actually said and the accuracy of the quote as it has only been through a second hand account that Manuelito's sentiments regarding settler schooling were recorder (Denetdale 2007), there is no skepticism regarding the effects this quote has had on Diné students. Missionaries deployed this quote as a means to boost Diné children enrollment numbers in missionary schools (Roessel 1979). Contemporarily the quote is used by the Office of Navajo Nation Scholarship and Financial Assistance to promote academic achievement and increase Diné enrollment in colleges and universities. This quote can be analyzed as an

eliminatory framing of education through the positioning of settlers as superior to Diné peoples (read white supremacy) in their technology and way of life (read progress). Within this framing, education (read schooling) becomes a mechanism to elevate Diné social and economic status to levels comparable to settler United States society.

Through the lens of settler colonialism the deployment of Manuelito's quote by Diné and settlers has contributed to Diné elimination when read through the lenses of neoliberalism, economic development, and modernity. I contend the discourse of education on the Navajo Nation has largely developed out of human capitol theory as exemplified in the Navajo Nations Comprehensive Economic Development Plan's framing of education in Diné economic development (Choudhary 2010). Education also becomes defined through the limited scope of schooling where Diné curriculum and pedagogies of education are eliminated. The purpose of education is also limited through the goals of reaching social and economic prosperity comparable to the United States settler society. This study attempts to de-conflate the discourse of Diné education by providing a critical lens to understand how concepts of education have been developed by the settler society in order to eliminate Diné permanence from the land and highlight assumptions about schooling that conflict with the eliminatory effects settler schooling has on Diné permanence. By developing a deeper understanding about education tribal communities can make informed decisions regarding how education should and can be framed and deployed in their communities.

Literature Review

The available literature on the NSEA primarily comes from studies by Roessel (2011) and Cody (2012) who respectively analyze the challenges associated with

implementation of the NSEA policies from the perspective of educational practitioners. Roessel (2011) argues educational practitioners are unaware of the NSEA, its purpose, or goals citing the Navajo Nation tribal government's lack of providing information to schools. Cody (2012) also points out several education practitioners are not convinced the Navajo Nation has the capacity to take complete control of schooling on the Navajo Nation citing the legal and economic challenges that would be associated with the Navajo Nation attempting and actualizing complete Diné control and operation of schools. Neither Roessel (2011) nor Cody (2012) critically analyzes the NSEA as their studies are focused on highlighting educational practitioner's views on the challenges to implementation.

Outside of Roessel (2011) and Cody's (2012) studies the NSEA is briefly analyzed by Diné scholar Lloyd Lee as a tool to provide further leverage for Diné control of education. Lee (2014) discusses the NSEA from the context of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous people arguing the UNDRIP provides a point of leverage for the implementation of the NSEA. Lee (2008) also argues the NSEA is a part of a larger struggle for Diné people to reclaim intellectual space, knowledge, and educational practices. In particular Lee (2012) focuses on the potential for the NSEA to aid in the attempt to reverse Diné language shift from English back to Diné. Lee (2014) also highlights the NSEA has yet to live up to its lofty goals due the States of Arizona, Utah, and New Mexico maintain budgetary control over public schools. Lee's (2008; 2012; 2014) discourse on the NSEA act aligns with an argument that the Act is decolonizing but makes such claims through an analysis of the Navajo Nation's deployment of sovereignty and does not analyze the specifics of the NSEA. Lee's (2008; 2012; 2014) analysis frame the NSEA as a potential tool for decolonization but is largely silent on the NSEA as potentially eliminatory.

Outside of the academic literature on the NSEA the Department of Diné Education has conducted a feasibility of the Navajo Nation assuming direct operation of Bureau of Indian Education funded schools on the Navajo Nation. The report recommends the Navajo Nation take direct control of operation and funding of BIE schools and that the Navajo Nation further develops the capacity required to take complete control over BIE schools (Martin, Rude and Welsh 2014). The report also positions CCSS as a potential point of leverage for deploying a Diné pedagogy due to what Martin et al. (2014) argue is the emphasis on learning outcomes rather than the pedagogy used to meet those outcomes. The logic is Diné language and Diné pedagogy are not excluded from the classroom because the emphasis is on learning outcomes.

The available literature on NSEA is primarily concerned with the implementation of the NSEA and asks questions regarding the challenges in realizing sovereignty in education leaving a gap in the literature on critical analysis of the education policies the NSEA creates. Considering the eliminatory effects federal Indian education policy has had on Diné communities, it is important to be critically aware of how the NSEA frames education to ensure that the purpose of the NSEA, to reclaim Diné education as an inherent right, is actualized. This means the NSEA must be analyzed to ensure eliminatory education policy is not reproduced. And if eliminatory education policy is reproduced in the NSEA, Diné communities need to be aware of how the NSEA's eliminatory aspects in order to negotiate and navigate eliminatory policies. *Organization of Study*

The first chapter deconstructs the term education and argues compulsory middle class schooling affects American Indian students by eliminating their Indigeneity and weakening American Indian sovereignty. I argue in chapter one that the early federal American Indian education policies of "civilization" that promoted American Indian Christianization and Americanization and contemporary policies framed in the language of "development" by the Navajo Nation Tribal Council and United States federal government that promote a neoliberal values in students have the same eliminatory and containing effects. I also highlight the social and economic conditions that promoted the reframing of Diné communities' concepts of education to align with concepts of settler schooling. I conclude by developing a framework of what I term educational elimination as a means to analyze the NSEA as potentially eliminatory or containing.

The second chapter explores Indigenous education and best practices that disrupt and intervene in settler colonial education and how Indigenous educational practices contribute to a project of decolonization. I begin with a critique of research that frames Indian education through the "achievement paradigm" to position Indigenous and CRS framed education policy and practice as decolonizing. Using a decolonizing lens I analyze Indigenous education and CRS case studies to identify markers of decolonizing education. I conclude by discussing the principles of a decolonizing education as a framework to analyze the potential for the NSEA as potentially decolonizing. Utilizing the eliminatory education framework developed in chapter one and the decolonizing education framework developed in chapter two I analyze the 2005 Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act by highlighting settler colonial education aspect of the NSEA and aspects of the NSEA that supports or reinforces methods of education that are decolonizing.

I conclude by providing recommendations to negotiate those aspects of the NSEA that are eliminatory and how those aspects of the NSEA that are potentially decolonizing can be turned into practice.

Terminology

In this study I use the term Navajo in regards to official titles of Navajo Nation government offices, agencies, and documents. I use the term Diné in all other references to the Indigenous peoples of *Diné Bikéyah*, the traditional Diné territory between the four sacred mountains of *Tsisnaasjini*, '*Tsoodzil*, *Doko*'ooslid, and *Dibe Nitsaa*. I use the term Diné-ness to denote markers of Diné being such as language and culture.

I use the term American Indian to refer to the Indigenous peoples to what is now known as the United States. I use the term Indigenous to refer to a larger global solidarity between people who have and continue to resist colonization and settler colonialism and more importantly have markers of what I have previously defined as Indigeneity.

CHAPTER 2

EDUCATIONAL ELIMINATION

The focus of this study is Diné education. The difficulty of studying Diné education or education in general is the conflation of the concept "education" with the forma institution of Western schooling. Can education take on different meanings in different historical contexts? What is the purpose of education? What is the relationship between the concept of education and schooling? I argue a United States settler middle class concept of education, defined here as schooling, has been deployed upon American Indian and Diné people for the purpose and effect of eliminating Diné Indigeneity and sovereignty. American Indian and Diné people are subject to a form of education classified as "Indian education" that has historically differed from the education received by mainstream settler society in benefits, opportunities, and privileges. Education in the form of Indian boarding schools and contemporary settler middle class schooling for Indian people eliminates sovereignty and Indigenousness while schooling for settler society serves to reproduce and maintain white settler privileges. In this section I examine the historic development of "Indian education" through the lens of settler colonialism to identify the processes, mechanisms, and markers of elimination. In doing so I develop a framework of settler colonial educational elimination that may be used in chapter two to develop decolonizing principle from Indigenous education practices and culturally relevant curriculum that may disrupt elimination. The framework of settler colonial educational elimination I develop in this section will also be utilized in chapter three as a framework to analyze the 2005 Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act.

A historic understanding of the development of Indian education is useful to the development of a framework of settler colonial educational elimination because a historical analysis traces the overt settler practices of assimilation such as Indian boarding school to the subtler settler practices of socialization, habitualization, and disciplining. This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section discusses the concepts of civilization and assimilation as mechanisms of settler colonial elimination in the context of Indian education and the relationship between federal Indian policy, Indian education, and Diné education. The second section examines the historical development of American Indian education and Diné schooling. The historical analysis of American Indian education and Diné education policy highlights markers of settler colonial elimination in education from which a framework of educational elimination is developed. The third section analyzes literature on contemporary Diné education through the framework of educational elimination to link contemporary schooling to the settler colonial logics of elimination. I conclude by arguing contemporary Diné schooling exhibits markers of settler colonial elimination and therefore serves a different purpose than neoliberal middle class schooling.

The importance of federal Indian policy to understanding Indian education is reflected in the emphasis the literature on American Indian education places on an analysis of federal American Indian policy (Lomawaima and McCarty 2006; Reyhner and Eder 2004; Adams 1995; Szasz 1999; Lomawaima 1999; Tippeconnic 1999; Warner 1999; Grande 2004; Klug and Whitfield 2003; Fear-Segal 2007). The precedent for understanding Indian education through federal Indian policy highlights the influence federal Indian policy has had in structuring Indian education and highlights the

relationship between American Indian sovereignty and education. Szasz (1999) argues, "the Education Division served as a barometer; whenever federal policy changed course, Indian education also changed" (4).

A historical analysis of Diné education requires an analysis of the larger context of Indian education framed through federal Indian policy. A historical analysis of Diné education that takes into account federal Indian policy also highlights the relationship between Indian education and American Indian Nations' sovereign status. The settler state's framing of the relationship between American Indian Nations and the federal government changed from a sovereign to sovereign relationship to varying degrees of U.S. paternalism and American Indian "quasi-sovereignty" status as federal Indian policy changed from removal, assimilation, Indian-self-rule, termination, self-determination, and self-governance (Wilkins and Stark 2010). Policy changes resulted in varying effects on American Indian and Diné sovereignty through the degree local communities influenced curriculum and controlled local schooling (Lomawaima and McCarty 2006). As federal policy became more overtly eliminatory, such as in the case of Indian of assimilatory Termination policy in the 1950s-1960s which sought the complete dissolution of tribal entities as political sovereigns (Wilkins and Stark 2010), so too did Indian education policy and practice become more eliminatory through the shifting of Indian education to state public schools (Reyhner and Eder 2004). Diné people have also been susceptible to federal Indian education policies following the signing of the 1868 Navajo Treaty which the United States federal government has leveraged to diminish Diné sovereignty.

When looking at Diné education through the lens of Diné sovereignty what emerges is a complex struggle over Diné communities' rights to define and control education within their communities through claims of sovereignty and self-determination. An analysis of the effects education has on sovereignty highlights the relationship Indian communities struggle for the right to determine their own education and the status of Indian nations have in the context of federal policy. The history of Diné education is also the history of Indian education and federal Indian policy. I argue the concept of "civilization" and policies of assimilation can be traced from their formations of federal Indian policy into Indian education practices all the way to Diné education policy and practices.

Civilization, White Supremacy, and Settler Colonialism

In the introduction to this work the concept of "civilization" was briefly explored as developed by settlers in the United States as a logic of American Indian elimination due to overt policies of eliminating American Indian Indigeneity and sovereignty. In this chapter the concept of "civilization" is further explored in the context of Indian education. As previously stated in the introduction the English language, Christianity, United States democracy, United States social and political institutions, and white middle class American values were markers of "civilization." Therefore to be "uncivilized" was to speak a tribal language, practice tribal spirituality through ceremony, maintain traditional tribal governance and other political and social institutions, and maintain values of kinship and values related to place. Lomawaima (1999) describes the process of "civilizing" as replacing American Indian ways of being with Christianity, subordinating American Indian peoples to the state, and through schooling by designing pedagogy on the presumed deficiencies of Indigenous peoples. In order to justify the "civilizing" project American Indian people were framed as deficient and in need of tutelage which the "superior" settler United States society could presumably provide. Pewewardy (2005) frames the concept of United States "civilization" as a part of a "white supremacist" project. In order to subjugate Indian people, Indian people have been "miseducated" to better submit to "superior" Eurocentric, individualistic, competitive, and materialistic values (Pewewardy 2005, 140). Under these lenses schooling eliminated Indigenous values, knowledge, and practices in order to impose white middle class values, knowledge, and practices.

The settler United States concept of education revolves around institutionalized English instruction in an academic curriculum. Schooling which has traditionally been deployed by the state to solve the ills of society (Fuller 1991), was utilized to transform Indian people. As a tool of the state, the "Indian problem," defined by the settler colonial project as Indian presence on land, became the social ill which the state deployed schooling to solve. Tellingly, Reyhner and Eder (2004) argue Indian education framed through the policy of "civilization" was intended to "decrease tensions between American Indian settlers who were taking Indian land by changing American Indian perspectives about land ownership from community ownership toward individual ownership and commodification" (40). Through schooling American Indian people could be "taught" how to be white middle class United States citizens, dissolving their status as sovereign political entities with ties to land by removing influences of tribal social reproduction and forcing students to comply with Euro-centric curriculum.

The historical development of American Indian education took place in three epochs: missionary schooling, federal schooling, and self-determination (Grande 2004). In the missionary Epoch the principles of American Indian education and markers of settler colonial elimination were intentionally developed to assimilate American Indian people. Christian missionaries' perceived American Indian people in need of "civilization," primarily through Christianization, thereby establishing principles of educational elimination. In the proceeding federal schooling and self-determination epoch's the principles of American Indian elimination based on settler concepts of "civilization" and assimilation would spread to the Diné people and although the language and practices of educational changed from overt language and practices of "civilization," the logic of educational elimination remained and continues to provide the foundation for contemporary Indian and Diné education.

Indian Education Formation and Missionary Schooling

Grande (2004) describes the formative years of Indian education as a product of the relationship between the church and state. Missionary schools were supported by state funding and political capital. Through missionaries the concept of "civilization" became deeply related to Christian principles and values. Christian missionaries considered the "civilization" of American Indians as part of their Christianly duty to save souls. Christian missionaries criticized Indian cleanliness and ceremonies, viewing Indian spirituality through the lens of Christian Dogma as false and the work of the Devil (Grande 2004). Missionaries also criticized Indian child rearing practices for a perceived as a lack of disciplining Indian children through corporal punishment (Reyhner and Eder 2004). In order to combat the negative influences of perceived deficient Indian societies, missionaries developed schools as vehicles to introduce a Christian curriculum which focused on bible study. Indian languages were viewed as a useful vehicle for transferring biblical knowledge leading missionaries to learn one or two American Indian languages but these languages were viewed only as useful tools to assimilationist ends. Indian culture and spirituality on the other hand were viewed as a threat to Indian wellbeing and society (Reyhner and Eder 2004).

The Charter of the Colony of Virginia explicitly states "desires for the furtherance of so noble a work... in propagating the Christian Religion to such People, as yet live in Darkness and miserable Ignorance of the true Knowledge and Worship of God [with the hope that they] may in time bring the infidels and Savages, living in those Parts' to human Civility" (Quoted in Reyhner and Eder 2004, 25). In this protestant missionary context the most prevalent example of missionary schooling can be seen in the establishment of "praying towns." Praying towns were established as spaces to convert Indian people and a space where Indian people would assume the dress and mannerisms of British colonists. Indian languages were viewed in a utilitarian manner in that Indian languages could be used as a vehicle for biblical knowledge, Christian theology, and mass. Outside of the utilitarian use of Indian language, praying towns sought to assimilate Indian people into colonial society through the teaching of Christian values and ethics (Reyhner and Eder 2004).

The passage of the Civilization Fund by congress in 1819 exemplifies the ideology of "civilization" behind schooling Indian people and the relationship between the church and state to accomplish "civilization" (Grande 2004). Through the Civilization Fund the United States federal government assigned various Christian denominations to manage the affairs of Indian people (Prucha 2000). One of the most prominent results of the Civilization Fund was the creation of missionary schools within Indian communities. Through federal government endowment of land to missionaries the "moral" mission of

"civilizing" Indians transitioned into a "for-profit" enterprise of "manual labor schools." Indian students were used as free labor under the guise of education (Grande 2004; Reyhner and Eder 2004), a policy that would re-emerge in the boarding school era.

In the Diné context the ideology of civilization and the policies of assimilation did not impact Diné people directly until 1862 when the "protective isolation" of Western tribes was disrupted by settler expansion into what would come to be known as the American Southwest (Reyhner and Eder 2004). Diné communities which would later comprise the Navajo Nation remained outside of the political and legal influence of the United States due to their proximity from settler society (Iverson 2002a). From the lens of settler colonialism the lack of United States imposition in Diné affairs was a result of Diné territory remaining outside the United States settler project of claiming Indigenous land. The project of settler colonial territorial expansion came into conflict with Diné community land claims in the mid-1800s as treaties between Diné communities and the United States on behalf of settlers in New Mexico territory were signed to ease tension over increasing raids and encroachment of Diné and settlers in what each respective community defined as their territories (Acrey 1988). The struggles over land ownership between Diné communities and settlers in New Mexico Territory came to a head with the United States military campaign against Diné people and the resultant forced march over 300 miles and incarceration at Fort Sumner in Eastern New Mexico (Acrey 1988; Iverson 2002a).

The 1862 United States military campaign against the Diné people represents a dramatic political, economic, and social shift in Diné communities through the United States imposition of legal and political jurisdiction over the Diné people with no regard for Diné communities' sovereignty and rights to self-determination (Roessel 1979). Through the lens of settler colonialism the Navajo Long Walk and incarceration at Fort Sumner represent the most overt and deliberate attempts by the United Sates settler state to eliminate Diné markers of permanence by physically removing Diné people from their ancestral home lands and destroying the Diné markers of permanence: agriculture and settlements. Diné removal opened up resource rich lands to white ranchers in what is now known as New Mexico, land that United States would force the Diné to secede (Iverson, 2002a).

Diné incarceration at Fort Sumner ended in 1868 with the signing of the Navajo Treaty of 1868. The effects of the 1868 treaty were the defining of Diné territory or rather the United States claiming of Diné land and the imposition of federal Indian policy on Diné people. From the perspective of the settler state the 1868 Navajo treaty limited Diné sovereignty, however, Diné people never relinquished sovereignty and their rights to selfdetermination, United States American Indian policy rearticulated inherent Diné sovereignty through the repositioning of the sovereign to sovereign relationship to one of guardianship. Under the guardianship paradigm, American Indian and Diné sovereignty was diminished due to their status as wards "in need of protection" (Wilkins and Starks 2011, 123). It is important to note the treaty process was undertaken while Diné people incarcerated at Fort Sumner were under duress. Besides misunderstandings in the language and meaning of the treaty the Diné faced removal to Indian Territory in Oklahoma as oppose to their ancestral home lands between the Four Sacred Mountains (De Voto 2000).

Among other articles stipulated in the 1868 treaty, Article Six imposed upon the Diné people settler schooling as the means of education (Iverson 2002a). Article Six establishes the United States federal government's responsibility to provide school houses and teachers for the purposes of providing an "English" education to promote the "civilization" of the Diné people. Article Six was never implemented by the United States federal government to any real effect, like many treaty provisions, these promises were made with the intention that Indian people would eventually "disappear." Despite the United States not actualizing Article Six the rhetoric positions schooling as a civilizing mechanism (Iverson 2002a). Under a settler colonial lens Article Six highlights the orientation and intention of Diné elimination through schooling.

The United States federal government left the establishment and operating of schools to various Christian denominations as an extension of the President Ulysses S. Grant American Indian "Peace Policy" and established legislation of the Civilization Fund (Prucha 2000). The Act of April 10, 1868 assigned Presbyterian Board of Missionaries to "civilize" and Christianize Diné people (Thompson 1975). It is through Presbyterian mission schools that Diné people first came into contact with eliminatory education in the form of day schools which due to failure (Thompson, 1975), and repeal of the Civilization Fund in 1873 (Grande 2004) transitioned into federal operated and funded Indian boarding school. A large part of the failure of Presbyterian missionary schools can be understood through the resistance of Diné parents to send their children to school due to what Iverson (2002a) characterizes as "anxieties" resulting from the Navajo Long Walk. Federal agents and church missionaries who attempted to teach Diné children recorded attendance as sporadic at best (Iverson 2002a). Although eliminatory

education changed from missionary control to federal control and day schools to boarding schools, the ideology of "civilization" and policy of assimilation that formulated Indian education remained intact. The following years of Indian boarding school policy would prove to be the most overt and effective era of educational elimination.

Formation of Indian Boarding Schools

The American Indian boarding school system arose as federal policies of physically eliminating Indian bodies through state violence began to lose momentum (Grinde 2004, Adams 1995). The settler state and settler society also began to perceive Indian people as "domesticated" through the establishment of Indian reservations (Adams 1995). With the closing of the physical frontier the eliminatory project turned inward to eliminate American Indian Indigeneity (Wolfe 2006). This new phase of United States settler colonial elimination was marked with the creation of federal Indian boarding schools. The first Indian boarding school, Carlisle Indian Industrial School, opened in 1879 and through the founder Richard Henry Pratt's successful publicizing of Carlisle, the Carlisle model became the standard for federal American Indian education (Reyhner and Eder 2004). The white supremacist concept of "civilization" and the belief that Indian people were "vanishing" as "superior" American society expanded westward provided the framework for Indian boarding school. Pratt articulated this eliminatory framing through his Indian education philosophy, "Kill the Indian... and save the man," (Quoted in Grinde 2004, 27).

The negative aspect of elimination was practiced through the removal of American Indian youth from the influence of their communities, cutting off access to institutions that reproduced Indigenous values. Boarding School policies banned the use of Native language, ceremonies, traditional clothing, and hair styles and enforced such policies through corporal punishment (Adams 1995). The positive aspect of elimination emerged as "thoroughly soaking" of Indian youth in Christianity, the English language, a Euro-centric curriculum, U.S. patriotism and capitalist logic and values (Grinde 2004; Prucha 2000). The combination of the negative and positive aspects of boarding school elimination is what Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) refer to as "erase and replace." To "kill the Indian" was then to eliminate Indigeneity through the assimilation of Indian people into settler society. The problem of Indian permanency would be solved through the dissolution of communal land claims as Indian people would enter into settler society as individuals with individual land claims.

The Diné experience with boarding school can be described as precarious in the context of the larger narrative of American Indian boarding school. The early history of Diné experiences with boarding school is defined through the continuation of Diné parents resisting to send their children to boarding schools due to the recent memory of the Long Walk, practical concerns of the roles children played in daily family and community life, and parents' emotional connection to their children (Iverson 2002a). Never-the-less some Diné choose to send their children to off reservation boarding schools, and in some cases boarding schools became the last option for children who were orphaned, poverty stricken, or came from dysfunctional families, where they received an English education and in most cases experienced unhealthy and abusive experiences (Child 1998). Disease became a common problem due to unhealthy conditions maintained in boarding schools in some cases resulting in death. Many youth ran away from boarding school in hopes of returning home although not all Diné youth

viewed boarding school in such a negative light as others (Iverson 2002b). In 1892 the Diné resistance figure known as Black Horse held Fort Defiance Indian agent Dana Shipley hostage to stop the agent from gathering thirty Diné Children to send to Fort Defiance Boarding School. School attendance became compulsory in 1887 which lead to efforts by "overzealous" Indian agents to force Diné children to attend school in order to fill student attendance quotas (Left-Handed Mexican Clansmen, Young, and Morgan 1952). Black Horse was aware of the poor conditions of the Fort Defiance boarding school including but not limited to beatings, starvation, handcuffing, solidarity confinement, and school Superintendent Wadleigh's reputation for mistreating students (Left-Handed Mexican Clansmen, Young, and Morgan 1952). Until the 1940s Diné parents continued to resist sending their children to schools even as on-reservation day schools began to replace boarding schools in the 1920s and 1930s (Iverson 2002a).

Diné people's experience has been historically characterized as an anomaly by Reyhner and Eder (2004) as exemplified in 1914 by Diné politician and eventual tribal chairman Chee Dodge who welcomed government schooling for the "advancement of the Navajos" and to "enable them [Navajos] to compete with their white neighbors" (Iverson 2002b, 4-5). In 1926 the Navajo Nation tribal council unanimously supported schooling as a means of providing skills and knowledge to create a livelihood (Iverson 2002b): in 1932 the Greaswood Chapter officials petitioned the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for a boarding school in Greasewood followed by a petition by Diné Rock Point residents in 1939 (Iverson 2002b). Reyhner and Eder (2004) argue that at least in these instances boarding schools were not imposed on Diné communities.

The boarding school era of Indian education is the most overt form of Eliminatory education. The explicit goal of boarding school was the elimination of Indigeneity to be replaced by middleclass values of white supremacy, capitalism, patriarchy, and heterosexuality. Adams (1995) description of Indian education as the process of the transferring of Indian land to settlers for "civilization" describes the function of settler colonial elimination. Reyhner and Eder (2004) also points out the emergence of Indian boarding schools along with Allotment of Indian land as part of a singular project of settler territorial expansion. American Indian youth who were able to graduate or maintained attendance in settler schools for an extended period of time often returned to their communities lacking or having deteriorated markers of Indigeneity (language and cultural practices) which boarding schools had attempted to eliminate. The project of total assimilation ultimately failed as even students who had spent an extensive amount of time in boarding schools retained some Indigenous knowledge and ways of being (Deloria and Wildcat 2001). However, the boarding school experience had reverberating negative effects throughout Indian communities to the extent that Waziyatawin (2005) recognizes "the long term effects have yet to be quantified or realized" (114).

The effects of elimination Indian boarding schools have been devastating to Indian communities as research has shown not only were communities suffering from the disruption of childless societies but also the intergenerational effects of the trauma caused by the anti-Indian policies of boarding schools (Brave Heart & DeBruyn 1998). The intergenerational effects of boarding school also stigmatized the use of Indian languages as Indian students had been punished in boarding schools to not speak their languages (Whitbeck et. al. 2004). Also disrupted is the passage of intergenerational knowledge of

child rearing, ceremonies, and cultural practices through the fact that children were not physically in the community to learn and through the disruption of language as the medium of instruction. Family structures were encouraged to align with Christian heterosexual and patriarchal frameworks of dominant U.S. culture (Ing 1991).

Indian boarding school gave rise "either/or' policy of assimilation" which Szasz (1999) suggest is the positioning of Indian children to choose whether they would live as an Indian or as a white American. Failing to live in the manner of the settler middle class, it was the opinion of policy makers that Indian people would simply "vanish" or be outright eliminated by a "superior" settler society (Archuleta, Child, and Lomawaima 2000). As previously stated the effects of boarding school were the disruption but not outright complete elimination of Indigeneity. Despite being forced to learn English, transform their physical appearance to align with middle class settler society, and being severely punished for deploying their Indigeneity, Indian children found means to resist settler schooling and maintain aspects of Indigeneity (Archuleta et.al. 2000; Deloria and Wildcat 2001).

Upon returning to their communities from boarding school American Indian youth were more often welcomed back into their communities although those youth who committed to adopting the way of life taught to them at boarding schools found it difficult to adapt to life among their communities while other transitioned back to the way of their communities relatively easily (Adams 1995). Regardless of whether returning youth committed to adopting the life style taught at boarding school or were determined to return to their communities way of life the day to day interactions between returning youth and their families and larger communities were telling of the underlying

cultural clashes between the values, principles and beliefs of American Indian communities and those that arose out of the boarding school experience (Adams 1995).

The precarious position youth found themselves in upon returning to their communities after boarding school can be explained through the elimination of Indigeneity. Through the loss of certain markers of Indigeneity students became disconnected from kinship networks, cultural practices, spiritual practices, and access to Indigenous knowledge. The elimination of Indigeneity through boarding school can be understood through these mechanisms: Christianization, U.S. patriotism, English only, Eurocentric curriculum, and the physical and ideological removal from Indigenous communities. These are markers of settler colonial elimination that can be traced through the missionary schools to boarding schools as schooling.

Diné communities largely resisted sending their children to boarding schools as an act of resistance to the elimination of Indigeneity expressed as the need to preserve their established way of life. Schooling had little consequence in the context of Diné daily life and therefore schooling was not a priority among many Diné communities. Implicit in the attempt to preserve and maintain a traditional way of life is the maintenance of Diné values, principles, and beliefs, the resistance to settler colonial elimination and survival of Diné people. Traditional forms of Diné education continued to dominate home and community, even more so for those community members who refused to send their children to boarding school. However, the political and economic effects of settler colonialism on Diné society and way of life would eventually create the necessary conditions for the Diné people to look to schooling as a mechanism to provide a living.

Self-Rule

The 1930s saw the most dramatic shift in American Indian Education policy since the boarding school system with the release of the Meriam Report documenting the abuses and poor conditions American Indian youth suffered under in boarding schools (Grande 2004), Roosevelt's "New Deal" which opened resources for community development (Iverson 2002a), and a power shift in the Bureau of Indian Affairs to white academics, including Indian sympathizers such as John Collier (Reyhner and Eder 2004). Collier's term as Commissioner of Indian Affairs brought with it a new federal Indian policy of "Indian self-rule" demarcated by the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, ending the allotment of Indian land (Wilkins and Stark 2011). In the context of Indian education more "progressive" policies that emphasized on-reservation day schools, use of Indian languages and culture within school curricula and an increase of Indian involvement with schools (Grinde 2004). This new "progressive education," called so because of the policies, relative to those of the assimilationist epoch of education, was deemed beneficial to Indian learning. However, schools remained oriented towards Euro-centric curriculum and non-Indian policy makers maintained their control over federal Indian policy and Indian education. Despite Collier's attempts to create a gentler, kinder settler state the logics of elimination continued to inform federal Indian policy.

Collier's "progressive" education policies had little effect on the Navajo Nation due to Navajo Nation Chairman Jacob Morgan's opposition to day schools (Reyhner and Eder 2004) and more significantly the conflict between Diné people and Collier's imposition of livestock reduction (Iverson 2002a). Livestock reduction played a crucial role in the elimination of Diné people through the elimination of the sheep based Diné subsistence economy and independence from the United States and global economies (Francisconi 1998). Livestock reduction was a policy designed in response to what government agents reported as a deteriorating Diné Range (Iverson 2002a). In 1930 it was reported Diné livestock was grazing at twice the carrying capacity the Diné range could support (Iverson 2002a). With the completion of the Hoover Dam federal anxiety arose over soil erosions impact on dam operations especially with the added effects of the mid-Western "Dust Bowl" (Francisconi 1998; Kelly 1968). Collier's appointment to Commissioner of Indian Affairs also brought in a paternalistic and "scientifically" informed plan to reduce Diné livestock to a population which could be supported by the reported carrying capacity of 510,000 units (Iverson 2002a; Kelly 1968).

The manner in which Diné Livestock reeducation was carried out throughout the 1930s and 1940s left a lasting negative impression on Diné people. The heavy handed "scientific" approach Collier's administration took towards livestock reeducation failed to take into account the deep economic, cultural, and spiritual relationships Diné had established with their livestock, sheep especially served a significant purpose in the Diné subsistence economy, creation story, and ceremony (Kelly 1968). Due to mismanagement and administrative issues in the federal government and Navajo Nation Council, livestock reduction was carried out in what Diné people saw as brutal, unnecessary, and devastating process. Sheep were killed by the thousands and left to rot where they fell (Bailey 1980; Kelly 1968). Diné people were first blindsided by the reduction process then forced to watch their livestock slaughtered due to the inability of the federal government to transport livestock off of the Navajo Nation (Bailey 1980). Increasing the animosity and resentment Diné people felt toward the federal government were Collier's failure to deliver lofty promises of jobs and an increased reservation land base for cooperation with the Livestock reduction program (Keller 1968; Pollock 1984).

From the perspective of the Diné people livestock reduction represented the end of traditional Diné lifestyle and from an economic analysis livestock reduction represented the shift from a subsistence economy toward a capitalist economy dependent on wage work (Francisconi 1998). Diné people were forced to look for wage work in the growing Southwest mining industries, railroad companies, and in towns bordering the Navajo Nation bringing them further into a state of dependence with the capitalist U.S. and world economy (Francisconi 1998).

In the context of education livestock reduction had the effect of maintaining a level of distrust for parents sending their children to government run schools (Iverson 2002a). The paternalistic approach and destructive effects livestock reduction had on Diné ways of life left Diné people with a deep animosity and resentment to the federal government (Bailey 1980). Although the "progressive" education policies of the Collier administration emphasized day schools over boarding school, community involvement, and the use of Indian languages and culture in curriculum Diné parents and other community members continued to resist sending their children to schools. Attendance in schools remained sporadic as Diné social, cultural, and other events were prioritized by Diné families (Thompson 1975). The instruction Diné children received at settler schooling remained irrelevant to Diné daily life.

Despite what Thompson (1975) and Iverson (2002a) describe as increasing conditions and less oppressive natures of day schools on the Navajo Nation, Diné people continued to resist efforts to increase Diné student enrollment and attendance causing Bureau of Indian Affairs Education Director Willard Beatty to conclude in 1951 day schools were not feasible on the Navajo Nation (Reyhner and Eder 2004). Through a lens of settler colonialism livestock reduction acted to eliminate Diné people through the elimination of Diné cultural practices and knowledge associated with the sheepherding culture of the Diné and through the elimination of the Diné subsistence economy. Diné resistance to schooling can be viewed as a continuation of a tradition of a resistance to settler colonialism; in particular the paternalistic relationship Diné people were placed into with the federal government and the elimination of Indigeneity through the destruction of culturally important livestock. However, the economic and social effects of livestock reduction would reemerge as a major driving force to Diné enrollment in schools after World War II.

Termination

The pendulum of federal Indian policy swung from Collier's "kinder" settler state to renewed ideologies of "civilization" through termination policy. In 1953 the Post World War II United States federal government passed Resolution 108 and Public Law 280, ushering in a renewed assimilation policy era referred to as "termination" (Wilkins and Stark 2011) Termination was designed once again to be the final answer to the "Indian problem." The white supremacist ideology of "civilization" was reinvigorated as the desolation of tribalism or rather the elimination of Indigeneity and sovereignty were considered necessary steps to absorb American Indians into larger American society. The federal government ended its trust relationship with a handful of tribes while attempting to relocate other tribal populations into urban centers. The physical and ideological removal of tribal people was reframed to no longer just incorporate youth but entire

families. Using a similar logic to boarding school American Indian people were expected to adopt a white middle class life style, become American citizens, and cut relationships with reservation communities and land. Due to the philosophy of forcing Indian people into the U.S. citizenry by eliminating their status as federally recognized tribes, the federal government began to place emphasis on public schools, the normative education system of the general United States citizenry, thereby severing the relationship and responsibility the federal government has to Indian people.

Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) points out the concept of public schools emerged from the idea of local control of education. Ironically public schools have increasingly come under the direct influence of the federal government; creating what Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) refers to as increasingly divisiveness between American Indian community's wants and needs compared to the federal and state dictating of Indian education. Public schools were and continue to be state run education systems. The United States Constitution does not invest the federal government with the authority to establish and run a federal education system for citizens of the union; instead, the responsibility to educate citizens falls to the state. The public school system is a part of state governing body with a state board of education and state education department which controls education standards, curriculum, teacher certification, law, and policy. The purpose of public schools is the education of citizens, meaning the framing of public schooling assumes students are settlers. The positioning of students as settlers overcomes the barrier of outright elimination, killing the Indian to save the man, and is reframed as social reproduction. However, the core issues of elimination remains, Indian children are taught from a settler epistemology about settler ways of being but the language and

framing of the project of elimination becomes subtler because the language of "civilization" becomes a language of "development." The public school system is a compulsory schooling system that is funded through state taxes but also receives federal funding in certain circumstances such as in cases where states cannot tax federal lands (Roessel 1979). An analysis of state public education through the lens of settler colonialism theory reveals that the transition from Indian people in federal schooling to state controlled public schooling is significant in that it diminishes and eliminates the sovereignty of Indian nations to control their own education system. Indian sovereignty is also diminished and out right eliminated with the federal government's abrogation of the nation-to-nation relationship symbolic in the exclusion of state sovereignty in Indian affairs.

Contemporary theories on the effects of Indian education on Indian people have conceptualized the process of "assimilation" as the socialization (Deloria and Wildcat 2001), habitualization (Grande 2004), and "disciplining" (Smith 2012) of children through schooling. These concepts take on subtler characteristics of elimination compared to the overtly assimilative policies of the Indian boarding school era because Indian people are no longer physically forced to attend school through large scale physical violence. Instead the elimination of Diné ways of being and the capacity to carry on Diné ways of being created the conditions for Diné people to voluntarily enroll their children into schools. Public schools did not operate to explicitly eliminate Indigeneity in the ways Indian boarding schools targeted Indian languages and ways of being. Instead, public schools operated under the assumption that students' aligned with the goals, purposes, and ways of being embedded in settler society. Diné were schooled under the

framework of equality in the services, skills, and knowledge learned by other non-Diné students. The settler colonial effects of elimination were maintained but no longer framed as "killing the Indian" but developing human capital and Nation building (Grande 2004). Eliminatory education became subtler in the language but not in eliminatory effect.

The new focus on public schooling was also meet with a new focus on Federal Indian education within the federal boarding schools. Indian education began to shift from an emphasis on vocational training to focus on "urban technological society" in the form of professional and technological professions, beginning the neoliberal relationship between education and economic development (Szasz 1999). Director of the newly created Education Division in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Hildegard Thompson, began to establish an "academic curricula" with the hope of opening more opportunities for Indian students to attend college. These new policies and curricula were not as overtly eliminatory to American Indian people as those of the boarding school era but continued the tradition of aligning curriculum with white middle class values. Instead of being out right forced to adopt the English language and middle class values to be able to "compete" within a capitalist labor market. The logic of elimination developed by missionaries and boarding school continued to undergird education policies.

Although termination policy sought to dissolve the trust relationship between American Indian nations and the United States government, the Navajo Nation took a different trajectory regarding education. Although state run public schools eventually began to appear the federal government sought to reinvigorate the off-reservation boarding school model for the Diné. The Special Navajo education Program (1946),

Navajo-Hopi Long Range Rehabilitation Act (1950), and the Peripheral Town Dormitory Program (1955), and the Navajo Emergency Education Program (1954) revived the tradition of Diné parents sending their children away from their communities to receive schooling. Day schools continued to operate but as children matured they were increasingly sent off reservation for schooling. The result of these programs was a jump in Diné children attending school. In 1900 it was estimated one in every nine Diné children was attending school and in 1934, 45 percent of Diné Children were attending school. As a result of the aforementioned programs the majority of Navajo children began attending school regularly (Roessel 1979).

The neoliberal framing of the curriculum at these new boarding schools were centered on the issue of economic development. The Navajo Nation had been economically impacted by the livestock reduction program and by the great depression. Sympathizers to the economic conditions on the Navajo Nation petitioned the federal government to allocate relief (Iverson 2002a). The new era of Diné off reservation boarding schools were a part of this effort to "rehabilitate" the Diné economy by aligning Diné people with the values, principles, and beliefs of the developing capitalist economy on and at the perimeters of the Navajo Nation. From a lens of settler colonial elimination the "rehabilitation" of the Diné economy can be analyzed as a continuation of the project of "civilizing" Indian people by reframing the "Indian problem" as an issue of neoliberal economic development. The project of settler colonialism facilitates Diné elimination through schooling by eliminating Diné independence from settler structures and knowledge. Diné people's independence from settler structures is exemplified in Diné families viewing schooling as irrelevant to Diné daily life. Diné society changed through the elimination of the sheep based subsistence economy forcing Diné people to seek wage work and align with the capitalist U.S. economy (Francisconi 1998). The shift in economic structure was a shift in Diné way of life. The value of settler schooling rose as a settler education became relevant to Diné people who were increasingly being forced to be part of the settler economic structure and increasingly interacting with settler society on a daily basis.

Public schooling existed on the Navajo Nation prior to the establishment of termination policy and the emphasis to shift the responsibility of Indian education from the federal government to state run public schooling but prior to the 1950s public schools or "accommodation schools" were reserved for the children of white Bureau of Indian Affairs school teachers and officials, meanwhile Diné children were sent to boarding school outside their communities, a clear demonstration of the differences between Diné and white middle class schooling (Roessel, 1979). The desire for Diné parents to keep children within their communities fostered a movement by local communities to establish public schooling for Diné youth. With the return of World War II veterans in the community, motivated by their experience outside the Navajo Nation and in developed capitalist societies of the world, successfully began developing public schools on the Navajo Nation (Thompson, 1975). The Johnson O'Malley Act of 1934, Public Law 874 (1950) and Public Law 815 (1950) created a source of funding for public schools on the Navajo Nation as the Navajo Nation did not contribute to state taxes which normally would pay for public schooling (Roessel 1979). In 1947 it was reported 66% of Diné had no schooling with a median of one year of schooling compared to 5.7 years in other Indian populations and 8.4 in the national population (Young 1961). These statistics

became part of the Krug report which influenced the passage of the Hopi-Navajo Long Range Rehabilitation Act which was partially designed to transfer the responsibility of Diné education to state run public schools (Young 1961). The overwhelming amount of Diné students not in school also influenced the BIA's Division of Education Director, Hildegard Thompson, to pass the Navajo Emergency Education Program (Roessel, 1979). An important factor in the push for Diné public schooling was the federal policy of termination (Roessel, 1979). The shifting of Navajo schooling from federal responsibility to state responsibility fit the federal government's agenda at the time. From a policy standpoint the resignation of the Navajo Nation tribal council to federal standards of schooling shifted as the Navajo Nation tribal council developed their own educational policy, Title Ten of the Navajo Nation Code, with the passage of CAU-43-61. Title Ten was changed to include the new philosophy of public schooling serving as the primary means for Diné education. The first two objectives for Title Ten were, to keep children near their homes "in keeping with the pattern of public education in the United States" and "to develop and participate in public education "on an equal basis with other citizens" (NTC 1978: 10 prec. § 1). The major drawback to this policy was the infringement of the states of Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona over the jurisdiction of Diné schools.

Under the Epoch of termination and relocation schooling for Diné youth reverted back to the assimilationist era boarding school structures of the late 1800s and early 1900s, however, this time a majority of Diné children found themselves attending school due to the political and economic impositions of the United States on the Navajo Nation. The need to find wage work and interact with settler society forced Diné people to

seriously consider schooling as a means to acquire the skills and knowledge to be competitive in a wage economy. This change in the Diné economy served as an eliminatory effect as the migration of Diné people to rail roads, mines, and urban areas off the Navajo Nation weakened ties with land and place. Schooling facilitated the movement of Diné people off reservation and out of their communities as a means to achieve modernity an advanced capitalist society demanded. The values which were prized in the market place were those of individualism, independence, achievement, humanism, detachment from sources of local and personal knowledge, and detachment from nature which schooling provided (Grande 2004). These eliminatory boarding schools epoch mechanisms of removing Diné youth from their physical and ideological communities remained.

The Navajo Nation's sovereignty took on a precarious nature during this policy era as the federal and state governments began to assume more responsibility for educating Diné youth. From 1943 until 1961 the Navajo Nation tribal council "rubber stamped" the policies of the federal government by adopting federal education polices as the educational policies of the Navajo Nation (Roessel 1979). Title Ten of the Navajo Nation Code effectively deferred responsibility of Diné schooling to the federal government. Once again termination policy began to alter the sovereign status of American Indian nations with the federal government by further positioning American Indian nations as "quasi-sovereigns" (Wilkins and Starks 2011). The termination policy era sought to eliminate American Indian sovereignty by no longer recognizing Indian nations as sovereign entities with extraconstitutional status. Termination logic concluded that American Indian people would be "free" of the paternalistic federal government,

develop a liberal ideology, and become United States citizens. An analysis of education highlights the entrance of the state into the federal-state-tribal nation relationship through public schooling. As the federal government pulled funding for federal operated schools, the state would assume the responsibility for educating American Indian people (Roessel 1979). The entrance of the state to educate American Indian students therefore represents an eliminatory process of American Indian and Diné sovereignty. Although the Navajo Nation's relationship with the federal government was never terminated, the philosophy of termination further oriented the Navajo Nation to utilize state public schooling.

State public schooling was designed for the reproduction of United States settler values, principles, and beliefs. American Indian education under federal control was oriented with an explicit mission of assimilating American Indian people whereas state schooling did not carry the same purpose but had the same effect. Signing of treaties brought American Indian people into a stronger relationship with the federal government and facilitated the imposition of federal policy on American Indian affairs. More youth in federal and state schools also meant more youth would be subjected to the decisions of white policy makers; subject to white middle class values, principles, and beliefs. However, Diné politicians and communities began to perceive a need for schooling as the world around them began to change and acted by placing their children within schools to meet the challenges of those changes (Iverson 2002b). The agency on part of Diné communities and politicians can be considered a deployment of sovereignty however; sovereignty had been deployed within the parameters of the settler colonial structure. The Navajo Nation had realized its right to choose education but not to define and control it. Self-Determination

Wilkins and Stark (2011) refer to the 1960s as a shift from Termination policy to self-determination that "renewed the government to government and trust relationship." Despite the renewal of the federal state policy, the previous policy of termination had already oriented Indian nations, even those where not terminated, toward public state run schooling. Federal boarding schools continued to exist although public schools became the primary means for Indian students to receive schooling. Through the 1960s and 1970s American Indian activism began to articulate the American Indian struggle in new, militant, and dramatic fashion. Wilkins and Stark (2011) argue that Indian activism lead to several political, legal, and cultural victories. In 1970 president Richard Nixon called upon congress to officially end termination policy and set out to make self-determination the goal of his administration (Wilkins and Stark 2011).

The effect Self-determination policy had on education from the lens of settler colonialism can be described as mixed at best. Federal and public education officials negotiated how public schooling for Indian children on reservations would be handled from the perspective of funding and curriculum without American Indian consultation or approval. With the increasing alignment of curriculum and practices between schools which serviced American Indian children and the public schools which serviced non-Indian children, American Indian people began to question whether or not their children were receiving the same quality of schooling non-Indians were receiving (Iverson 2002b). American Indian students on reservations received less funding and suffered from lack of highly qualified teachers (Pavlik 1985). The Kennedy Report, which prominently featured the disastrous education conditions on the Navajo Nation (Pavlik 1985) described school conditions and the Eurocentric curriculum of schools remained in a similar state as had been reported in the 1933 Meriam Report (Deloria and Wildcat 2001). The Kennedy Report prompted the passage of the Indian Education Act which attempted to reintroduce Indian languages and culture into the curriculum of federally run schools (Szasz 1999). Public schools however continued to struggle with the question of how to meet the needs of Indian children.

On the Navajo Nation the 1960s and 1970s saw significant developments in Indian education with the establishment of the historic Rough Rock Demonstration School (RRDS) and Navajo Nation College. Through the Office of Economic Opportunity the community of Rough Rock gained access to federal funding for charter schools, obtaining a measure of local community control and autonomy in matters of schooling (Roessel 1979 and McCarty 2002). Originating out of ceremony, RRDS was designed to "demonstrate" the implementation of Indigenous education within the school context, utilizing the Diné language as the medium of instruction and drawing on local community members, elders, Diné language speakers, and keepers of ancestral knowledge as teachers and administrators. These accomplishments were primarily facilitated by an all Diné Board of Education and the support of RRDS administration, specifically, principle Robert Roessel (McCarty 2002; Roessel, 1979).

Rough Rock community engaged in the negotiation of the parameters of schooling and in doing so disrupted the eliminatory aspects of settler schooling. Education became centered on cultural knowledge and pedagogy through the reliance on local knowledge and community members who lacked "certification" to teach in other schooling institutions (McCarty 2002). Though the "unconventional" methods of educating Diné children, performance raised and attitudes about schooling changed.

However the logic of containment worked to limit the success of RRDS in two ways. The first was federal Indian education policy maintaining an influence over the activities of Rough Rock due to requirements for federal funding (McCarty 2002).

The mechanism of funding ultimately eliminated and diminished Diné pedagogy and curriculum within RRDS. Funding often came in late, disrupting school operation and eventually forced the Rough Rock community to look to various federal agencies for funding. The increased sources of funds increased the requirements for funding. In order to comply with the various federal agencies that began funding RRDS the original vision of "a place to be Diné" was compromised in order to meet funding requirements (McCarty 2002). From a settler colonial analysis the logic of containment worked to prevent the spreading of the RRDS model in other Diné communities, maintained the operation of RRDS at a minimal level through inconsistent funding, and maintained principles of settler schooling such as the concept of schooling, standards, and mandatory federal testing. Rough Rock continued to exist but as funding from different federal agencies was accepted the school was forced to orient towards conventional schooling practices (McCarty 2002).

The second means of settler colonial containment of RRDS was the isolation RRDS existed in within the larger context of state and federal education systems. In other words, RRDS was an exception to the project of Diné elimination through schooling. The majority of Diné students continued to attend state public schools and federally controlled schools. However, the RRDS model had the effect of influencing other Diné communities to attempt to find ways to obtain further control of their own communities' schooling (Iverson 2002a).

Navajo Community College, now known as Diné College, was established as the first tribally controlled college in the United States (Tippeconnic 1999). Navajo Community College attempted to provide effective and local higher education access to the Diné people while also develop Diné epistemology, knowledge, and pedagogy. Unlike Rough Rock Demonstration School Diné college has fared better in building upon its original goals through the development of several educational frameworks rooted in Diné philosophy (Benally, 1994; McNeley, 1994), although the College has not been without problems. Through a strong relationship with the Navajo Tribal Council, Navajo Community College became heavily politicized which has effected the day to day operation of the college in various negative ways (Roessel 1979). Despite these setbacks Diné College has disrupted eliminatory education framing by providing a space for Diné people to learn Diné philosophy, language, and culture and for Diné scholars and administrators to develop and enact Diné pedagogies.

In the context of Diné policy, the Navajo Nation code has gone under slow yet significant changes. As stated above, the original education policy outlined by the first Navajo Tribal Council deferred to the federal government to define how education would be framed for Diné people. As a means to resist the removal of children from communities to attend boarding schools as well as gain more control, the tribal council began increasingly turning to public schooling (Thompson 1975). However, during the 1960s and 1970s, three new federal boarding schools were built on the Navajo Nation, continuing to frustrate Diné community members as schooling on the Navajo Nation became a patch work of federal, state, and contract schools (Reyhner and Eder 2004). However Diné people sis not simply accept the policies outlined in the Navajo Nation Code as public hearings in 1974 by the United States Commission on Human Rights revealed Diné communities concerns about schooling aligned with long standing concerns in national American Indian education, a lack of language, no culturally appropriate curriculum, and a lack of local community control (United States Commission on Human Rights 1974). The election of Navajo Tribal Chairman Peter McDonald in 1971 represented a shift in Diné education policies as McDonald believed it was crucial for the Navajo Nation to gain full control over Diné schools. In his first year as Chairman McDonald established the Navajo Division of Education (NDOE) with the goal of the Division becoming "the primary vehicle for the preservation of Navajo cultural Heritage" (Iverson 2002a, 254). However, personal conflicts between McDonald and the head of the NDOE impeded any significant process of gaining control of Diné schools.

The 2005 Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act was founded on the policy level through the establishment of the NDOE, however, the Navajo Nation's inability to equip the Navajo Division of Education with the proper mechanisms to govern over a Diné school system and the conflict of personalities within the Navajo Nation government lead to the inability for the NDOE to take a measure of authority in federal and public schools. However, several key aspects of the 2005 NSEA regarding the importance of Diné language, culture, and the inherent right for Diné to determine their own education system were established through amendments to Title Ten of the Navajo Nation Code in 1984. The Navajo Nation Tribal Council developed language which challenged the federal and state framing of Diné schooling by acknowledging Diné rights to educate

their children in the manner they saw fit and acknowledging the importance of Diné language to the survival of Diné people (NTC 1987: 10 § 111).

By the 1970s nearly all Diné youth were attending school with a majority attending public schools controlled by the states of Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah (Roessel 1979). During the Self-Determination era of federal Indian policy, federal schooling remained a significant force in Indian education even as public schools enrolled significantly more students. Although the curriculum and practices found within federal and state controlled schools remained heavily Eurocentric and English based, Diné communities began to find new models of schooling (McCarty 2002; Roessel 1979). Through the success of Rough Rock Demonstration school three more charter schools were opened on the Navajo Nation. Despite a lack of control in federal and state schools the Navajo Nation, Diné communities, and individuals continued to resist education practices that marginalized the Diné language and culture.

Diné resistance to federal and state schooling in the form of Rough Rock Demonstration School and Diné College highlights the markers of educational elimination. The primary concern which brought about the development of the demonstration school was an emerging trend of language and culture loss, elimination of Indigeneity, partly facilitated through schooling, a vehicle of settler colonial elimination. The settler practices of physically and ideologically removing children from their communities were overcome through a negotiation between Indigenous education and settler schooling. In order for the Rough Rock community to address concerns of elimination they needed a measure of influence within schooling that was not attainable through federal and state schooling. The settler structure of schooling remained however;

the Rough Rock Community was able to disrupt specific practices of elimination by gaining local control. The decision making in state and federal schools largely excluded local communities' voices by executing decisions at upper levels of government. By utilizing a charter school model the Rough Rock community deployed their inherent right to define and practice education in a way that was more suitable to the community's needs, bypassing the most stringent constraints placed on curriculum and teacher certification (McCarty 2002; Roessel 1979). The Rough Rock communities struggle to gain a greater control over education highlights both the continuation of eliminatory educational practices of a Eurocentric curriculum, a focus on the English language, and a lack of community control and the continuation of the Diné tradition of resistance to the forces of elimination

As a result of the 1975 Diné community educational hearings Diné education policy would again shift in 1981 with the Navajo Nation Tribal Council passage of CN-61-84. Under this new policy an "appropriate" Diné education was defined through: "Competence in basic academic and cognitive skills; competence in English language skills and knowledge of American culture; competence in Navajo language skills and knowledge of Navajo culture; the development of Navajo and United States citizenship; self-discipline and a positive self concept; preparation for lifetime responsibilities in the areas of employment, family life, recreation and use of leisure; an attitude toward education which encourages lifetime learning" (NTC 1987: 10 § 102). The orientation of Diné education remained toward a Western academic curriculum which prioritized the English language and American culture. Although these policies mark a significant improvement over the absence of Diné culture and language as well as a shift away from public schooling, the orientation of the policy is still firmly rooted within eliminatory frameworks of education.

Self-Determination and Self-Governance

The legacy of Diné education is characterized by the various factors which make up the American Indian education model of education. The orientation of "Navajo education" since colonization has been to further the colonial agenda of through the elimination of Indigeneity. Diné people were not complacent in the imposition of Western style education upon them, but through the diminishment of Diné sovereignty and imposition of colonial administration the Diné have been forced to negotiate with the practices of settler colonialism. However, the structural problem of settler colonialism remains. In the case of Rough Rock Demonstration School, funding from the federal government and the requirements which come with funding, contained the potential impact which the Rough Rock model had in disrupting the settler colonial institution of schooling by pressuring the school into aligning with established norms of settler schooling as a requirement for funding (McCarty 2002). Through the lens of settler colonial elimination, funding becomes a mechanism to eliminate Diné-ness and contain what Diné language, knowledge, and pedagogy was allowed within schools. Navajo Community College, now known as Diné College, has also been forced to align with settler colonial structures through accreditation. What this history also demonstrates is the projection of the current Navajo Nation education policies toward potentially decolonizing processes.

Another disruption in the norm of settler colonial Diné educational elimination came from public schools in the Diné community at Fort Defiance where the most well documented Diné immersion school was established in the Arizona public school system. The school, Tse'hootsoi' Diné' Bi'olta,' emerged from a language survey in 1986 that documented less than a tenth of children were competent Diné language speakers (Holm and Holm 1995). The school began as a voluntary immersion and developed into a full immersion program covering grades K-8 with plans for further expansion. The results of the program were students who scored higher than their monolingual peers in English reading and writing and mathematics (Holm and Holm 1995; Johnson and Legatz 2006). As will be covered in depth in chapter two, Indigenous language and culture was found to be beneficial to Indigenous students and as Tse'hootsoi' Diné' Bi'olta' founder Tom Holm stated, immersion schooling also infused a sense of pride in Diné students (Holm and Holm 1995).

Despite the success of Tse'hootsoi' Diné' Bi'olta,' the norm of Diné schooling remained English dominates state controlled public schooling. Some inroads were made through state policy to provide for Native language classes but these classes remained at the margins of state schooling. Diné scholars have questioned the use of schooling as a form of education because of what they see as structural violence and a reorientation of the purpose of education. Davis (1994) views schooling as a means of handicapping Diné children by placing them within a position of inferiority and deficiency unlike Diné philosophies which view children as being teachers and holding knowledge as they come into this world. Schooling has also been critiqued as a hierarchal system for the purpose of gaining access to prestige and privilege (Jones 1989).The American Indian education framework is clearly visible in these arguments as the structure of schooling clashes with Diné philosophies of development and child rearing. In the Diné context the effects of an American Indian education framework can be seen in language studies conducted on the Diné language shift towards English. Studies of language shift link colonization theory, settler colonialism, and imperialism to schooling as the elimination of language, one of the critical markers of Indigeneity. One of the tangible ways to measure socialization is through the loss of language and shift in language ideologies of Indigenous language communities. Research on Diné language loss/shift by Lee (2007) and Parsons-Yazzie (1995) is in agreement that Diné attitudes and beliefs about the Diné language have become increasingly negative. Conversely the English language has grown in prominence among younger Diné. Lee (2007) and Parsons-Yazzie (1995) contribute Diné language shift in part to the influence of English dominate schooling for Diné students. In 1970 Spolsky (2002) surveyed 3,500 six year old Diné children and found nearly 90 percent were fluent Diné language speakers. In 1990 however, it was found that half of 682 Diné children in preschool were reported as being monolingual English speakers by their teachers (Platero 2001).

As research shows the socialization of Diné children through exposure to English only language policy has resulted in the loss of positive attitudes about the Diné language. As Lee (2007) describes the Diné language has become associated with low income or poverty stricken community members, rural living, and backwardness. Within the school context teachers and administrators are normatively English speakers while bus drivers, cafeteria workers, and janitors, all associated with a lower social standing, speak Diné. Schools feed into this mechanism by "progressively" orienting students, meaning, schools frame the purpose of education as the preparation for the accumulation of wealth in a capitalist wage market (Winstead et al. 2008). In order to succeed in that

market one must align their values and world view to those that are most valuable within a capitalist system. English is one of the markers/skills that create opportunities to succeed within a capitalist market (Smith 1999). Students are socialized by the creation of a schooling environment that promotes the English language as a superior way of life. As Lee (2007) further argues, the domain of school is also the domain of English. Male students have also reported code switching from Diné language use to English langue use as the primary when talking to friends and romantic interests as a means of deploying an elevated social status related to the English language.

Linguists describe the values, principles, attitudes, and beliefs a person has toward a language as language ideology. As Crenshaw (2001) writes a shift in language is accompanied if not created through a shift in language ideology. Therefore in measuring and discussing language loss Lee (2007) and Parsons-Yazzie (1995) are also examining the socialization process of schools. Meaning, language shift highlights fundamental changes in ideology. From an analyses of settler colonial elimination the "ideology" of language as essential to relationships to land, kinship, and ceremony, Diné ways of being, is eliminated and replaced with an ideology that facilitates alignment with the English language and settler society.

Recent scholarship on Diné education and schooling addresses several themes that intersect with settler colonialism. In a 1995 study Deyhle correlated Diné students "success" and "failures" with Diné students' experiences with racism within and outside of school. Deyhle (1995) notes the ability for racism to orient Diné youth away from well-paying jobs and the acquisition of power and status. In doing so, Deyhle (1995) highlights the power relationships imbedded in school curriculum and the effects of Diné student's interactions with the Anglo population in order to create a deeper understanding of the structural violence and unequal power relationships inherent in schooling. Similar to Deyhle's (1995) study, Werito (2011) uses critical educational studies, Indigenous theory, and critical race theory to develop a critical Indigenous (Diné) theoretical framework to investigate Diné schooling. Through this framework Werito (2011) discusses colonization, racialization and globalization within institutional power structures of education. Werito (2011) argues Diné education must align with Diné struggles for sovereignty and capacity building for nation building. Werito's (2011) analysis highlights how schooling manufactures difference between the culture of school and Diné student's cultural background. In such a space the Diné language and cultural traditions serve as markers for schooling faculty and staff to prejudice students. When Werito's (2011) study is viewed through a settler colonial lens the eliminatory mechanisms of schooling, in this case hostile attitudes and behaviors toward Diné students who maintain markers of Diné-ness, have been maintained in contemporary schooling.

The developments of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Legislation and in the Arizona context proposition 203 are two policies which continue the colonial legacies of Indian and Diné education. Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) propose Safety Zone Theory as the mechanism from which U.S. federal American Indian policy was developed. In their analysis Lomawaima and McCarthy (2006) argue difference as a perceived threat to United States national unity and democracy as the primary cause for oppressive educational policies. Further Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) also argue that Safety Zone remains a component of American Indian education policy. In the context of NCLB and Arizona's English only schooling law, Proposition 203, they argue that state and federal American Indian education policy has made it impractical or extremely challenging to teach in the medium of Indigenous languages do to the gate keeping mechanism of English only standardized testing.

The standardization of knowledge and the testing of that knowledge is eliminatory due to the legitimization of English only Eurocentric curriculum. Standardization exclusively prioritizes the English language and Eurocentric curriculum as the knowledge base which must be tested, and therefore the knowledge base that is the most important to measuring academic success (Winstead et.al. 2008). Academic success is therefore defined through non-Diné markers of what it means to educated or Diné. Diné languages and knowledge is eliminated through the prioritization of English and non-Diné knowledge in standardize testing.

Wauneka (2008) attempts to identify the reformation of Diné public school curriculum and school structure through the implementation of NCLB as schools attempt to comply with standards. Wauneka (2008) demonstrates the disruptive force of NCLB as programs, including Diné language courses, are cut in order to develop curriculum which teaches to the test. Further Wauneka (2008) discovered that NCLB also places economical strain on already neglected American Indian students due to the allocation of school resources to tutoring programs and further test readiness initiatives. The purpose of the study was to examine address weakness and challenges developed from NCLB and although Wauneka (2008) makes several critical discoveries in regards to the negative impacts of NCLB on Navajo Nation public schools, Wauneka does not engage in an anticolonial or critical discourse with the colonial nature of standardized testing but shows elimination by arguing that "teaching to the test" works as a mechanism to prioritize certain knowledge over others. In particular teaching to the test eliminates Diné language and knowledge through NCLB's accountability system. In the face of corrective measures teachers align curriculum to exclude knowledge which does not align with standardized testing. Under the accountability structure of NCLB teachers and administrators are pressured into cutting Indigenous languages and knowledge from curriculum to concentrate on standardized knowledge.

Common Core has been marketed as a state driven movement to align standards across all states as oppose to the previous system of states independently creating their own standards. The logic behind the Common Core standards movement is that aligning standards will create a more effective and clear accountability system to judge academic success, students moving between states will be more likely to maintain their progress in schooling without having to catch up or repeat lessons, the Common Core standards are academically benchmarked, and align with the skills and knowledge employers seek in employees. CCSS are designed to align the United States academic standards with those of highly achieving nations in order to create citizens who are competitive within a globalized economy. The Navajo Nation recently began the process of aligning their standards with those of common Core. As of this writing these standards have yet to be developed (Department of Diné Education 2011).

The markers of educational elimination include the institutionalization of education through schooling which displace Diné institutions of education, Eurocentric curriculum, standardization (legitimization) of Eurocentric curriculum, progressive orientation, the English language (elimination of Indigeneity), and non-Diné control (diminishment of sovereignty). The specific settler practices of elimination include violence against Diné language and culture in federal and state schooling through Eurocentric curriculum which privileges the western scientific tradition, English only standardized testing, marginalization of Diné language and culture curriculum and courses, racialization of Diné students, and compliance with federal education standards such as Goals 2000, No Child Left Behind, and Common Core that provide the legal support for these efforts.

Under the current model of education, Diné students are oriented towards the adoption of colonial values, principles, and beliefs. The result is the elimination of Indigeneity. Schooling is firmly embedded in the agenda of colonization by way of the "hidden curriculum." By aligning with settler colonialism American Indian sovereignty and claims to land are diminished. Western education provides a means to justify the displacement and elimination of Indigenous peoples shifting those values, principles, and beliefs which make Indigenous peoples towards the Western hegemony. Resistance to settler colonial forces however have developed throughout Diné experience with colonization and are increasingly becoming noticeable in tribal policy.

Discussion

The purpose of this chapter has been to trace the development of educational elimination in the Diné context and argue the continual existence of eliminatory logics in contemporary Diné schooling. The development of educational elimination also highlights the differences in effect and purpose between schooling for Diné and American Indian students to that of white settler middle class students. The educational elimination of Diné and American Indian people through schooling was not a one sided imposition by missionaries, federal, and state actors but was meet by Diné resistance. In this section I elaborate on these lessons to prepare for a discussion in chapter two on practices that may lead to decolonization in Diné education and to develop a framework of educational elimination to analyze the 2005 Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act in chapter three.

The development of educational Diné elimination is rooted in early federal polices of White supremacy designed to provide legal legitimization of United States Westward expansion (Williams 2005). The purpose of educational elimination is what Alfred (2009) refers to as the "colonization of the mind." The schooling of Indian children served as a vehicle to accomplish two goals: breaking up American Indian nations' land holdings through their "Americanization" and the creation of capitalist laborers within the settler structure (Grande 2004).

The Navajo Treaty of 1868 created the boundaries of the Navajo Nation and in doing so reduced Diné land base to a fraction of its pre-Long Walk size. With the destruction of crops and homes caused by the United States military campaign against the Diné in 1862, Diné people became increasingly dependent on the United States federal government to provide resources to produce a livelihood. Another economic blow was delivered with the signing of sub-surface mineral rights to United States corporations for development in the early 1900s, prompting the development of the Navajo Nation business Council in 1928, the precursor to the Navajo Nation Council. The combination of the Great Depression and Federally imposed livestock reduction in the 1930s and 1940s completed the elimination of the Diné subsistence economy as Diné people began to shift towards capitalist labor markets to provide a living for themselves and their families (Francisconi 1997, Iverson 2002a).

The elimination of the Diné subsistence economy and further inclusion into the U.S. and world economy provided the key force in shifting the framing of Diné education to align with an "academic curriculum" oriented toward vocational, professional, and technological skills required in the capitalist labor market. The decline of the Diné economy and struggles of early stage capitalism brought about federal policies to facilitate the "development" of the Navajo Nation which framed schooling as an integral part of developing Diné knowledge and skills to "rehabilitate" their economy (Iverson 2002a). The language of "development" frames the Navajo Nation and Diné people as "underdeveloped" or deficient. Similarly to the language of "civilization" and policies of assimilation positioned American Indian people in a similar deficient state in need of the settler knowledge of modernity. The eliminatory schooling project continued but rhetorically shifted from the white supremacist language of "civilization" to "development." Diné politicians and citizens began to demand a quality of education equal to those of non-Indians in order to compete within the new economic logics of capitalism (Iverson 2002a, 2002b).

The development of education and the Diné capitalist economy and nation state parallels neoliberal policy developed by the World Bank, IMF, and other international banking institutions (Arnove 1997, Samoff 1996). Structural adjustment policies that deploy Western style education as a means to build capacity (Carnoy 1995) mirror's the federal government's policy of education in the context of the Navajo Nation. The Navajo Long Range Act and the Navajo-Hopi rehabilitation Act can be seen as neoliberal policy with explicit linking between the "development" of the Diné economy by developing Diné people as human capital. The language of "civilization" shifted to the language of "development" which maintains a white supremacist connotation. The federal report, *Navajo Nation: An American Colony* highlights the emerging relationship between the Navajo Nation as a source of resources that are extracted for the use and benefit of the metropole, in this case the United States. Through the lens of colonization theory, the Navajo Nation government and the emerging institutions are developed to support these industries as the colonial authorities and agents. No longer is there a need for an Indian agent and military forts to maintain Diné compliance, the increasing dependency of the Navajo Nation with the federal government and United States economy provided the incentives for the Navajo Nation to begin to model after the United States as "the" model of a modern nation state.

The history of Diné education provides evidence of this theory as the Navajo Nation tribal council was developed in order to facilitate the extraction of resources from the Diné communities, neglecting the development of a Diné policy of education until 1943, even than it would not be until 1961 that Navajo nation policy begin to support Diné language and culture within schooling. Diné politicians such as Chee Dodge and critiques of Diné communities through public education hearings reveal shifting Diné attitudes toward schooling and curriculum to align with white middle class models of education. The early success of Rough Rock Demonstration School and the election of Peter McDonald in 1971 ushered in a philosophical shift in Diné education policy with a renewed focus on Diné culture and langue and Diné control over schooling. The gains of the 1970s translated into stronger policy stances to Diné language and culture within

schools which serviced the Navajo Nation in 1981 culminating into the recent passing of the 2005 sovereignty in education Act. Despite these gains the neoliberal relationship between education and economic development has persisted as noticeable in the Navajo Nation's recent economic development plans.

It must also be pointed out that not all Diné people agreed with the concept of education and its practices the federal government and state developed for Indian children. Throughout the history of the Navajo Nation, Diné people have resisted settler colonial elimination through education. Early resistance arrived in the form of Diné parents refusing to send their children to school. Of those children who attended early boarding schools resistance came in the form of running away from school to using the Diné language and continuing Diné cultural practices. Diné communities' adoption of day schools and public schools rather than off-reservation boarding schools can also be seen as an act of resistance, a negotiation between communities' desires to keep children within the community and federal and state imposition of the concept of education and development. The development of charter schools such as Rough Rock demonstration school and Navajo Community College also represent negotiations between language and culture with academic curriculum.

The development of this historical analysis of Diné education through the lens of settler colonialism is important for three reasons. A critical historical analysis informs a framework of educational elimination by highlighting the process and mechanism by which Indigeneity and sovereignty are eliminated that can be used to examine contemporary Diné Education policies and practices. The second reason this historical analysis is important is because it may inform decolonizing strategies that disrupt

elimination by drawing upon the lessons of Diné resistance and understanding how the process of settler colonial eliminatory education works to strategically disrupt eliminatory practices. The third reason this historical analysis is important is because it allows us to reframe the purpose of Diné schooling, not as a tool to achieve economic development, but as a vehicle for elimination.

CHAPTER 3

DECOLONIZING EDUCATION

Shifting the Discourse: Frameworks of Decolonization

Through a settler colonial lens a historical analysis of American Indian and Diné schooling reveals how schooling functions as a vehicle of elimination that can be traced from early settler missionary schools to contemporary federal and state schooling. Diné people and American Indians in general have struggled against settler colonialism and resisted elimination. The lived experience of Indigenous struggle against colonialism and settler colonialism have informed theories and practices of resistance which has commonly been referred as decolonization by framing Indigenous issues around the effects of colonial societies in their efforts to exploit the labor of Indigenous populations or eliminate Indigenous permanency from the land. However, the discourse of education has largely been framed through the "achievement paradigm" which at worst is incapable of addressing settler colonialism and at best is forced to reframe discussions of education into narrowly defined concepts of schooling. Indigenous education continues to exist within Indigenous communities but due to the imposition of settler schooling on American Indian people Indigenous education has largely been excluded from wide spread use within schools.

Culturally Relevant Schooling (CRS) has emerged as a framework for introducing Indigenous practices and pedagogies into settler spaces, negotiating Indigenous ways of being within eliminatory institutions. Castagno and Brayboy (2008) highlight the first CRS framework was derived from the 1928 Meriam Report. The report recommended the use of American Indian language and culture within schooling curriculum for American Indian students as crucial for American Indian academic success (Demmert & Towner 2003). Despite the Meriam report's call for change in Indian education it would not be until the 1960s and 1970s when any significant action would take place (Castagno and Brayboy 2008). American Indian communities pressured the federal government to investigate Indian education and enact policies including supporting Indigenous education leading to the 1969 Senate report *Indian Education: A National Tragedy-A National Challenge*, the 1972 Indian Education Act and the Indian self-determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975. The report and policies provided points of leverage for Indian communities to implement Native languages, pedagogy, and curriculum in schooling and Executive order 13336 (Castagno and Brayboy 2008). By the 1980s a number of studies arising out of educational anthropology formed the first literature on culturally relevant schooling (Brown 1980, Deyhle 1986; McLaughlin 1989).

CRS is not a unique to American Indian and Indigenous peoples but has arisen out of various studies of minority populations. Connected these various populations are largely developed out of literature and research on cultural difference, multi-cultural education, and academic achievement of "minoritized" students (Castagno and Brayboy 2008). CRS acknowledges the effects differences in the culture of school may have with the culture of a child's family life, the socioeconomic effects of low income students, and the resulting "achievement gaps" that emerge. Although there are differing definitions of CRS in the American Indian context, CRS is a "both/and" approach to education that recognizes the benefits of Indian language and culture rather than framing Indian language and culture as a deficit "either/or" between an English education and an Indigenous education (Brayboy and Castagno 2009).

CRS negotiates the settler space of schooling but does not completely overcome settler logics of elimination embedded within neoliberal and white supremacist framing of schooling. CRS research recognizes dominant forms of schooling as a means to "erase and replace" Indigenous language and culture (Lomawaima and McCarty 2006) and acknowledges policy such as No Child Left Behind's effect of cutting Indian languages and culture from curriculum (Castagno and Brayboy 2008). However CRS literature remains tied to the settler colonial structure of schooling. Considering this, does CRS have lessons and principles for a decolonizing education agenda and decolonizing education framework? What are the decolonizing lessons that can be learned from CRS? What are the limits of CRS in a decolonizing project?

The inability for CRS to fully address settler colonialism leads this research to also examine Diné understandings of education as a framework to challenge the narrow definition of education through the lens of schooling. This chapter looks at the Diné philosophy of living a good life, Sa'ah Naaghai Bik'eh Hozhoon (SNBH), as a means to challenge and overcome settler colonial, neoliberal, and white supremacist framing of schooling. SNBH's epistemological framing within a Diné world view provides a means to question, critique, and guide action that decenters settler colonial framing of education. In particular SNBH can be used as a means of critiquing the assumption that education should primarily take place within schools. How then does the Diné philosophy of SNBH and CRS form a decolonizing framework of Diné education?

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section addresses the need to reframe the way American Indian and Diné education is understood by discussing the prevailing framing of Indian education research, the" achievement paradigm" and how this paradigm supports an elimination of Diné language and culture. I also discuss the limits of CRS as a decolonizing educational lens due to CRS's inability to challenge the settler institution of schooling. After establishing the limits of the achievement paradigm and CRS to address educational elimination I offer an alternative lens of decolonization as a means to disrupt educational elimination. The second section reviews literature on CRS and Indigenous education in order to draw upon lessons and principles that guide the creation of a decolonized Diné education. The third section discusses how the limits of CRS may be overcome through Indigenous theorizing of education focusing on the SNBH model of Diné education. This chapter concludes by developing a framework for a decolonized Diné education that can be used to analyze the 2005 Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act as a potential tool for creating a decolonized Diné education.

In order to argue that American Indian and Diné education should be framed to account for colonization, I discuss the achievement paradigm as a lens that is incapable of highlighting educational elimination. I define the "achievement paradigm" as a framework that limits the understanding of Indian education as a problem of "achievement." In the context of schooling achievement has increasingly been measured by students' ability to compete with non-Indians in standardized tests. The framing of Indian education through "achievement" creates a lens which highlights the "achievement gap" between American Indian students and their non-Indian peers. Deyhle and Swisher (1997) argue, "that the kinds of questions asked, such as "How do Indian children compare with White students?" position the Indian student in a deficit category in need of "change" thus supporting an assimilation model" (116). The fundamental questions of the achievement paradigm are what are the factors which contribute to low student achievement and how can the achievement gap be closed? What the achievement paradigm assumes is that standardized testing and the institution of schooling are themselves acultural and are ultimately the correct way to frame education and achievement.

The premise of the achievement paradigm, American Indian students are unable to academically achieve at the level of their peers, has led to the production of two primary theories: deficiency theory and cultural relevancy theory (Castagno and Brayboy 2008; Deyhle and Swisher 1997). These theories lie at different poles of the achievement paradigm. The first, which has been criticized by American Indian scholars and educators as a holdover of settler concepts of "civilization," argues that American Indian people are inherently deficient in some aspect of their "different" way of life, often employing a "two worlds" paradigm as the explanation to the conflict between Indigenous ways of being and the culture of schooling (Berry 1968; Deyhle and Swisher 1997). That is to say the influence of American Indian language, intellectual tradition, values, principles, and beliefs conflict with schooling because the culture of American Indian children is deficient, and "backwards." Deficiency theory argues Indian culture and language hold Indian children back due to the belief that Indian culture and language are inappropriate tools for learning, and higher level thinking.

The two worlds theory poses that American Indian people exist within the different cultures of Indigeneity and modernity or rather U.S. settler middle class ways of being (Henze and Vanett 1993). In this analysis U.S. middle class ways of being are associated with the English language, and markers of modernity such as capitalist values of individualism, humanism, and progressivism, and social institutions that align with

U.S. democracy, governance, and enlightenment rationality. The problem with the two worlds theory besides its metaphysical and epistemological indifference to among other Indigenous people, Diné worldview that we exist in a world that cannot be compartmentalized and divided, is the reframing of the central conflict of schooling, elimination, as merely difficulties in "code switching" between Indigenous and settler culture.

Through the lens of deficient theory, American Indian students can only achieve academically (score on standardized test scores at levels comparable to their peers) they must be further removed from those forces which connect Indian students to their cultures and languages (the Indian world) so that they may better function in schooling (world of the U.S. middle class). An "either/or" choice is presented to American Indian students in which they must choose between being Indian or conform to the world view of the U.S. middle class. From a settler colonial analysis, the deficient theory provides academic leverage for the elimination of Indigeneity and by extension sovereignty. The academic leverage is created in the positioning of Indian children's only option to achieve academically as assimilating into the U.S. middle class. The connection deficit theory makes between American Indian languages and culture to low performance provides leverage for political actors and police makers to eliminate Indigeneity using deficiency theory, more specifically test scores, as leverage.

The framing of American Indian students existing in a middle ground also has its problems. Through a critical analysis of the "two worlds" metaphor Henze and Vanett (1993) argue the positioning of Indian children as living between the Indigenous and Western world's overly simplifies a complex lived reality. The framing of the "two worlds" metaphor creates a simple binary that eliminates any other "worlds" or ways of being and essentializes and romanticize Indigenous and Western "worlds." It is also assumed that schooling can somehow mediate the "two worlds" to give children the "best of both worlds." The "two worlds" metaphor then becomes a barrier to Indigenous children who cannot live up to the lofty goals of an ideal bicultural person (Henze and Vanett 1993). The "two worlds" framing therefore acts in an eliminatory and containing way by asking Indigenous children to make choices based on assumptions that are ultimately unattainable. Indigenous people are not allowed to fully be Indigenous.

From the lens of settler colonial theory the conflict that arises between settler and Indigenous language and knowledge does not arise due to Indigenous deficiency but because of the violence perpetrated by settlers against Indigenous language, culture, and knowledge to dispel Indigenous permanence. When viewed as a site of contention between settler and Indigenous ways of being, the inability for students to academically achieve is related directly to the violence settler schooling perpetrates on Indigenous students through violence against their identity as Indigenous. Indigenous language and ways of being are marginalized while settler epistemologies, language, and knowledge are standardized, forcing Indigenous students to engage with the sources of violence against their Indigeneity.

At the other spectrum of the achievement paradigm are CRS projects framed through academic success. Not all examples of CRS place achievement as its primary goals, some CRS models that are discussed later in this chapter such as the *Keres* immersion schools emerged out of concerns over language shift (Romero 2001). However, CRS has primarily been leveraged within the context of settler schooling to

specifically address the "achievement gap" such as *Puente de Hozho* which will be discussed further in this chapter (McCarty 2009). In the Keres context community concern over language shift from Keres to English was the primary motivator and focus of CRS efforts while in the Puente de Hozho example Diné language is used as a means to primarily improve academic achievement amongst Diné students. In both the Keres and Puente de Hozho examples standardized testing scores were raised, however, the primary difference between the two projects was the Keres communities placing of schooling within a larger framework of culture and language survival while the Puente de Hozho was designed and implemented by non-Diné to address the achievement gap (McCarty 2009). The Keres example aspires to greater goals of language revitalization while Puente de Hozho more narrowly aspires to academic success within the established structure of settler schooling.

The primary reason CRS research has been framed through the achievement paradigm is because of the politics of schooling which emphasize raising test scores over moral assertion of rights to language and culture (Brayboy and Castagno 2009). The ability for CRS to link the benefits of Indian language and culture to elevated test scores becomes a more effective point of leverage to argue for the use of Indian language and culture within schooling than inherent rights to education. The audiences of CRS research are policy makers and politicians who are accountable for academic achievement. The effects of CRS programs and methods since the 1970s have consistently reported a positive relationship between American Indian language and culture to academic achievement (Berry 1968; Castagno and Brayboy 2008; Deyhle and Swisher 1997). Cultural Responsive Schooling (CRS) challenges the deficit theory through empirical evidence that shows the use of American Indian languages and culture in the schooling context improves Indian student's academic success. CRS argues for the increased use of Indigenous languages and culture in schooling curriculum. This evidence provides a point of leverage for policy makers on the state and federal levels to support the use of American Indian language and culture within curriculum for American Indian students.

The primary problem with the achievement paradigm is that it is incapable of engaging with the effects and intent of educational elimination. Instead the achievement paradigm only addresses the symptoms of settler colonialism. In the context of education the symptom is poor academic performance. The cause of poor academic performance, as it related to settler colonialism, cannot be addressed because the achievement paradigm is incapable of highlighting educational elimination because it assumes fundamental aspects of educational elimination such as standardized testing, the institution of settler schooling, and will continue to exist. These assumptions imply American Indian students will either be eliminated in the context of deficit theory or adapt to a friendlier settler institution in the context of CRS which holds as its singular purpose to close the achievement gap. This premise leads to a limited analysis of what education is and can be along with its goals and effects. In other words, under the achievement paradigm, the concept of education as standardized schooling is correct, it is merely the practices within schooling that must be adjusted to better facilitate the socialization of American Indian children into settler society.

However, CRS models that are framed through the achievement paradigm are not useless in developing a decolonizing education. Achievement oriented CRS, such as Puente de Hozho is engaged in creating innovative ways to create bilingual and bicultural schooling. As will be discussed at length further in this chapter, Puente de Hozho has provided a model for effectively teaching Diné language and culture, increasing parent involvement in their child's schooling, and provided insight in changing Diné youth's language ideology to view the Diné language positively. CRS models that focus on academic achievement also provide points of leverage for further inclusion of Indian language and culture within schools by negotiating the usefulness of Indian language and culture through the language of academic achievement and test scores. A theory of decolonized Diné education can utilize and further develop achievement oriented CRS by finding those aspects of achievement oriented CRS that provide guidance for a more radical decolonizing project.

As discussed earlier, there are CRS projects that do not prioritize academic achievement. The Keres example highlights the potential for CRS projects to engage in meaningful projects of decolonization when the goal of a CRS project is the revitalization of Indigenous language. In this context CRS explicitly challenges settler colonial elimination by focusing on the reclaiming and revitalization of Indigenous language. The objective of decolonizing CRS is not to create students who academically achieve within settler concepts of achievement and success but to engage in the larger political project of decolonization. As will be discussed later in this chapter these CRS models are often informed by Indigenous epistemologies, and methods, philosophies, and theorizing of education.

Decolonization theory emerged out of decolonization struggles in Africa with theorizers Albert Memmi and Franz Fanon (Riding In and Miller 2011). In the African context colonization took on the form of "classic colonization" (Jacobs 2009) or

"franchise colonization" (Wolfe 2006), that is the exploitation of Indigenous land and labor, not the elimination of Indigenous peoples. As such decolonization was primarily defined through the process of the expulsion of settlers from Indigenous territories, minds, and bodies (Fanon 2004). Decolonization theory was rearticulated in the American Indian context in the 1960s by Clyde Warrior and Robert Thomas among other American Indian theorists (Riding and Miller 2011). However, the change in context from the classic colonization of Africa to the settler colonial context of the United States has produced a need to re-theorize decolonization. Settler colonial theory recognizes that the "settler" is permanently settled requiring a different strategy and end goal then expunging non-Indigenous peoples from Indigenous territories. Byrd (2012) offers the concept of "living together differently" as a more appropriate goal of decolonizing within a settler colonial context. Alfred (2005) also argues settler expulsion may conflict with specific tribal philosophies and ways of being. However, the concept of "living together differently" and the settler colonial context does not mean the colonial structures and institutions will remain or that American Indian people will take a passive role in finding justice. Yellow Bird and Waziyatawin (2005) define decolonization as "the intelligent, calculated, and active resistance to the forces of colonialism that perpetuate the subjugation and exploitation of our minds, bodies and land" and that "decolonization is engaged for the ultimate purpose of overturning the colonial structure and realizing Indigenous liberation" (2005, 2). Yellow Bird and Waziyatawin (2005) also refer to more advanced forms of decolonization which are rooted in Indigenous epistemologies and theories. Jacob (2013) exemplifies this model of decolonization through the development of the tribal specific Yakama decolonizing praxis.

Laenui (2011) further enriches a definition of decolonization by highlighting it not as an end goal but as a process. Specifically Laenui (2011) points out five phases of decolonization: rediscovery and recovery, mourning, dreaming, commitment, and action. These phases are not linear or chronological but an individual, community, or nation may engage in the various phases at different times or in combination with each other. Decolonization is defined here as a process of healing, reclaiming, reconnecting, and disrupting settler practices to address the structural problems settler colonialism have caused for the purpose of Indigenous liberation. In this context liberation refers to the realization of Indigenous sovereignty: self-governance, self-determination, and selfeducation (Lomawaima forthcoming). I also contend markers of Indigeneity such as language, cultural competency, ceremonial participation, engagement in Indigenous kinship, and reliance on Indigenous institutions such as medicine people and markers of sovereignty which include the realization of inherent rights to land and self-governance, the influence of Indigenous epistemologies in tribal law and courts. In the context of an educational decolonization project these markers are similar, language revitalization, cultural competency, tribal and local control of education, and the realization of rights to education. Decolonization projects are defined as practices that are oriented toward the end goal of Indigenous liberation (Waziyatawin 2008). Decolonization is therefore a socially transformative process that is committed to social justice. Decolonization is not a narrowly defined process. Because decolonization is not narrowly defined it also takes the form of a spectrum. Decolonizing projects work on multiple scales at the individual, community, national and global levels. At times a researcher, activist, community, or local community members may not realize they are involved in a decolonizing project.

Instead the terms "revitalization, reclaiming, retelling, and healing" are used to characterize work, organized and individual, that is oriented towards Indigenous liberation.

With an understanding of how I am defining education I now use the remainder of this chapter to analyze practices of CRS and Indigenous education.

What is Indigenous Education?

In the Introduction I defined the concept of Indigenous and through a discussion of Indigeneity, reviewed several values, principles, and beliefs that are markers of Indigeneity. These markers include: kinship, collection to land, language, culture, and knowledge systems that are tied to place and the specific experiences of an Indigenous people to a specific place. Indigenous education emerges from Indigeneity; more specifically it emerges from Indigenous epistemology that is tied to place (Cajete 1997; Kawagley 1995). Indigenous education is therefore an expression of the experiences Indigenous people have within a certain local context. This means Indigenous education, even among communities with a shared language and culture could have varying means of educating and varying content that comprises education because of variances in the experience and context of place.

Indigenous education served the purpose of ensuring the passing down of Indigenous epistemologies and knowledge through generations and practical survival skills (Barnhardt 2005). The teacher student relationship was often mediated through kinship. This ensured multiple generations were involved within the education process as learners and teachers. Teachers were also not limited to human beings but included animals, plants, and spiritual beings (Deloria and Wildcat 2001; Lomawaima and

McCarty 2006). In the Diné context the matrilineal societal structure insured boys would be taught by their uncles on their mother's side and young girls would be taught by their mother and aunts on her mother's side of the family, because of the intricate and expansive clan system communities as a whole played a role in the education of children. Through both the means and methods of an Indigenous Diné education the values, principles, and beliefs were reproduced (Benally 1995).

Despite the long standing myth that American Indian education has largely been informal, Indigenous education has always been deliberately planned out and structured. Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) highlight several Indigenous teaching methods that have been intentionally structured to discipline and achieve certain skills within children. Education was organized according to seasons, time of day, gender, age, and clan or rank. The most "formal" means of education however happened in ceremony and story-telling as strict guide lines and methods were followed closely. The Diné story telling tradition is extremely structured to guarantee the accurate passing down of sacred oral histories. This type of education requires a disciplining of the mind and body to listen and memorizes songs and sacred history which must be repeated in the manner originally heard.

Indigenous education is defined by scholars as a holistic experience encompassing the lifetime of an individual (Barnhardt 2005). Unlike "formal" schooling, Indigenous education is not limited to the space and time of the classroom. Knowledge is not limited to secular experiences but also includes spiritual learning. The basic imagining of the world as largely anthropomorphic is challenged by Indigenous ways of knowing. This knowledge shifts the relationships between humans and their environments by highlighting the existence of relationships that are otherwise erased in an anthropomorphic worldview (Cajete 1997).

Indigenous education does not need to be validated by Western knowledge or be included in the Western cannon of knowledge. Indigenous education exists on its own terms; it does not ask to be approved by Western "experts" or beneficial capitalist structure. The analysis of Indigenous education that follows is intended to disrupt and intervene in the structure of settler colonialism by presenting a system of education that challenges the schooling paradigm definition of education and what it means to be educated. Smith (2012) raises concern over the study of Indigenous knowledge and knowledge systems in the context of imperial research. Several authors (Harry 2001; Riley 2004; Whitt 1998) have demonstrated the modern day exploitation of Indigenous knowledge to gain access and control over those aspects of Indigenous knowledge that benefits corporate capitalism. Imperial research and capitalist exploitation have served to eliminate and erase Indigenous presence, erasing Indigenous knowledge. By recontextualizing and reframing those aspects of Indigenous knowledge that is beneficial to the Western academy and corporate interests. The following analysis and discussion of Indigenous epistemology and knowledge takes into account the concerns raised by Smith (2012) and Harry (2001).

In chapter one I described the markers of settler colonial elimination as imposed schooling, absences of American Indian and local community control of education, practices which eliminate Indigeneity and tribal sovereignty. These practices specifically include standardized testing; English only curricula; lack of Indian education practitioners; a lack of local control and relevancy; unsupportive faculty, staff,

administration, and policy makers; racialization of Indian youth; separates generations of Indian people from regularly interacting, and a Euro-American framing of education through a capitalist economic lens. The result is the elimination of Indigeneity and sovereignty. How does Indigenous education and CRS disrupt these practices?

Through the processes of colonization and settler colonialism Indigenous education has been diminished in the physical and intellectual sense. The practices of Indigenous education have largely been replaced through the imposition of schooling on American Indian and Diné communities as outlined in chapter one. Indigenous knowledge and educational practices continue to survive as a result of Indigenous resistance to settler colonialism; however, these knowledge systems and practices have been disrupted and marginalized. The 1970s saw the reemergence of Indigenous education within the context of schooling with the development of Rough Rock Demonstration School, Diné College, Hawaiian and Maori language movements, and new federal policies which provided leverage for American Indian communities to deploy language and culture within the classroom. Although Indigenous education has existed outside of schooling despite attempts to eliminate Indigenous language and culture, the settler concept of school has undermined efforts by community, family, and individuals to revitalize Indigenous language and culture. As Roessel (1979) observed in the Diné context, as long as language and culture within schools remained marginalized, language and cultural genocide will continue.

Decolonizing education must therefore engage in revitalizing Indigenous ways of being outside of the context of schooling while also engage and overcoming the challenges of schooling. A decolonizing approach to Indian education is therefore holistic and operates on multiple scales to achieve wellness. In the context of decolonization wellness is a concept that is defined as a state in which Indigenous peoples have healed from the effects and legacy of settler colonialism and are engaged in what Alfred (2009) calls "living again." Wellness is therefore the realization of Indigenous peoples to live to their fullest capacities in the manner in which they choose. There are specific markers of wellness such as suicide rates, prevalence of alcoholism in Indigenous communities, diabetes rates, and other statistics that give glimpses that Indigenous and Diné communities are not well. A decolonized educational approach more importantly establishes Indigenous permanence by reclaiming, recreating, and redeveloping intimate relationships with land. In establishing a new epistemic lens to view the world, Indigenous peoples become may become more contentious and critical of settler colonials structures aiding in a larger project of decolonization on multiple other fronts.

Decolonization in the context of Indigenous education has concentrated on the schooling context. However, most education scholars recognize Indigenous education cannot and should not be limited to institutions of schooling (Cajete 1997; Kawagley 1995). Schooling and Indigenous education has therefore taken on a precarious relationship. The Rough Rock Demonstration School example in Chapter one illustrates the relationship between funding for CRS efforts through federal and state education agencies and the policies, standards, and mandatory testing which accompany such funding present serious challenges to education that is framed through an Indigenous lens. Federal and State funding conditions for CRS schooling has traditionally lead to the phenomena of teaching to the test covered in chapter one, teachers heavily relying on scripted lesson plans having an overall effect of marginalization of Indigenous languages

and cultures that will not appear on mandated standardized test scores. The importance of CRS is the ability to leverage the raising of test scores through the use of Indigenous teaching practices and knowledge.

The question of schooling whether it can facilitate decolonization or if it must be radically transformed or eliminated is a serious questioned that decolonizing frameworks raise. The structure of state and federal schooling today is inherently eliminatory as outlines in chapter one. What part does schooling then play in a decolonization movement? As Roessel (1975) argued, state and federal schooling have had a devastating impact on the cultural survival of Diné people but to completely ignore schooling would be what Alfred (2005) calls "turning your back on a beast when it is angry and intent on ripping your guts out" (20). Schooling therefore becomes a site of political struggle. Education on a whole must be directly related to larger political and ideological agendas. In the context of decolonization, schooling cannot continue to exist in its current form if at all. However, I do not argue decolonizing projects cannot take place in schooling nor that decolonizing efforts should be placed in other areas. Instead I argue that American Indian nations and the Navajo Nation poses the fundamental right to determine their own education and practice it and that local communities should possess the autonomy to define what education means to them, its purpose, and practices.

As part of the process of decolonization, Indigenous education and schooling have entered into a precarious relationship where the safety zone becomes contentious as Indigenous communities push the boundaries of what state and federal policy makers and administrators deem acceptable in schooling. What follows is a discussion of principles and lessons that have emerged out of the struggle for Indigenous communities to reclaim and determine what education should like in their communities. From these lessons and principles I develop a framework of decolonizing education.

Indigenous Education Practices and Culturally Responsive Schooling

Brayboy and Castagno (2009) point out concepts of Culturally Responsive Schooling emerged in federal Indian education policy since the Meriam report which argued for locally controlled Indian schools that utilized American Indian language and control. Prior to the Meriam report however, Diné communities were attempting to influence the curriculum within schools to utilize relevant curriculum and when schools did not parents refused to send their children to school. The 1970s saw the first major movement for CRS with the establishment of Diné controlled charter schools and the emergence of Maori and later Hawaiian immersion schools. The review of CRS case studies that follow is not an all-inclusive list. American Indian and Indigenous peoples have been finding new creative ways to resist educational elimination that cannot all be covered in this review of literature. I have attempted to draw from recent case studies and those which have more recently been highlighted by McCarty and Lomawaima (2006) McCarty (2009) and McKinley and Brayboy (2009) have identified as exceptional models of CRS.

Where this review of CRS literature and case studies differs from those of previous scholars is in developing a decolonizing educational framework. CRS research is aligned with projects of decolonization but has yet to specifically address the limitations CRS presents to a decolonizing project.

Inspired by Maori Language nests, Hawaiian community members went about creating their own Hawaiian immersion schools, *Aha Punana Leo* (Warner 2001; Wilson

1998). The original pre-schools were operated by families in 1983. The lack of a traditional school format allowed community members, specifically elders to interact with children. This early format of the school was also structured around traditional ways of life including singing, physical activity, storytelling, and interacting with family through cultural activities (Wilson and Kamana 2001). The schools did have some "structured lessons" found in traditional schooling such as reading, math, asocial studies and art but would transition back to emphasizing cultural teachings through community socialization (Wilson and Kamana 2001). The success of these original immersion schools lead to the creation of K-12 Hawaiian schools to retain students within the language and cultural environment found in the pre-school *Punana Leo* (Warner 2001).

As a result of the Punana Leo success and community struggle against the State of Hawaii to have native Hawaiian speakers recognized as certified teachers. The Punana Leo movement developed a political capacity within the community in order to influence political action to further carve out the spaces where immersion schooling could occur. Specifically Hawaiian community members sought to place children graduating from Punana Leo schools into schools that utilized the Hawaiian language as a significant medium of instruction. Hawaiian community members lobbied and petition the State of Hawaii School Board to create Hawaiian immersion schools.

The *Nawahi* School which emerged out of the Punana Leo movement further exemplifies Indigenous education through the emphasis on Hawaiian language and cultural revitalization rather than traditional academic success. The emphasis on Hawaiian language and culture decenters settler schooling by reframing the purpose from neoliberal goals to decolonizing goals of reclaiming knowledge and creating Hawaiian language speakers (Wilson, Kamana, and Rawlins 2006). At the *Nawahi* School students were not judged by the standards of traditional schooling but instead the standards of Hawaiian language and cultural achievement (McCarty and Lomawaima 2006). Despite the emphasis on Hawaiian language and culture immersion students saw significant gains in traditional measures of academic and achievement due to the challenging curriculum and contextualization of knowledge through Hawaiian world views (Wilson and Kamana 2001).

Goodyear-Ka'opua (2005) attempts to negotiate the use of Hawaiian knowledge within the context of settler colonial institutions arguing that Indigenous education, specifically Hawaiian education, should be a transformative institution which directly relates the colonization and Imperial overthrow of the Hawaiian government. Goodyear-Ka'opua (2005) argues that the projects such as the *'auwai* irrigation ditches are a metaphor for the restoration of pathways of cultural transmission against continued imperialism, meaning that Goodyear-Ka'opua (2005) is arguing for the transformation of the larger political economic structure. Unlike previous scholars Goodyear-Ka'opua uses a "sustainable self-determination" framework to highlight the how rehabilitation of Native Hawaiian economic and ecological systems contributes towards a larger project of decolonization by detaching from settler colonial structures.

Goodyear-Ka'opua (2013) expands this discourse through the framework of survivance. Through this framework self-determination and sovereignty become key components and motivations for reframing and ultimately decolonizing education. By creating a space that privileges and reproduces Indigeneity the larger projects of decolonization are facilitated by the questioning of settler structures that attempt to eliminate and conflict with Indigenous world views. Education in the form of schooling has always been political. Goodyear-Ka'opua (2013) politicizes schooling by disrupting settler elimination through Indigenous centered critical thinking skills. The colonial and imperial power structure can be questioned when Indigenous epistemologies come into contact with a contradictory settler system. Through the development of critical Indigenous thinking schooling becomes a site to transform Indigenous reality

Keres Immersion in the 1990s also provides a powerful case study for the merging of Indigenous education and schooling at Cochiti and Acoma in the 1990s. The Keres immersion movement began with a yearlong planning process (Sims 2001) that began with language surveys and research that reported no child speakers of Keres in Acoma (Romero 2001) and two thirds of Cochiti lacking the ability to speak fluently. However, the surveys also reported adults and youth were interested in revitalizing language (Pecos and Blum-Martinez 2001; Romero 2001; Sims 2001). Through community meetings the community was able to see they were going through language shift. The meetings also produced discussion that something should and could be done about leading to an immersion program. The programs decided to focus on creating language speakers thereby focusing their efforts to oral skills rather than the traditional methods of literacy and grammar (Pecos and Blum-Martinez 2001). The following year immersion camps were established that paired fluent speakers with language users. The model placed multiple generations into dialogue and modeled natural dialogue. These efforts eventually translated into the struggle to create year round immersion in public school. One of the important means of success for these efforts in the Cochiti community has been tribal control in the operational and funding sense (Suina 2004). The effects of

these efforts align with other CRS research in raising test scores and producing higher scores then peers who attend monolingual English schools (Sims 2001).

As discussed earlier, the effects of raising student test scores was not the goal of the Cochiti and Acoma education movement. The focus was on creating young language speakers. The added benefit of raising test scores is indicative of the ease knowledge can be transferred when placed within a cultural context that utilizes Indigenous language and vulture as benefits to the education process rather than deficits.

Another example of CRS that gives insight into building a decolonizing education comes from the *Yup'ik* example. Yup'ik teachers simulated the Yup'ik community within their classroom. Specific community characteristics that were introduced to the classroom space included "communication styles, values, praised behaviors, and curricular content" (Brayboy and Castagno 2009, 46). Lipka (1990) points out teachers attempted to use student's prior knowledge to build upon lessons. For instance activities were chosen to present students with the connection between community based activities. Combined with the kinship based relationships and interaction styles modeled off of the community, students were able to contextualize lessons. A similar Yupik example that draws upon a bilingual curriculum and community support also comes from Barnhardt (1990).

In these Yupik examples the primary means of decolonizing emerges out of the connections between knowledge and context specific spaces. Stronger connections and relevancy of Yup'ik ways of life and community values place knowledge within context. The classroom becomes a site that reproduces Yup'ik ways of being as a means of relating information. The introduction of kinship as related to community also disrupts the hierarchal framing of the teacher-to-student relationship. The modeling of Yup'ik

community may also serve as a vehicle to reestablish or build on intergenerational relationships that schooling has normatively eliminated.

Klump and McNeir (2005) also provide two Alaskan examples that draw upon the Indigenous knowledge to meet academic standards. The school focuses on subsistence activities that are of important and interest to the local community. Klump and McNeir (2005) focus on a particular example in which students pick berries that are later used to create traditional foods while also learning the biological and ecological importance of the berries. As Klump and McNeir (2005) write, "the berry picking activity incorporates benchmarks from science, health, and personal/social skills standards" (12). The results of these and similar activities has been an increase in student enrollment, increaser in subsistence activities within the community, and stronger relationships between teachers and students and elders (Klump and McNeir 2005).

Similar to the previous example, the *Tuluksak* School in Alaska uses a similar hand-on and culturally relevant approach to meet academic standards. The school uses a dog-sled racing team to link standards to culturally relevant curriculum. The specific standards the dog-sled team are used for are "home economics, science, and even reading," and the results have been "improved social and interpersonal skills among students" (47). Outside of culturally relevant curriculum the school has also placed a strong emphasis on teacher training with a six credit professional training course in Yup'ik language and culture, and English learner instructional strategies (Brayboy and Castagno 2009).

The Diné context has also seen the emergence of a successful immersion school in Fort Defiance, *Tsehootsooi Diné Bi'olta*, ' founded in 1986. The Immersion school was influenced by Maori and Hawaii immersion previously mentioned (Arviso and Holm 2001). Similar to the Keres example the Diné immersion school initially came about through language research which reported a significant language shift in the Fort Defiance area as well as a lack of English language skills (Arviso and Holm 2001; Holm and Holm 1995).

Unlike the Keres example *Tsehootsooi Diné Bi'olta'* placed an emphasis on literacy. The program used Diné exclusively in the initial schooling grades but as students advanced into upper grades English use was increased to fifty present of the day and then by fourth grade the majority of instruction was carried out in English (Arviso and Holm 2001). Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) point out one of the most profound lessons that can be learned from the Diné immersion program was the effect the program had in strengthening community use of the Diné language. McCarty (2009) also points out that the school utilizes Diné standards for language and culture. Like the previous examples the Diné immersion school students saw gains in academic performance that were not seen in non-immersion students (Arviso and Holm 2001; Holm and Holm 1995).

McCarty (2009) also points to the untraditional dual language example Puente de Hozho as an example of an innovative CRS program. Puente de Hozho was designed to raise academic performance of Flagstaff area students. The community of flagstaff is home to significant Diné and Latino populations. Local educators who were attempting to close the achievement gap between minority language speakers and English speakers. The school set out as a bicultural and bilingual school aimed at but not exclusive to Diné and Spanish speaking communities. Similar to the *Tsehootsooi Diné Bi'olta* ' model, Puente de Hozho begins instruction in initial grades as 100% immersion but more English is used as students enter higher grades.

McCarty (2009) highlights two practices from the school that are particularly informative. The first is the paradigm shift of Diné language from a deficient to a privileged position. The Diné language is elevated through the narrative of the Diné languages importance to the war effort in the Pacific during World War II. Second, McCarty (2009) notes a high level of parent involvement with students and schooling. As in the other examples, Puente de Hozho has raised student academic performance. As discussed earlier, Puente de Hozho is representative of achievement focused CRS. Compared to the Hawaiian, Keres, and *Tsehootsooi Diné Bi'olta* examples which primarily focused on language revitalization. However, Puente De Hozho stresses the decolonizing components of the importance of changing language ideology of Indigenous youth to privilege Indigenous languages and the importance of community inside of the classroom as oppose to the segregating and isolating of community and generations. *Lessons and Principles that Inform a Decolonized Education*

Culturally Relevant Schooling case studies give several principles and lessons that may inform a decolonizing education framework. The first and most obvious is the use of Indigenous language and culture within the curriculum. In each example Indigenous language or culture was the core feature of CRS. In some cases however language and cultural revitalization were not the goal of schooling but the means to increase academic achievement. However, the Hawaiian example illustrates that even when the goal of CRS is not to improve academic achievement but to create language speakers and cultural competence the academic achievement benefits still persist. Although communities may deploy the achievement benefits on policy makers for leverage, the project of Indigenous language and culture revitalization in itself produces gains in academic achievement. This principle challenges the basis of CRS as a means to close the achievement gap. Therefore from a decolonization perspective, the focus should be placed on Indigenous language and cultural revitalization over academic achievement.

The measure of achievement is standardized tests which in the context of an increasingly globalized world and neoliberal economy, are benchmarked against different countries. As the language of Common Core Standards highlight, the purposes of such tests are to provide benchmarks and accountability for raising the settler state, the United States, Gross Domestic Product (Au 2013, Martin 2012). As critical pedagogy theorists argue, schooling provides the means to socialize children with progressive, anthropocentric, and consumerist values that support such a project (Grande 2004). From a settler colonial lens the socialization of Indigenous children into the settler society is eliminatory. By framing education in this manner the settler concept of achievement is disrupted. Schooling is no longer a vehicle to create capitalist laborers and therefore the emphasis on capitalist values are disrupted by the Indigenous values principles, and beliefs embedded in language and culture.

The emphasis CRS places on Indigenous language and culture also reframes who is a teacher and how teachers are valued. Indigenous language speakers and community members become valued teachers. In particular elders are elevated in status within communities. The emphasis on language and cultural competency forces the hierarchal structure of schooling to re-center around Indigenous values of education by privileging those with Indigenous knowledge. In the context of immersion schools the

administrators, faculty, and staff are all hired according to Indigenous knowledge and language preference. This reframing of values of staff addresses what Lee's (2007) study highlighted was a deterrent of Diné students to speak their language, the devaluing of language speakers social status by placing them in staff positions that students viewed as occupying a low social status: Bus Drivers and cafeteria cooks. English speakers however occupied teaching and administrating jobs. The reframing of Indigenous language and culture as valuable to the educational process may disrupt the settler practice of devaluing and positioning language speakers as deficient, elevating the status of the language within the community, in effect "decolonizing" the minds of students and community members. Bilingual and immersion schooling requires Indigenous language speakers. Spolsky (1974) points out schooling that requires Indigenous language speakers is an economic threat to non-native educators. Not only teachers but staff and administers are more likely to be Indigenous and local community members if schooling places a greater focus on Indigenous language.

Besides the focus on Indigenous language and culture, local community control is perhaps the most important principle that can be taken from the CRS case studies. Throughout most examples the ability for communities to actively influence how education is framed, its purpose, who the community considers a teacher and what is considered knowledge can be a powerful practice of decolonization. One of the critiques of Indian education and long standing recommendations for Indian education has been the increase of control form non-Indians who live outside of the context of Indian communities to local Indian community members. As Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) point out, it is ironic that American Indian people have had to struggle to gain local

control of schooling when public school in the United States was designed around the idea of local control. As was pointed out in chapter one, one of the mechanisms of educational elimination has been the long standing tradition of federal and state policy makers to dictate local schooling practices (Lomawaima and McCarty 2006). CRS case studies illustrate local control is feasible and has a positive impact on students' academic achievement. The myth of American Indian people as incapable or incompetent to run their own affairs is disrupted through case studies which illustrate Indigenous people's ingenuity and resistance to conventional education while also positively influencing academic achievement (Brayboy and Castagno 2009; McCarty 2009). The ability for Indian people to believe in their own communities and for Indian people to control their own educational institutions bolsters sovereignty and disrupts elimination by rebuilding relationships and trust within communities that lack confidence in their ability to control their own affairs and trust each other.

The emphasis on community control leads to emphasis an on community leadership through the need to develop schooling material, curriculum, language and cultural teachers, and grass roots organizing to establish schools. In the example of Hawaiian and Maori Immersion schools, local community members were called upon to provide spaces for schooling and eventually to organize movements to establish k-12 schooling (Warner 2001). The example of Rough Rock Demonstration School also demonstrates the need leadership which shares a similar vision and goals for education. The development of the all Diné Board of Education for RRDS and the leadership of Robert Roessel created a supportive foundation for the community to implement schooling their way (McCarty 2002). In the context of schooling, CRS schools need

administrators to support the vision of the community. In the context of the larger community, community members will need to support CRS efforts. Research on American Indian language and cultural revitalization in the Southwest and on the Diné Nation has shown community members and youth are interested in revitalizing efforts (Lee 2007, Romero 2001). These sentiments must be leveraged to create support for CRS efforts within communities. The Keres example provides a lesson for surveying communities to determine their needs and wants as a means to mobilize community members.

What an emphasis on community also disrupts is the elimination of ties to place. The contextualization of knowledge within local community, local community practices, and ecology create a powerful means of disrupting the standardization of knowledge. Along with the ability to determine what knowledge is and what knowledge should be learned, CRS informs a decolonizing education through the couching of knowledge within place. The placing of knowledge reestablishes Indigenous peoples' connection with each other and land.

The overall effect of CRS is the decentering of Eurocentric curriculum through the introduction of Indigenous language and knowledge that challenges the elimination of Indigeneity through the English language and settler knowledge hierarchies. CRS also disrupts non-Diné control as a vehicle for the diminishment of sovereignty by requiring Diné language speakers and culturally competent educators to be a part of the decision making processes by virtue of their expertise in language and curriculum. However, there are limits to what CRS has been able to disrupt. State and federal mandated standardized testing and accountability remain entrenched as settler practices of "containment." The specific settler practices of elimination of violence against Diné language and culture in federal and state schooling through Eurocentric curriculum which privileges the western scientific tradition are intervened in but English only standardized testing demands settler knowledge and pedagogies be represented within schools. However, subtler practices of racializing Indigenous youth and deconstructing settler power structures become disrupted within the space of schooling by introducing Indigenous educators, staff, and administration that attempt to model Indigenous communities within schooling.

The literature on CRS highlights several educational mechanisms that can be utilized in a decolonizing educational framework. However, as was pointed out earlier, when discussing education in the context of Indigenous education, the concept is not limited to schooling (Cajete 1997). Effective CRS models have been able to engage the local Indigenous community in language and cultural revitalization projects that overcome the limitations of schooling. Schooling in itself is a challenge to a decolonizing educational project. Goodyear-Ka'opua (2013) recognizes the contradiction between the institution of schooling and the use of Indigenous knowledge, introducing the concept of the logic of containment to explain the inability for Indigenous language and cultural based practices to become the norm rather than the exception in schooling.

Although CRS presents several pathways and lessons for developing decolonized educational systems there remains a need to link the political relationship between Indigeneity, sovereignty, and decolonization. Goodyear-Ka'opua (2013) points out the field of Indigenous education has begun to push past the limits of settler schooling through the creation of epistemological space for Indigenous knowledges and social relations to flourish. As Goodyear-Ka'opua (2013) continues, "the ability to define what knowledge is and determine and what our people should know and do – What Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2012) calls "epistemic self-determination" – is a fundamental aspect of peoplehood, freedom, collective well-being, and autonomy" (39). What follows is a discussion of Diné theorizing of education. This discussion highlights the creation of what Goodyear-Ka'opua (2013) terms "sovereign pedagogies," defined as the "collective struggle to support Indigenous survivance and to end colonial relations of power and knowledge" and related to the concept of sovereign pedagogies" (6). "To practice sovereign pedagogies then is to signal that the continuing socioeconomic and educational inequalities Kanaka Maoli face within the settler school system and broader society can never be fully remedied without addressing the continued suppression of Hawaiian political sovereignty. In other words, education that celebrates Indigenous cultures without challenging dominant political and economic relations will not create futures in which the conditions of dispassion are alleviated" (Goodyear-Ka'opua 2013, 6). *Indigenous Theorizing in Education*

A means of overcoming settler structures of schooling is the assertion of sovereignty in education. Sovereignty in education is not limited to the legal and political jurisdiction that gives American Indian people the political capital to control school systems but the ability to practice sovereign pedagogies and intellectual selfdetermination. The concept of the logics of containment has played out in schools by limiting and fractionalizing Indigenous epistemologies in "safety zones." In order to overcome these barriers sovereignty in education must take a deeper meaning. Smith (2012) argues for "epistemic self-determination" through the reclaiming, recreating of the Indigenous intellectual tradition, Indigenous knowledge, and epistemology. Indigenous theorizing challenges the safety zone by facilitating the dreaming and conceptualization of what a decolonized education may look like. CRS research provides lessons and principles to ground Indigenous theorizing of education but Indigenous theorizing provides the means to decenter settler colonialism in education. Indigenous theorizing utilizes Indigenous epistemology of a people to create analytical frameworks.

The Maori example of Indigenous education has become one of the most wellknown demonstration of Indigenous education looks like. What is important about the Maori example is not the education and Maori schooling movement that developed, but as Smith (2003) argues, it is the "counscientization" and larger social and political objectives of Maori peoples. This framework outlines the process, goals, and purpose of education through Maori theorizing. *Kaupapa Maori* Theory forms the basis of the Maori education movement. Smith (2003) argues the necessity of Kaupapa Maori theory as an anti-colonial framework capable of disrupting settler colonial structures. Smith also points out Kaupapa Maori Theory as a means to de-center the colonizers in the decolonizing agenda.

Maori scholars have utilized Kaupapa Maori Theory in order to create anticolonial and transformative education and schooling (Mahuika 2008). Kaupapa Maori is deployed for the transformation of Maori conditions draws from the Maori intellectual tradition through the use of Maori intellectual tradition and perspectives (Smith 2003). Further Kaupapa Maori calls for transformative praxis through conscientization, resistance, and transformative action. The Kaupapa Maori model provides for a critical perspective on Maori affairs, concerns, wants and needs rooted in Maori world views (Smith 2003). Indigenous knowledge in this sense is deployed as the epistemological backbone of Maori education and schooling. Further Kaupapa Maori links Maori education and schooling with larger projects of self-determination and Maori sovereignty. From this example I begin a discussion on Diné models and philosophies of education, schooling, teaching, and learning.

Lee (2008; 2010) calls for Diné scholars to begin theorizing through Diné ways of being. SNBH has arisen as a Diné theoretical tool by several Diné scholars in contemporary academic discourses (Denetdale 2007; Lee 2007) as a means of Indigenizing research. Lee (2008; 2010) has called on Diné scholars to link the reclaiming of Diné though with the larger agenda of decolonization. What follows is a synthesis of SNBH as a framework for overcoming the settler logic of containment and link Diné thought to the larger project of decolonization through the reframing of Diné education through the lens of *Sa'ah Naaghai Bik'eh Hozhoon*.

Sa'ah Naaghai Bik'eh Hozhoon Framework

Sa'ah Naaghai Bik'eh Hozho forms the basis of Diné philosophy (Aronilith 1994). The term SNBH has been roughly translated to "long life happiness" and represents the balance of the male *Sa'ah Naaghai* and the female *Bik'eh Hozhoon* (House 1997). The male SN derives those teachings that are found in *Naayee'eek'ehgo na'nitin* that provides a framework to recognize danger and obstacles (House 1997). The female BN that compliments SN is derived from *Hozhoojik'ehgo na'nitin* teachings that provide a framework for achieving balance and harmony (House 1997). "Because we view ourselves as Holy People, the way of Sa'ah Naaghai Bik'eh Hozhoon becomes our way as well. Learning is the internalization of the principles of *Hozhoogo Iina*, the way of Happiness" (Benally 1997, 42). The purpose of education in the settler context, as

discussed in the previous chapter, has been the development of capitalist labor, maintenance of white supremacy and patriarchy, and the elimination of Indigenous peoples. Through the SNBH lens education, education purpose is shifted to "gather knowledge that will draw one closer to a state of happiness, harmony, and balance" (30).

Working from this core philosophy Diné scholars have begun developing a body of knowledge that is framed through SNBH. It is important to point out that although there is a shared metaphor of SNBH among Diné people, how SNBH is achieved and lived in individual lives is up to the discretion of the individual. This is not to say that SNBH is a philosophy of individualism but one that respects the autonomy of individuals as a part of the larger community. Therefore an accurate definition of SNBH or framework of education that is derived from SNBH is difficult to define.

Benally (1994) proposes SNBH as a model of presenting knowledge within the schema of the four sacred directions, mountains, seasons, and times of day. Diné college has attempted to implement Benally's SNBH model with mixed results (Clark 2005). Criticism of Benally's SNBH framework has arisen from a lack of community input in the SNBH framework, primarily from elders and medicine people, and the framing of Benally's model through the dissertation requirements that were the original impetus for the creation of the SNBH education framework. House (2002) has gone on to critique the SNBH framework as impractical for designing curriculum, arguing the four-direction framework and organization of curriculum and content developed at Navajo Community College/Diné College have been difficult to conceptualize and implement (102). House (2002) therefore proposes the use of the SNBH Paradigm as a holistic approach, in-and-out of schooling, for language acquisition and revitalization solely.

In developing an SNBH model to address Diné language shift House (1997) argues SNBH and Western ways of knowing are not mutually exclusive, but that the strength of Diné people has been the ability to adopt and incorporate elements from other cultures while retaining their cultural core, "a value system that recognizes the interconnectedness of all things, kinship based on the Diné clan system, and the Diné language which that represents and assure the Diné world and worldview" (House 1997, 47). House recommends, beginning in the East with *Nitsahakees* the use of SN to assess threats to the Diné language and become realistic in the increasing language shift. the Blessing Way elements of SNBH would be used to establish what Diné people will believe will bring themselves and their community into balance. Drawing from the knowledge of the four sacred directions Diné communities would then implement *Nahat 'a* from the south, *Iina* from the west, and *Siihasin* from the North. House (1997) presents SNBH as a framework for achieving critical consciousness and praxis rather than a means to create curriculum.

The principles which unite Benally and Houses' SNBH models is the centrality of the Diné world view and purpose. Embedded in the Diné worldview is Diné language, kinship, and land. In this context education is understood as the acquiring of knowledge and skills which will lead to living of a long and happy life. Neither Benally or House view Diné and Western knowledge as mutually exclusive, but that when knowledge is understood through an SNBH framework the effects of epistemic difference between Diné and Western knowledge become apparent. Through SNBH knowledge is recognized as an interconnected web derived from the experience of the Diné people with specific place (land). The relationship between the natural environment and knowledge is represented in the link between Benally's (1994) schema of knowledge as related to the four sacred directions, mountains, and times of day and House's (1997) concept of cycle. Settler colonial eliminatory education on the other hand has been critiqued by Diné scholars and educational practitioners as highly hierarchal, knowledge is divided, and uncontextual (standardized). SNBH provides a Diné framework to critique settler colonial educational elimination and a means to organize principles of CRS.

What SNBH provides is a framing of education through the Diné philosophy of living a long happy life. Through this framing of education the achievement paradigm and settler schooling can be critiqued through SN as that which causes harm and creates disturbances. The BH process restores balance and harmony and returns Diné individuals, communities, and the Navajo Nation to the Beauty Way. An SNBH framework does not assume the continual existence of schooling nor its complete elimination. What an SNBH framework allows is a critical analysis of schooling and the achievement paradigm by asking whether the institution of schooling impedes or destroys the ability for Diné people to live SNBH and whether the achievement paradigm aligns with the goal of happiness. As I have demonstrated in chapter one, settler schooling does not provide the adequate tools or space for Diné people to achieve happiness because settler schooling seeks to eliminate Diné Indigeneity, which the Diné world view tells us is directly tied to the ability to live long and happy.

When principles and lessons of CRS are viewed through the lens of SNBH a powerful model of achieving and living SNBH emerges. Researchers have demonstrated the ability of CRS to raise academic performance, self-esteem, and provide a means for communities to deepen and build relationships. Lessons from CRS also demonstrate community's abilities to empower themselves and seek further changes to the social and economic structures that pervade their life. These effects of CRS align with Diné goals of education (Aronilth 1992). In order to push a decolonizing educational project past the logics of containment the epistemological foundations of settler education must be questioned. The SNBH model of education provides a framework to do so. I argue that through an SNBH model, settler schooling (institution, curriculum, standards, goals, and purpose) must be critiqued as a disruptive force that is incapable of creating a long and happy life. Under SNBH CRS principles and lessons may lead to a new conceptualization of what a decolonized education looks like.

In comparison to the available literature of Kaupapa Maori Theory, the Diné SNBH approach is lacking in creating a greater context for the need to use Diné knowledge as the foundation for Diné schooling. Kaupapa Maori Theory on the other hand links Maori education to a larger political movement which relates education to Maori sovereignty and self-determination. Further, as Smith (2012) argues Indigenous knowledge is required in order to disrupt and eventually disengage with colonizing and imperialistic forces. Although House (2002), Benally (1994) and McNeley (1994) are engaging in acts of decolonization they lack a deeper understanding of the significance of their work in the context of decolonization projects such as the strengthening and practice of Diné sovereignty as well as Diné self-determination. The framework presented here places SNBH directly in discussion with the larger goal of Diné decolonization through the creation of what Goodyear-Ka'opua (2013 refers to as "sovereign pedagogies." *Discussion*

Education is not an experience limited to Western schooling. Defining education through the schooling paradigm creates an impoverished view of education by denying the rich knowledge found in non-Western intellectual traditions and experience. Indigenous peoples have developed sophisticated cosmologies, epistemologies, languages, and systems of knowledge that are marginalized and erased through imperial knowledges (Smith 2012). In the settler schooling paradigm, to be educated is to complete various levels of schooling and receive certification or conferred a degree. In this chapter I challenged the definition and practices of settler schooling or educational elimination. Where in a Diné definition of education, to be educated is to know the Diné language, sacred history, ceremonies, and songs to achieve SNBH (Manuelito 2005). SNBH does not exclude Western knowledge but reframes it through a Diné epistemology. In reframing Western knowledge, what House deems the "Navajo Core," language, kinship, and relationship to land, is preserved.

In chapter one I argued settler colonial schooling has sought to eliminate Dinéness through English only and English oriented curriculum, control of Indigenous education through the settler state, and the socialization of American Indian students through curriculum that aligns with white middle class values of white supremacy, patriarchy, and hetero sexuality. Goodyear-Ka'opua (2013) argues that those spaces in which Indigeneity, have come to exist (CRS) have been contained through the logic of containment. The combination of the lessons and principles found in CRS and the SNBH concept of education provides the tools to end educational elimination and overcome containment within the settler colonial institution of schooling. SNBH and CRS provide the means to achieve a decolonized Diné education through the disruption of elimination through *Naayee'eek'ehgo na'nitin* and the dreaming of a new education system *through Hozhoojik'ehgo na'nitin*.

Alfred (2009) refers to colonization as a process of disconnection, disconnecting Indigenous people from land, each other, and the knowledge to live as Indigenous. The combination of CRS framed through SNBH defends and strengthens Diné sovereignty and Indigeneity. Stronger ties to the land are created, stronger bonds in the community are forged, and access to language and Diné knowledge to live a long and happy life is assured. Therefore only through the epistemological framing of CRS is decolonization able to provide a truly decolonizing framework of Diné education.

In the Next chapter the framework of educational elimination derived in chapter one and the framework of decolonizing education are used to analyze the 2005 Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act. The analysis will highlight those areas in the NSEA that maintain settler colonial eliminatory practices and mechanisms and ways in which the NSEA may be utilized in the process of decolonization.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS: 2005 NAVAJO SOVEREIGNTY IN EDUCATION ACT

The 2005 Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act has been heralded by Diné and Indian education scholars as land mark legislation and education policy for the Diné's deployment of sovereignty and the promise of increased authority and control over Diné education. Lee (2014) argues the NSEA is a part of a larger vision of the Navajo Nation gaining control over state public schooling on the Navajo Nation by developing the governing capacity necessary to provide all of the functions which the Education Departments of Utah, Colorado, and Arizona provide. Effectively the NSEA places state and federal officials on notice that the Navajo Nation intends to gain control over all schooling on the Navajo Nation (Roessel 2011). The importance in Diné control over education on the Navajo Nation is what Cody (2012) highlights as the ability for the Navajo Nation to emphasize the Diné language and curriculum through education policy. From a settler colonial analysis, the NSEA presents the possibility for the disruption of settler colonial elimination by providing spaces to pursue avenues of decolonizing educational practices. However, there is a gap in the literature that critically analyzes the NSEA as disrupting the assimilatory frameworks which have plagued Diné and Indian education in general or if the NSEA reproduces settler colonial framings of education. The NSEA amends, reorganizes, and updates old language of Title Two and Title Ten of the Navajo Nation Code. McCarty (2013) identifies three core components of the NSEA as the elevation of the Division of Navajo Education to the Department of Diné Education (DODE) comparable to state department of education, creates the position of the Navajo Superintendent of schools, and creates a Navajo Nation Board of Education

(NNBOE) to carry out duties in conjunction with the DODE and Navajo Superintendent. The significance of the establishments of DODE, Navajo Superintendent, and the Navajo Board of Education is the creation of a structure that is capable of assuming direct control of schools on the Navajo Nation. By creating a structure that has the capacity, authority, and resources to operate schools, the Navajo Nation can challenge the states of Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah over the control of public schools. Cody (2012) highlights the significance of Diné control of schooling as the establishment and enactment of education policy that supports Diné language as the language of instruction and Diné epistemology and pedagogy in curriculum and practice.

The DODE is established under the executive branch of the Navajo Nation Government as the administrative agency within the Navajo Nation with responsibility and authority for implementing and enforcing the education laws of the Navajo Nation (Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act of 2005, Sec. 4: 1801). Through the DODE the NNBOE is also responsible for establishing and implementing curriculum, standards, standardized tests, and consolidate Diné language and cultural knowledge within public schools (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 106.3.a); establishing procedure and criteria for endorsing Diné Language and culture and certifying teachers in Diné controlled schools (NSEA 2005: Sec.3: 106.3.d.); endorsing or refusing to endorse state curriculum and recommending changes (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 106.3.g.); creating and publishing Diné language and cultural material (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 106.3.i.); Coordinate between the BIA and the states of Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 106.3.i.); Propose education legislation to the Tribal Council Education Committee (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 106.3.k.); and enforce Diné educational law and policy to the fullest extent of the Navajo Nation's jurisdiction (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 106.3.n). The DODE is also charged with inquiring into all schools that service Diné people and determine the impact of education within those schools (NSEA 2005: Sec. 4: 1805.3-5).

The NSEA is a part of a continuum of evolving Diné education policy and a continuation of Diné assertion of sovereignty in education that began with the 1984 Title Ten amendments of the Navajo Nation Code. The 1984 amendments updated the language of the Navajo Nation's education policies and placed an emphasis on the inherent right of the Diné to prescribe and implement policies applicable to all schools on the Navajo Nation or receiving significant funding to service Diné people (NTC 1987: 10 § 104: a). The 1984 amendments placed an emphasis on the integration of language and culture while recognizing the importance of the Diné language to the survival of the Navajo Nation as a separate and distinct nation and the need to develop school staff and faculty who can take these language and cultural needs into consideration (NTC 1987: 10 § 111-112). Navajo Nation Tribal Chairman Peterson Zah noted as one of his administrations goals, "Development of long-range plans for the tribal government to exercise the full powers of a state department of public instruction over all educational programs on the reservation" (Zah 1984, 4).

Through the 1984 amendments the Navajo Nation attempted to gain a measure of oversight of schools on the Navajo Nation through the Navajo Division of Education. The NDOE was designed as the office and oversight agency to unify Bureau of Indian Affair schools (now Bureau of Indian Education) and public schools operated by Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah. The NDOE was also designed to coordinate the various federal, state, and private schools standards, curriculum, and teacher certification requirements (NTC 1987: 10 § 105).

Although the 1984 Title Ten amendments were hailed as a new direction in Diné education policy compared to previous education policies, the ability for the Navajo Nation to implement the amended 1984 education policies was limited due to the Navajo Nations lack of creating language in the Title Ten amendments to invest in the Division of Navajo Education the authority comparable to a state department of education (Emerson 1983). In order to invest the required authority in NDOE the Navajo Nation sought designation for the NDOE as a Tribal Educational Agency but never received federal approval (McCarty 2013).

The 2005 Navajo Nation Sovereignty in Education Act is the result of a long tradition of Diné resistance to the imposition of federal and state concepts and practices of schooling. As American Indian education in general has evolved from the explicit language of the United States federal government to "civilize" American Indian people (Lomawaima and McCarty 2006), toward the language of attempt "development" and "Nation building" framed through economic rationales. As covered in chapter one, the effects of contemporary state and federal schooling, although no longer overtly eliminatory in language, maintain distinct logics of elimination. American Indian and Indigenous people around the world have found ways to create space for Indigenous languages, educational practices, and knowledge within settler colonial institutions (Goodyear-Ka'opua 2013). Indigenous peoples have also begun the process of using their world view in creative ways to dream and imagine ways of beings that exist outside of the settler colonial structures and ideologies trough Indigenous theorizing (Cajete 1997).

With the passage of the NSEA, the Navajo Nation tribal council has created an opportunity to reexamine what education is and how it affects Diné people, communities, and the Navajo Nation. Is the NSEA a tool that may aid in a decolonizing agenda? Does the NSEA maintain settler colonial elimination of Indigeneity and sovereignty? In order to understand the potential importance of the NSEA and continue to push a discourse of education that links the political and social objectives of sovereignty and Indigeneity with settler colonialism, I analyze the NSEA through the framework of eliminatory education developed in chapter one. The eliminatory education framework highlights the neoliberal framing of education, the "progress" orientation of schooling, focus on academic "achievement," standardization, white supremacy, settler control, English only policies, U.S. patriotism, deficit framing of American Indian and Diné people's languages and cultures, and narrow definition of education as eliminatory. The framework of decolonizing Diné education derived in chapter two highlights the recentering of Education through Indigenous epistemology, focuses on tribal and local community control, is intergenerational, structured through kinship, views Indigenous language and culture as a benefit, focuses on revitalization of Indigenous language and culture, privileges Indigenous language and knowledge, defines the concept of education more broadly than schooling, place based and contextual as strengthening and reclaiming Indigeneity. Through eliminatory education Indigenous connections to land are eliminated through the elimination of values which place Indigenous peoples into an intimate relationship with land and places Indigenous peoples into the settler hegemony. A decolonizing education disrupts elimination and develops a framework by which to critique and challenge settler colonialism due to settler structures principles, values, and

beliefs conflicting with Indigenous ways of being. The goal of this analysis is to highlight those aspects of the NSEA which may be eliminatory or decolonizing.

Before I begin this analysis it is important to discuss the relationship between elimination and policy and decolonization and policy. Chapter one highlighted the historic relationship of American Indian education policy and the practices of educational elimination. It is important to link policy to practice as Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) argue a study of policy alone does not give a complete picture of American Indian education but requires an understanding of those practices which are framed and influenced by policy. As Culturally Responsive Schooling examples discussed in chapter two illustrated, despite eliminatory policies of No Child Left Behind, local communities created spaces to practice Indigenous and what I argued in chapter two were decolonizing education practices. However, these decolonizing practices were contained. Goodyear-Ka'opua (2013) argues, despite the ability for Hawaiian charter schools to disrupt many of the eliminatory educational practices of settler schooling, the larger policies of mandated high stakes standardized testing and state standards have worked to contain decolonizing practices. Therefore, even when Indigenous peoples negotiate the settler spaces of schooling to create decolonizing practices policy remains a major influence in guiding eliminatory educational practices.

As was documented in chapter one, contemporary neoliberal policies have influenced federal educational policies of NCLB and Common Core State Standards which continue a tradition of federal and state top down paternal dictating of Indian education and the settler logic of containment. Neoliberal ideologies frame federal education policy leading to the eliminatory practices of standardized testing, the legitimization of certain knowledge, accountability, the marketization of schools, the commodification of student bodies, and English only language policies (Phoenix 2004). Chapter two highlighted the eliminatory effects NCLB had on Diné language and knowledge through the phenomena of teaching to the test, demonstrating the real effects policy has in orienting and framing eliminatory education practices.

Just as policies of "civilization" and their contemporary neoliberal form influence eliminatory educational practices, the NSEA potentially creates the space for decolonizing educational practices through the establishment of a Diné controlled education system. However the passage of the NSEA does not guarantee acts of decolonization will emerge, what it potentially does is create a point of leverage and a guide to action. At the core of this analysis is a critical investigation into what aspects of the NSEA guides Diné education to potentially maintain Diné elimination and decolonization. Therefore to analyze the NSEA as eliminatory or decolonizing is not to argue the mere passage of the NSEA leads to elimination or decolonization but that it may create a useful framework and guide for leveraging political, economic, and social forces for practices of elimination or decolonization.

Given the reality that federal education policy has had the effect eliminating Indigeneity, the NSEA becomes important legislation for potentially disrupting and intervening in educational elimination. As was discussed above, policy provides a political and legal guide for actualizing practice. An example of the potential leverage policy provides can be found in the Hawaiian context. Hawaiian is recognized as an official state language in Hawaii which has provided an important leverage point for Hawaiian communities to argue for the use of Hawaiian language in state operated and controlled schools (Warner 2001). The importance of policy lies in the ability to create points of leverage that can be deployed for communities to accomplish goals such as indigenizing and reclaiming education. The NSEA has the potential to provide the political leverage to pursue a decolonizing educational agenda or, maintain the status quo of educational elimination. In either case it is important to understand the framing of Diné education in order to disrupt potential avenues for educational elimination supported in the NSEA or find avenues which create greater leverage for decolonization.

In the Diné context the study of decolonizing policy becomes complex when the Navajo Nation is analyzed through the lens of settler colonialism. The Navajo Nation emerged out of the Navajo Business Council as a mechanism for the United States government to interface with Diné people collectively. The purpose of the Business Council was not for Diné people to govern themselves but for the United States to award sub-surface mineral leases to mining industries (Iverson 2002a). Although the Navajo Nation Tribal Council has evolved from its original function and structure as a business council, the Tribal Council can still be critiqued as a largely imposed governing structure. The Navajo Nation has modeled itself after the United States as "the" model of a modern nation state. Although the Navajo Nation is comprised of uniquely Diné institutions and governing practices such as the Diné Peace Making Court, and the inclusion of Diné Fundamental Law in the Navajo Nation Code (Lee and Lee 2012), the logic of settler colonial containment has limited the deployment of Diné Indigeneity within the Navajo Nation government. What this analysis amounts to is a critical questioning of the NSEA as a tool for decolonization when it emerges as legislation passed and structured through

a Diné governance structure through concepts of sovereignty framed through settler colonial concepts of nation state governance and sovereignty.

This research recognizes the Navajo Nation as a product of- and a settler colonial structure of governance itself. This point is important point to make because it does not assume Diné policy makers and the Navajo Nation are not decolonized themselves and therefore does not assume the NSEA is inherently decolonizing. However, this analysis of the NSEA emerging from the colonized structure of the Navajo Nation does not diminish the potential for the NSEA to be used as a tool for decolonization. I defined decolonization in chapter two as a process. When the NSEA is viewed as a part of the process of decolonization and not the ends, than the critique of the NSEA emerging and ultimately being legitimized through the settler colonial structure of the Navajo Nation, does not delegitimize the NSEA as potentially decolonizing. The NSEA can be positioned as a tool that can be further built upon.

Policy Analysis

When analyzing the decolonizing potential of the NSEA I will deploy the decolonizing educational framework developed in chapter two and eliminatory framework from chapter one. The eliminatory framework highlights settler colonial policy and practices that eliminate Indigeneity through the socialization of capitalist values, white supremacy, and modernity through the "hidden curriculum." Those practices and policies which support educational elimination in neoliberal schooling are English only policies, standardized testing, standardizing knowledge and language, and progress orienting (Eurocentric curriculum), and containing Indigenous knowledge and language as deficient. A decolonizing

framework of education reframes education through Indigenous epistemology whereby Indigenous values related to interconnectedness, kinship, language and land are taught, reestablishing and reclaiming markers of what Wolfe (2006) calls "Indigenous permanency." Practices and policy which support a decolonizing education include local community control, contextualizing of knowledge to local Indigenous communities and ways of life, use of Indigenous language as the medium of instruction, reconnecting communities to each other and land, Indigenous teachers, reframing of Indigenous language and culture as beneficial.

The NSEA does three general things. The purposes of the NSEA is to "establish the Navajo Nation Board of Education, to establish the Navajo Nation Department of Diné Education, to confirm the commitment of the Navajo Nation to the education of the Diné People, to repeal obsolete language and to update and reorganize the existing language of Titles 10 and 2 of the Navajo Nation Code." (NSEA 2005: Sec 1). In this section the relevant amendments and changes to the Navajo Nation's policy are described and analyzed through the frameworks of eliminatory education and decolonizing education. I begin with an analysis of the aspects of the NSEA that are Eliminatory and containing. I then analyze those aspects of the NSEA that are potentially decolonizing. I conclude by discussing how the decolonizing aspects of the NSEA can be informed by CRS and Indigenous education examples.

Elimination and Containment

The overall framing of the concepts of education and sovereignty are settler colonial in nature. The NSEA frames sovereignty through discourse on "inherent rights" and "authority" of the Navajo Nation over education and through the deployment of NSEA itself. The NSEA frames sovereignty through a nation state model in its establishment of governmental departments, positions, powers and authorities that mirror state and federal governmental mechanisms for governing schooling.

As discussed earlier, the DODE is established under the executive branch of the Navajo Nation Government as the administrative agency within the Navajo Nation with responsibility and authority for implementing and enforcing the education laws of the Navajo Nation (NSEA 2005: Sec. 4: 1801). Through the DODE the NNBOE is also responsible for establishing and implementing curriculum, standards, standardized tests, and consolidate Diné language and cultural knowledge within public schools (NSEA 2005: Sec 3. 106.3.a); establishing procedure and criteria for endorsing Diné Language and culture and certifying teachers in Diné controlled schools (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 106.3.d.); endorsing or refusing to endorse state curriculum and recommending changes (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 106.3.g.); creating and publishing Diné language and cultural material (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 106.3.i.); Coordinate between the BIA and the states of Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3.106.3.i.); Propose education legislation to the Tribal Council Education Committee (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 106.3.k.); and enforce Diné educational law and policy to the fullest extent of the Navajo Nation's jurisdiction (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 106.3.n). The DODE is also charged with inquiring into all schools that service Diné people and determine the impact of education within those schools (NSEA 2005: Sec. 4: 1805.3-5).

The NSEA's mirroring of federal and state education systems through the establishment of the DODE, NBOE, and Navajo Superintendent of Schools (NSEA 2005), provides evidence the Navajo Nation frames "sovereignty" though the framework

of nation state sovereignty. From this analysis the concept of Diné "sovereignty in education" is better conceptualized as Diné control over schooling. The NSEA is primarily concerned with schooling having no other reference to education occurring outside of the institution of schooling. As Lee (2013) highlighted, the NSEA is primarily concerned with taking control of public schools. In framing education in this way, the NSEA takes on characteristics of elimination and containment by not recognizing other forms of education that may exist and emerge from a Diné context. In particular Diné epistemology is not utilized to inform what education is. The absence of other forms of education in the NSEA, such as SNBH, positions Diné language and culture contained within the institution of schooling. Although this is not the intent of the NSEA the NSEA's silence on other forms of education outside of schooling is telling of the framing of education as schooling.

Alfred (2009) views decolonization as not just an act of gaining control over institutions and systems but also in the act of replacing institutions and systems to conform to values, principles, and beliefs, of Indigenous peoples. Alfred (2009) recalls, after the Mohawk Nation gained control over various facets of government, little changed. Control meant little when the institutions that were being controlled remained firmly rooted in colonial logics.

The Navajo Nation has developed a system to control schooling but has left the framing of education to remain rooted in settler colonial concepts of education, schooling. Chapter three outlined SNBH as a framework of education that is rooted in Diné epistemology. The NSEA however, does not attempt to frame education through a Diné epistemology. Instead schooling remains the primary means education is framed and is therefore a marker of eliminatory education. In this specific context what is eliminated are Diné ways of defining and practicing education that are not limited to the formal state system or settler institutions.

The discourse of "sovereignty in education" is framed through an educational elimination framework that supports the notion of "formal" education and the marriage between schooling, development, and the nation state. A discourse of control frames the struggle over education as the placement of Indian individuals within positions of power in pre-established structures of settler schooling. What this highlights is the narrow definition of education as schooling. Within this framework it is assumed that by gaining access to positions of power within faculty, staff, and administrative positions Diné people will have control of education. However, as I have highlighted the problem does not solely rely in gaining access to positions of power but in the way the discourse of education deploys colonial structures of schooling to co-opt the discourse of Diné education.

The NSEA legitimizes state and federal framing of education through the emphasis placed on schooling and the governance of schooling. The emphasis on settler framing of education is indicative of the negotiation between Navajo sovereignty and state and federal control over education. From a framework of educational elimination the framing of schooling through nation state sovereignty and settler concepts of schooling contains Diné epistemological concepts of education. This is not to dismiss the NSEA as serving no potential purpose to a decolonizing project. In the context of decolonization as a process the NSEA negotiates known means of influencing schooling, settler structures and framing of education. Just as the 1984 amendments to Title Ten

introduced Diné language and culture as serious aspects of educational policy, the NSEA introduces new mechanisms and language into the discourse of sovereignty in education. However, this analysis remains critical of the NSEA as potentially used to legitimize settler framing of education as contained to the institution of schooling.

The primary means the Navajo Nation uses to exert rights to control schooling are the establishments of the Navajo Nation Board of Education (NSEA 2005: Sec 3: 106), Department of Diné Education (NSEA 2005: Sec 4: 1801), and the position of the Navajo Nation Superintendent of schools (NSEA 2005: Sec 4: 1804: A). The Navajo Tribal Council Committee on Education takes direct oversight over the Navajo Nation Board of Education and the Department of Diné Education. The Navajo Nation Board of Education has oversight over the Navajo Superintendent of schools and the DODE. Under this new governing educational structure and claims to authority and inherent rights to education, the NNBOE is invested with "overseeing the operation of all schools serving the Navajo Nation, either directly if under the immediate jurisdiction of the Navajo Nation, or if operated by another government, by joint powers agreements, memoranda of understanding/agreement, cooperative agreements or other appropriate intergovernmental instruments" (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 106. A).

The NSEA outlines the powers of the NNBOE as monitoring schools on the Navajo Nation (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 106: G) and through the DODE to implement and enforce educational laws of the Navajo Nation (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 107). The NNBOE effectively becomes comparable to state boards of education in the context of those schools under the jurisdiction of the Navajo Nation, schools being federally funded through PL 93-638 and PL 100-297 (NSEA 2005). However, those schools which are

state funded do not come under the jurisdiction of NNBOE (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3.106: A). The establishment of the NNBOE and the powers and authority invested in the Board shifts the center of power regarding education to the Navajo Nation government and away from school boards who are not under Diné control. In the context of public schools the NNBOE does not exert direct authority but in effect challenges the authority of public school boards. The establishment of the NNBOE is the placing of sovereignty in education into practice as the NNBOE becomes the mechanism by which sovereignty is deployed. From the lens of decolonizing education, the establishment of the NNBOE is a disruption, or in the case of public schools, an intervention in the centering of power and authority in the federal and state governments that has been a staple of Indian education.

However, the NSEA also recognizes states have "legitimate authority" over education (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 106. A). "At the same time, the Navajo Nation recognizes the legitimate authority of the actual education provider, whether state, federal, community controlled, charter, or private. The Navajo Nation commits itself, whenever possible, to work cooperatively with all education providers serving Navajo youth or adults or with responsibilities for serving Navajo students to assure the achievement of the educational goals of the Navajo Nation established through these policies and applicable Navajo Nation laws" (Navajo Tribal Council 1987, 182). However, the Navajo Nation attempts to negotiate the recognition of authority by intervening in the top down approach of Indian education. "The Navajo Nation Board of Education shall coordinate with other governmental and educational entities in developing and implementing appropriate educational standards for school systems serving the Navajo Nation, including the teaching of Navajo language and culture" (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 109).

Although the Navajo Nation does not have complete control over public schools a mechanism is created to ensure the Navajo Nation has some ability to challenge state standards and pressure states into teaching Diné language and culture.

However, from an educational elimination framework the recognition of the "legitimate authority" of other state agencies acts to eliminate and contain Diné sovereignty over education. The simultaneous investment of power and authority within the Navajo Nation and "other governmental agencies" is contradictory to a decolonizing project but when decolonization is understood as a process the control over federally funded schooling and the challenging of state authority in public schools on the Navajo Nation can be viewed as a part of the process of decolonization. The NSEA negotiates the space between Diné sovereignty and state sovereignty. Under such a negotiation the NSEA can be framed as the settler colonial logic of containment. Diné sovereignty over education is contained through the states of Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico's ability to control funding of public schools. As was discussed through the example of Rough Rock Demonstration School by McCarty (2002) in chapter one and by Goodyear-Ka'opua (2013), funding has been used as a mechanism to establish authority and contain the use of Indigenous languages, knowledge, and pedagogy based by funders establishing requirements for funding. In the context of the state, control and authority over schooling is divested from the Diné and invested in state policy makers. The NSEA recognizes the various states' authority and in doing so acknowledges settler colonial control of schooling as legitimate (NSEA 2005: Sec 3: 106. A). The white supremacist project, neoliberal framing of education, and deficit framing of Indian people go unabated or at the most disruption of such aspects of settler schooling remain at the discretion of

settlers. However, the NSEA attempts to negotiate the loss of control over state funded schools by introducing mechanism to monitor state educational curriculum and practices in public schools.

Another mechanism of containment appears in the NSEA's ambiguity towards local community control of schooling. The NNBOE and DODE are invested with the authority and right to take direct control of local school boards. In one case the DODE illegally disbanded a local school board in an attempt to take direct control (Gross 2014). Diné educational practitioners have also debated the creation of a Diné department of education because of the consolidation of power in said department (Iverson 2002a). In this context the NSEAs structuring of education through the NNBOE and DODE potentially recreates settler colonial structures of schooling and at least contains the potential for decolonizing practices by not providing stronger language or mechanisms for Diné communities to take a measure of local control and authority in deciding what context specific education may be appropriate for their local needs.

The eliminatory and containing aspects of the NSEA are serious concerns for a Diné decolonizing education project but the eliminatory aspects are only parts of a larger policy. It is important to point out the eliminatory aspects of the NSEA in order to better navigate and strategically plan decolonizing strategies in those areas of the NSEA that support a decolonizing education project.

Decolonization

The mission statement of the 2005 Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act reads: "It is the educational mission of the Navajo Nation to promote and foster lifelong learning for Diné people, and to protect the culture integrity and sovereignty of the Navajo Nation." (NSEA 2005: Sec. 2) The NSEA specifically highlights the teaching of the Diné language and culture as mandatory for schools operating on the Navajo Nation.

As was discussed in chapter one, settler schooling has attempted to eliminate Indigeneity and Diné sovereignty. The NSEA's mission addresses these eliminatory effects of settler schooling by linking the concept of education to the political project of defending, strengthening, and deploying Diné sovereignty. The mission statement also provides a crucial link between "cultural integrity" and education. Compared to the 1984 Navajo Education policy mission statement, the NSEA decenters the English language, American culture, United States citizenship, and revises language that frames Diné people as "human resources" (NTC 1978: 10 §102). Although the NSEA includes the learning of English language and culture as aspects of curriculum, compared to the 1984 amendments the mission statement of the NSEA reframes the purpose of Diné education to challenge elimination of Diné Indigeneity and sovereignty.

Section 3, statute 1.a., Responsibilities and Authority of the Navajo Nation reaffirms the Subchapter 2 subsection 104 of the 1984 Title Ten amendments which position the Navajo Nation that education is an inherent right which the Navajo Nation can exert authority over. "The Navajo Nation has the authority and an inherent right to exercise its responsibility to the Navajo People for their education by prescribing and implementing educational laws and policies applicable to all schools serving the Navajo Nation and all educational programs receiving significant funding for the education of Navajo youth or adults" (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 1.a). Significant amendments are made with the addition of the Navajo Nation claiming "authority" and an "inherent right" where the 1984 amendments only read "inherent right" (NTC 1987: 10 § 104)

A decolonizing educational framework marks tribal control over education as a decolonizing act. In the case of the NSEA the ability of the Navajo Nation to exert authority over issues of schooling is a direct challenge to top down educational elimination. The language of "inherent rights" also recognizes the ability for the Navajo Nation to deploy sovereignty that has not been relinquished, in doing so education is reframed through politicizing and acknowledging the inability for states to provide a meaningful and adequate education to Diné people. In other words the establishment of the NSEA is a symbol of resistance and decolonization in itself because it attempts to transform the established settler norms of schooling. In this context the NSEA disrupts the narrative of Diné complacency to settler colonialism and provides language to challenge settler logics for settler control of Diné education.

Further the NSEA also claims the right of the Navajo Nation to prescribe and implement educational law as oppose to the original 1984 amendments of only educational "policy." Section 3. Subsection 1.b further distinguishes the NSEA from previous policy by outlining the Navajo Nations divestment of authority and ability to create educational legislation. The change in language of subsection 104 reflects the NSEA intended shift to invest authority in the Diné government. "The Education Committee of the Navajo Nation Council has oversight authority over the Navajo Nation Board of Education, Department of Diné Education, and over the implementation of education legislation. The Committee exercises such powers and responsibilities over Navajo education as are prescribed by its Plan of Operation (2 NNC § 481, et. seq.) and in other Navajo Nation laws. The Education Committee exercises oversight responsibility regarding the recruitment and operation of post-secondary education programs within the Navajo Nation" (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 1.B.) Further, Sec. 4: 484 B: 1-7 describes the Education Committee's powers as the ability to promulgate regulations, policies and procedures, to implement Navajo Education Laws" (NSEA 2005: Sec. 4: 484.B.1-7).

The claims to authority, inherent rights, and the ability to prescribe and implement educational law and policy form the major departure and are the focus of this analysis. The new language of the NSEA positions the Navajo Nation with agency the Division of Navajo Education lacked (Emerson 1983). The claiming of authority and ability to implement educational law is a decolonizing act as it disrupts settler top down and paternalistic approaches to Diné education. The normative settler colonial model of eliminating Diné sovereignty through the undermining of Diné control over educational affairs can potentially be disrupted through the claims of the NSEA. Inherent rights and authority are directly tied to concepts of sovereignty and relate to education as a means to create the space to challenge normative settler schooling by providing support to Diné language, Diné Culture, and values of *Ke*. As will be addressed later in this chapter the NSEA provides policy support for the use of Diné language and Diné studies within all schools on the Navajo Nation.

The establishment of the DODE and the Navajo Superintendent of Schools, like the NNBOE, create Navajo governmental agencies that are comparable to state and federal educational agencies. The DODE and Navajo Superintendent further build capacity for the Navajo Nation to operate its schooling system in the manner that states' of the union operate their schooling systems. Unlike the previous Division of Navajo Education the DODE is invested with the authority and power to implement and enforce Navajo Nation educational laws. The eliminatory aspects of educational law making that

was previously wielded by federal and state law makers is disrupted by the emergence of the Navajo Nation as a third sovereign that invests within itself the ability to determine the legality of practices in education. However, The NSEA makes reservations regarding state controlled public schools but intervenes in the authority of states' monopoly over establishing curriculum by tasking the DODE with consulting public schools on implementing Diné language and culture within curriculum. The NSEA again attempts to negotiate Diné claims to sovereignty in education and state jurisdiction over public schooling through the claiming of power for the DODE to challenge state power and legitimacy. The mechanism of endorsing state curriculum provides a point of leverage through official stances on state curriculum, better known as the "name and shame" tactic. Again, Diné sovereignty in education is contained and limited but the NSEA also challenges state power by creating mechanisms in which to monitor and critique state educational curriculum and practices.

The NSEA also makes specific direction in the realms of curriculum, language, and culture. Under the Navajo Nation Diné Language Act established through NSEA, the Diné language is mandated as a language of instruction to the greatest practical extent (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 52); The Diné Language Act applies specifically to Navajo Head Starts (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 53) but the Diné Language Act recognizes the importance of "continuing and perpetuating the Navajo (Diné) language to the survival of the Navajo Nation" (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 52), and that, "The Navajo (Diné) language must be used to ensure the survival of the Navajo (Diné) people to maintain the Navajo (Diné) way of life, and to preserve and perpetuate the Navajo Nation as a sovereign nation" (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 53). Those schools, in which the Navajo Nation claims jurisdiction over, federally funded, are immediately impacted and mandated to adhere to Diné education law and policy. The Navajo Nation has the ability to take direct control of these schools and begin to align curriculum, teacher certification, and standards with those prescribed by the DODE. In these cases the Navajo Nation has the ability to directly influence the use of Diné language as the language of instruction and Diné culture as a foundation to contextualizing knowledge. From a decolonizing education framework the direct control of schools represents a significant disruption of unilateral non-Diné control over schooling creating a potential space to reinforce Indigeneity

As Lee (2014) argues, the establishment of the NSEA begins the process of challenging state control over public schooling. Although the mechanisms of sovereignty in education may be rooted in settler concepts and structures of education, the NSEA is an important leverage point in acknowledging the relationship between the project of defending, strengthening, and deploying Diné sovereignty and education. Specifically the NSEA attempts to align Navajo language and culture with the survival of the Navajo people and Navajo Nation. Schooling becomes a vehicle in which to strengthen Navajo sovereignty through Indigeneity. Where this becomes clear in the language of the NSEA is in the connection between the continual existence of the Navajo language and the continued existence of the Navajo people as a distinct and unique people. The Navajo language acts as a marker of Navajo uniqueness which in the context of this study can be reframed as a discourse of Indigeneity. "The instruction program shall foster competence in both the English and Navajo language with knowledge of both American and Navajo culture. The instruction programs shall address character development based upon the

concept of Diné K'é and shall be implemented at appropriate grade levels at all schools serving the Navajo Nation" (NSEA 2005: Sec.3: 109. A).

Settler schooling has attempted to establish English as the language of instruction and American Indian languages, where present, have often been treated as foreign languages and been relegated to pedagogies that teach Navajo language as a foreign language by emphasizing literacy, phonics, and grammar. The shift in using the language as the language of instruction presents a disruption to the settler colonial containment of Indigenous languages to marginalized roles within schools. The NSEA does not mandate immersion schooling but does demand state students should have access to instruction in the Navajo language if they so choose. This specific policy point is not limited to only Diné controlled schools but all schools serving the Navajo Nation further challenging state control over public schools. Instruction in the Diné language also creates a space to reframe knowledge due to the Diné languages foundation within a Diné epistemology. Through the Diné language a Diné worldview can potentially be reproduced or reinforced.

Similarly the NSEA explicitly seeks to disrupt Euro-centric curriculum in all schools serving the Navajo Nation by demanding Diné-centric studies be included within curriculum. "The courses or course content that develops knowledge, understanding and respect for Navajo culture, history, civics and social studies shall be included in the curriculum of every school serving the Navajo Nation" (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 112). Despite recognition of state authority in public schools on the Navajo Nation the NSEA outlines the Navajo Nation's specific interest in creating access to Diné centric-studies to Diné students. Just like the case of Diné language being used as the language of

instruction in all schools the NSEA also challenges state curriculum in the area of Diné studies.

Aside from specific curriculum the NSEA also focuses on developing Diné cultural awareness in school staff and faculty. "All schools and school districts serving the Navajo Nation shall develop appropriate Navajo culture awareness and sensitivity programs as an integral part of their in-service training programs for all personnel" (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 113). Also "Counseling staff shall have an awareness of Navajo culture and tradition, particularly as these relate to the individual needs and life circumstances of the students and their families. The cultural program shall be concerned with the physical, cultural, intellectual, vocational and emotional growth of each student" (NSEA 2005: Sec. 3: 116). Although these amendments to the NSEA do not directly affect schooling, they emphasize the focus of Diné language and culture in schooling.

Where the NSEA disrupts eliminatory education is in the legitimizing of Diné language and culture in Diné controlled schools. The Diné Language Act in particular highlights the importance the NSEA places on Diné language and its relationship to sovereignty and the survival of the Diné people. The act applies specifically to the Diné run Head Start program but is indicative of the overall changes the NSEA attempts to create. In those schools which the Navajo Nation does not have jurisdiction the NSEA asserts Diné authority to intervene in state and federal educational practices through monitoring Diné student's achievement, state and federal curriculum, and creating Diné governmental agencies to interface with state and federal educational agencies. The NSEA specifically focuses on the DODE's capacity to endorse or choose not to endorse state curriculum and recommend curriculum changes to states.

The emphasis on Diné language and culture highlights the Navajo Nation's attempt to further influence non-Diné controlled schooling on the Navajo Nation as an act of negotiation with settler structures of schooling. Despite the recognition of state and federal authority within non-Diné controlled schools the NSEA does not leave the federal and state educational agencies to their own devices but attempts to intervene in the monopoly state and federal agencies have over Diné education through influence over curriculum and the claim to a right to monitor public schools on the Navajo Nation. As highlighted in chapter one the Navajo Nation Tribal Council has historically taken a passive governing role in relation to state schooling. The NSEA however, directly challenges the states of Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah over the control of education in the form of schooling.

Discussion

The NSEA is neither eliminatory nor decolonizing, it has elements of both. From an educational elimination framework the NSEA is framed through the settler concept of education and is more aligned with a discourse of "control of education" rather than "sovereignty in education." Sovereignty in education implies the complete ownership of education in a Diné specific way. The NSEA however recreates settler schooling structures of the settler state but places Diné people at the center of power and authority. This is not to say that control is not decolonizing but that control can be conflated with decolonization when the colonial structure of schooling is not also disrupted. The settler structure of schooling is not designed to accommodate Diné ways of educating and Diné knowledge as covered in chapter one. The NSEA's framing of education through schooling leads to another challenge, the attempt to take control of state public schools. What is problematic about framing education as schooling when challenging state authority is that it limits the avenues by which the Navajo Nation and more importantly local communities can claim authority due to the weight placed on funding for establishing power and control. If the Navajo Nation were to define Education through the concept of SNBH schools can be decentered and gaining funding for schools becomes less important. Although there may be new challenges, such as dreaming and envisioning what education that is not centered through schooling might look like, the disengagement from the settler structure of schooling disengages Diné people from the funding requirement that currently impedes Diné control over public schooling.

What is interesting about the NSEA is not just what it says but what it does not say. The language of the NSEA is positioned against state control of schooling and acknowledges the importance of the Diné language to the survival of the Diné as a people but does not engage in a heavier critique of settler schooling. The implication is that settler schooling has contributed to language loss but the NSEA does not make this connection clear. The inability for the Act to establish clear parameters of why it is important lends itself to conflation. Through the framework of decolonizing education the NSEA challenges white supremacy, deficient framing of Diné language and culture, settler control of Diné schooling, and English only policies by privileging and defending the use of Diné language, knowledge, values, and control. However the NSEA leaves the door open for educational elimination by emulating state structures of education and remaining silent on the goals and purpose of education. Instead it can be assumed that achievement and neoliberal goals of schooling remains the purpose of a Diné controlled school system.

What the NSEA does not do is develop Diné frameworks of education and comment on local control of education. The Eliminatory markers of progress orientation of schooling and standardization are not questioned because of the schooling framework of Diné education. It is important that the NSEA in its current form does not address these aspects of elimination as it allows for a decolonizing project to take these limitations of the NSEA into consideration. It also provides points for Diné people to further develop strategically ways to challenge and further develop off of the NSEA towards more decolonizing form of education.

The Diné must reframe schooling from achievement based goals towards goals of language and cultural revitalization. The research on CRS demonstrates regardless of intentionality of raising achievement, the results will be the raising of Indigenous children's test scores in the areas of math and English reading and writing (Berry 1968; Castagno and Brayboy 2008; Deyhle and Swisher 1997). The reframing of schooling through a language revitalization project centers schooling as a decolonizing project. When the NSEA is placed within the context of the larger history of Indian education, Diné education, and Diné education policies, the decolonizing aspects are more obvious. Despite the potential for the NSEA to align with educational elimination the language of sovereignty, the creation of an educational structure that rivals state and federal educational agencies, and the investing of power and authority of the Navajo Nation to influence school curriculum can potentially serve as a part of a larger process of decolonization. The limitation of framing education through schooling may be symptomatic of settler colonialisms elimination of Diné concepts of education and as Freire (2000) fear of the responsibility of taking control over education. In other words the solutions to the disastrous policies of Indian education policy and practices have traditionally been taken from the settler colonial context because other forms of education have been eliminated or delegitimized in the context of larger hegemonic social structures, primary economic and societal, that aligns with and contributes to the maintenance of schooling. It is somewhat understandable that the solutions to educational problems are drawn from established structures of schooling because Diné people have known little else. The question then becomes how can the NSEA be used to decolonize education now, and to continue to push the process of decolonization?

It is important to criticize the NSEA as maintaining settler colonial concepts and structures but in doing so there is a need to acknowledge the larger context of settler colonialism and its effects on the Navajo Nation. This is not to invalidate the critique of the NSEA as having eliminatory aspects but to provide a more useful understanding of why the NSEA maintains settler colonial structures. When placed into a larger context, the NSEA cannot be expected to address the issues of settler colonialism as a single policy, especially when the environment the policy has been formed in has been framed through settler colonial governance. The Navajo Nation's economic entanglement with the United States, structure of governance, loss of Diné knowledge, language, and influence from settler society contribute to settler colonialism. In order to address settler colonialism in education settler colonialism in other areas of Diné life, society, economy, and governance must also be addressed lest decolonization fall into the settler colonial trap of attempting to use education and more specifically schooling as a cure all for societal ills.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Settler colonialism is a land based project that seeks the elimination of Indigenous peoples from the land (Wolfe 2006). This research has demonstrated how the settler concept of education, schooling, has been utilized as a mechanism of elimination through the elimination of Indigeneity and the production of settler values which disconnect Indigenous peoples from the land. As the physical frontier vanished the new frontier of Indigeneity emerged for the settler colonial project to eliminate. The policies aimed to "civilize" American Indian peoples have transformed in language but not intent. Contemporary "civilization" is framed as economic development which schooling has become tied to through neoliberal educational policies (Phoenix 2005). The result is Indigenous peoples becoming oriented toward values which commodity land and natural resources therefore Indigenous permanence is eliminated.

Chapter one traced the eliminatory framing of Indian education since the 1880s to its contemporary form as neoliberal development that continues the settler framing of Indigenous peoples as deficient. Through an understanding of the eliminatory history of schooling for American Indian and Diné people I developed an educational eliminatory framework that highlights the institution of settler schooling, white supremacy, neoliberalism, progress orientation, standardization, settler control of schooling, English only instruction and testing, as eliminatory mechanisms. The most infamous example of settler schooling was the federal American Indian boarding schools experiment to eliminate American Indian and Diné people. The experiment ultimately failed (Deloria and Wildcat 2001) but the reverberating effects of Indian boarding schools disruption of Indigeneity have yet to be fully understood (Waziyatawin 2005). Today the mechanisms of elimination have become more subtle compared to the forceful and physically violent boarding school era but the eliminatory effects on American Indian and Diné children have remained consistent. The new tactics of elimination are socialization (Deloria and Wildcat 2001), habitualization (Grande 2004) and disciplining (Smith 2012) Indigenous people to learn the hegemonic "hidden curriculum." The attempts of early missionaries to "civilize" Indigenous peoples by converting them to the Christian faith bares a strong resemblance to contemporary neoliberal policies that frame Indigenous peoples as in need of adopting settler values in order to "develop" because both projects are rooted in the settler logic of elimination.

Chapter one also highlighted how schooling came to dominate education through the elimination of the Diné subsistence economy and an increased reliance and dependence on the United States settler society's wage economy. With a changing economy or rather the forcing of a new way of life on Diné people a need to develop the necessary skills to provide a living for Diné people arose (Francisconi 1998). Education became a major component of the "rehabilitation" of the Navajo economy after livestock reduction and due to the destruction of the sheep based economy (Iverson 2002a). In reframing Diné society through the U.S. and world economy, Diné social problems and solutions began to be framed as a matter of economic development. The Diné philosophy of living a good life, Sa'ah Naaghai Bik'eh Hozhoo, was eliminated through the new framing of Diné reality by settler society. The shift from federal boarding schools to state public schooling also represents a major changing point in eliminatory education as Indian children were subjected to the hegemonic hidden curriculum, not as Indian children but as American citizens. The elimination of the political status of American Indian peoples through their inclusion in the public schooling system is indicative of termination policies goal of ending the federal relationship with American Indian people and is representative of the methods state public schools use to "Americanize" Diné and American Indian people.

Despite facing elimination Diné people were successful in resisting settler colonial imposition of schooling well into the 1950s and 1960s through the refusal to send children to school. It is only recently that public schooling has become the norm for Diné people (Roessel 1979). Diné children resisted being sent to boarding schools by attempting to run away and make their way back home while Diné community members such as Black Horse physically resisted sending Diné children to schools (Left-Handed Mexican Clansmen, Young and Williams 1952). Today Indigenous communities in the United States and around the world are developing new frameworks, policies, and practices to disrupt settler colonial elimination and work towards decolonizing goals such as language revitalization. It is within this genealogy of Indigenous and Diné resistance to settle colonialism that the 2005 Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act emerges. The Navajo Nation has slowly changed and developed its education policy to address Diné language shift and concerns over the equity of schooling Diné children received compared to their non-Indian middle class peers (Navajo Tribe 1984, NTC 1987: 10 § 102). The 1984 amendments to Title Ten of the Navajo Nation Code laid the foundation for the NSEA by repositioning Diné language as important to the survival of the Diné people and recognizing Diné people's inherent rights to education. However, as was

demonstrated in chapter three it cannot be assumed that the NSEA is decolonizing or supports decolonizing projects.

When analyzed through the frameworks of educational elimination the NSEA has markers of both decolonizing education and educational elimination. Of particular concern is the framing of education through settler structures of schooling and governance of schooling. The NSEA does not attempt to reframe the discussion of education through Diné epistemology, instead the NSEA positions Diné people as the new authority of settler structures of schooling. In doing so Diné concepts of SNBH are eliminated through the rhetorical framing of education as schooling. SNBH frames Diné education as a broader concept than schooling and focuses on reproducing markers of Diné-ness as a pathway to living a good life. Contemporary neoliberal framings of education however are concerned with "progress," "achievement," and the development of a labor force which can compete in the global economy (Hursh and Martina 2003; Phoenix 2004). The NSEA's silence on how education is framed leaves the door open for the co-option and conflation of the concept of education by settler society. Considering the NSEA's adoption of eliminatory practices such as standardized testing and accountability the Navajo Nation's recent decision to adopt the neoliberal Common Core State Standards (Hearing on Indian Education 2014) adds urgency in the need to be critical in how educational policy is potentially eliminatory as Diné education is eliminated in the name of Diné sovereignty in education.

The NSEA also negotiates the institutions of settler schooling by mandating the use of Diné language and studies within all schools on the Navajo Nation. The NSEA also directly challenges state authority over public schools by developing an educational system that has the capacity to directly control schooling and receive funding from the federal government. In those schools the Navajo Nation has direct control over, such as the Head Start Program, the NSEA establishes policies that mandate the teaching of Diné language and culture as a language of instruction. In those schools which the Navajo Nation has no authority the Navajo Nation intervenes in the top down settler controlled decision making by developing systems to monitor the state and engage in "name and shame" tactics through the approval or disapproval of state curriculum.

The NSEA places the Navajo nation at a critical crossroads. One road leads to the continuation and strengthening of eliminatory practices while the other presents opportunities for decolonization. The roads are not mutually exclusive but they are clearly demarcated with placed in an eliminatory education framework of decolonizing education framework. Principles derived from the literature on Indigenous education and culturally responsive schooling such as framing education through decolonizing efforts such as language revitalization rather than academic achievement, tribal and local community control, context specific curriculum, privileging Diné language and culture as beneficial to learning, community planning and leadership in educational practices, reconnection of multiple generations, supportive leadership, and Diné pedagogy. The NSEA opens spaces for such practices, directly in Navajo controlled schools and indirectly in state controlled schools. Although these practices are contained in the framework of schooling, they provide point of disruption and intervention of schooling. As Roessel (1979) pointed out, schools are centers of Diné cultural genocide. As such a decolonizing project must disrupt settler elimination in schooling. However, control of

schooling should not be the end goal in decolonizing education but merely a part of the processes of decolonization.

The purpose of decolonizing education is the disruption of settler colonial elimination, reconnecting Diné people to place, revitalizing Diné ways of being, and providing a new world view for students from which to further critique settler colonialism. The NSEA potentially pushes the discourse of education to include these goals of decolonization but is ultimately incapable of fully realizing them. When the NSEA is placed in a larger process of decolonization the decolonizing aspects provide points of leverage for further decolonizing projects. The NSEA is useful to a decolonizing project but the eliminatory aspects of the NSEA must be highlighted and negotiated with to avoid recreating settler colonial structures and practices in Diné education.

REFERENCES

- Acrey, Bill P., and New Mexico. 1988. Navajo history to 1846: The land and the people. Shiprock, N.M.: Dept. of Curriculum Materials Development, Central Consolidated School District No. 22.
- Adams, David Wallace. 1995. Education for extinction: American Indians and the boarding school experience, 1875-1928. Lawrence, KN: University Press of Kansas.
- Alfred, Taiaiake. 2005. *Wasase: Indigenous pathways to freedom and action*. Toronto, CAN: University of Toronto Press.
- ——. 2009. Peace, power, righteousness: An Indigenous manifesto. 2nd ed. Don Mills, Ont.; New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Anaya, S. James. *Indigenous peoples in international law*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Archuleta, Margaret, Brenda J. Child, K. Tsianina Lomawaima, and Heard Museum. 2000. Away from home: American Indian boarding school experiences, 1879-2000. Phoenix, AZ: Heard Museum.
- Arviso, Marie, and Wayne Holm. 2001. "Tsehootsooidi Olta" gi Diné Bizaad Bihoo" aah: A Navajo immersion program at Fort Defiance, Arizona." The green book of language revitalization in practice, ed. Leanne Hinton and Ken Hale, 203-215. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Arnove, Robert F. 1997. Neoliberal education policies in Latin American: Arguments in favor and against. In *Education in Latin American: Comparative perspectives*, C. Torres (ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Aronilth, Wilson. 1992. *Foundation of Navajo culture*. Tsaile, AZ: Navajo Community College.
- Au, Wayne. 2013. "Coring social studies within corporate education reform: The Common Core State Standards, social justice, and the politics of knowledge in U.S. schools. *Critical Education*, 4(5): 1-15.
- Bailey, Lynn Robison. 1980. If you take my sheep--: The evolution and conflicts of Navajo pastoralism, 1630-1868. Pasadena, CA: Westernlore Publications.
- Barnhardt, Ray. 2005. "Indigenous knowledge systems and Alaska Native ways of knowing." *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 36(1): 8-23.

- Benally, Herbert J. 1994. "Navajo philosophy of learning and pedagogy." *Journal of Navajo Education*. 12(1): 23-31.
- Bender, Norman J., and Historical Society of New Mexico. *New hope for the Indians: The Grant peace policy and the Navajos in the 1870s.* 1st ed. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Berry, Brewton. 1968. *The education of the American Indians, a survey of the literature*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Brave Heart, Maria and Lemyra M. DeBruyn. 1998. "The American Indian holocaust: Healing historical unresolved grief." *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research*, 8(2): 56-78.
- Brayboy, Bryan McKinley Jones, and Angelina E. Castagno. 2009. "Self-determination through self-education: Culturally responsive schooling for Indigenous students in the USA." *Teaching Education*, 20(1): 31-53.
- Brown, Anthony D. 1980. Research role of American Indian social scientists. *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership*, 7(1): 47-59.
- Byrd, Jodi A. 2011. *The transit of empire: Indigenous critiques of colonialism*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cajete, Gregory. 1997. Look to the mountain: An ecology of Indigenous education. Skyland, NC: Kivakí Press.
- Carnoy, Martin. 1995. "Structural adjustment and the changing face of education." *International Labour Review*, 134(6): 653-673.
- Castagno, Angelina E., and Bryan McKinley Jones Brayboy. 2008. "Culturally responsive schooling for Indigenous youth: A review of the literature." *Review of Educational Research*, 78(4): 941-993.
- Child, Brenda J. 1998. *Boarding school seasons American Indian families*, 1900-1940. Lincoln, NB; London, UK: University of Nebraska Press.
- Choudhary, Trib. 2010. 2009-2010 Comprehensive economic development strategy of the Navajo Nation. Window Rock, AZ: Navajo Tribe.
- Cody, Herman. 2012. The implementation of the Navajo language and culture mandates of the Title X education amendment, Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act of 2005, in Navajo schools. Ph.D. Diss. Arizona State University.

- Davis, Patricia A. 1994. "Thoughts on Diné education." *Journal of Navajo Education*. 12(1): 15-17.
- Demmert Jr, William G., and John C. Towner. 2003. "A review of the research literature on the influences of culturally based education on the academic performance of native American students." Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Lab.
- Department of Diné Education. 2011. *Navajo Nation: alternative accountability workbook.* Window Rock, AZ: Department of Diné Education. http://www.navajonationdode.org/accountability.aspx (accessed April 24, 2015).
- De Voto, Bernard. 1984. *The year of decision, 1846*. New York, NY: Book-of-the-Month Club.
- Deloria, Vine, and Daniel R. Wildcat. 2001. *Power and place: Indian education in America*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Pub.
- Denetdale, Jennifer. 2007. *Reclaiming Diné history: The legacies of Navajo chief Manuelito and Juanita*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Deyhle, Donna. 1986. "Success and failure: A micro-ethnographic comparison of Navajo and Anglo students' perceptions of testing." *Curriculum Inquiry*, 16(4): 365-389.
 - ——. 1995. "Navajo youth and Anglo racism: Cultural integrity and resistance." *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(3): 403-445.
- Deyhle, Donna, and Karen Swisher. 1997. "Research in American Indian and Alaska Native education: From assimilation to self-determination." *Review of Research in Education*, 22: 113-194.
- Emerson, Gloria. 1983. "Navajo education." *Handbook of North American Indians*, 10: 659-671.
- Fanon, Frantz. 2004. The wretched of the Earth. New York, NY: Grove Press.
- Fear-Segal, Jacqueline. 2007. *White man's club: Schools, race, and the struggle of Indian acculturation*. Indigenous education. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press.
- Francisconi, Michael Joseph. 1998. Kinship, capitalism, change: The informal economy of the Navajo, 1868-1995. New York, NY: Garland Publishing.
- Freire, Paulo. 2000. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*, 30th anniversary ed. New York, NY: Continuum.

- Fujikane, Candace. 2008. "Introduction: Asian settler colonialism in the colony of Hawai'i." Asian settler colonialism: From local governance to the habits of everyday life in Hawai'i, Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Y. Okamura (ed.), 1-42. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Fuller, Bruce. 1991. *Growing-up modern: The western state builds third-world schools*. Critical social thought. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Goodyear-Ka' opua, Noelani. 2013. *The seeds we planted: Portraits of a native Hawaiian charter school*. First peoples: New directions in indigenous studies. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Grande, Sandy. 2004. *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought*. Lanham, MD; Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Grinde, Donald A. 2004. "Taking the Indian out of the Indian: US policies of ethnocide through education." *Wicazo Sa Review*, 19(2): 25-32.
- Gross, Michael. 2014. "New battle in turf war over Native education." *Indian Country Today*, September 5th. Accessed April 10th, 2015. http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/2014/09/05/new-battle-turf-war-overnative-education
- Hamilton, Jennifer Anne. 2009. Indigeneity in the courtroom: Law, culture, and the production of difference in North American courts. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Harry, Debra. 2001. "Biopiracy and globalization: Indigenous peoples face a new wave of colonialism." *Indigenous People Council on Biocolonialism*. Accessed on April 4th, 2015. Online www. ipcb. org/publications/other_art/globalization.html.
- Hearing on Indian education: Ensuring the Bureau of Indian Education has the tools necessary to improve. Hearing before the Committee on Indian Affairs, Senate, 2014 113th Cong., 523.
- Henze, Rosemary C., and Lauren Vanett. 1993. "To walk in two worlds—or more? Challenging a common metaphor of Native education." *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 24(2): 116-134.
- Holm, Agnes, and Wayne Holm. 1995. "Navajo language education: Retrospect and prospects." *Bilingual Research Journal*, 19(1): 141-167.
- House, Deborah. 1997. "A Navajo paradigm for long life happiness and for reversing Navajo language shift." *Journal of Navajo Education*, 14(1&2): 45-58.

—.2002. *Language shift among the Navajos: Identity politics and cultural continuity*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

- Hursh, David, and Camille Anne Martina. 2003. "Neoliberalism and schooling in the US: How state and federal government education policies perpetuate inequality." *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 1(2):1-13.
- Ing, Rosalyn N. 1991. "The effects of residential schools on Native child-rearing practices." *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 18: 65-118.
- Iverson, Peter. 2002a. *Diné: A history of the Navajos*. 1st ed. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- ——. Ed. 2002b. "For our Navajo people": Diné letters, speeches and petitions, 1900-1960. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Jacobs, Margaret D. 2009. White mother to a dark race :Settler colonialism, maternalism, and the removal of Indigenous children in the American west and Australia, 1880-1940. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press.
- Johnson, Florian Tom, and Jennifer Legatz. 2006. "Tséhootsooí Diné Bi'ólta'." *Journal* of American Indian Education, 45(2): 26-33.
- Jones, Fred. 1989. "Coming of age in Navajo society: Adult roles and development," Journal of Navajo Education, 6(3): 12-19
- Kelly, Lawrence C. 1968. *The Navajo Indians and federal Indian policy, 1900-1935*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Klug, Beverly J., and Patricia T. Whitfield. 2003. *Widening the circle: Culturally relevant pedagogy for American Indian children*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Klump, J., & McNeir, G. 2005. Culturally responsive practices for student success: A regional sampler. Accessed April 4th, 2015. www.nwrel.org/request/2005 june/textonly.html
- Laenui, Poka. 2011. "Processes of decolonization." In *Reclaiming indigenous voice and vision*, ed. Marie Battiste, 150-160. Vancouver, B.C.: University of British Columbia Press.
- Lee, Lloyd L. 2008. "Reclaiming Indigenous intellectual, political, and geographic space: A path for Navajo Nationhood." *The American Indian Quarterly*, 32(1): 96-110.
 - ——. 2010. "Navajo transformative scholarship in the twenty-first century." *Wicazo Sa Review*, 25(1): 33-45.

—. 2014. "The Navajo Nation and the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples." *Diné perspectives revitalizing and reclaiming Navajo thought*, ed. Lloyd Lee, 170-186. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

- Lee, Lloyd L., and Tiffany S. Lee. 2012. "Navajo cultural autonomy." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 213: 119-126.
- Lee, Tiffany S. 2007. "If they want Navajo to be learned, then they should require it in all schools': Navajo teenagers' experiences, choices, and demands regarding Navajo language." *Wicazo Sa Review*, 22(1): 7-33.
- Left-handed Mexican Clansman, Robert W. Young, and William Morgan. 1952. *The trouble at round rock*. Navajo historical series. Vol. 2. Washington: U.S. Dept. of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Division of Education.
- Lomawaima. K. Tsianina. 1999. "The Unnatural History of American Indian Education." Next steps: Research and practices to advance Indian education, ed. Karen Gayton Swisher and John W. Tippeconnic III, 1-32. Charleston, WV: Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.
- Lomawaima, K. Tsianina, and Teresa L. McCarty. 2002. When tribal sovereignty challenges democracy: American Indian education and the democratic ideal. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(2): 279-305.
- Maaka, Roger, and Augie Fleras. 2005. *The politics of Indigeneity Challenging the state in Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand*. Dunedin, NZ: University of Otago Press.
- Mahuika, Rangimarie. 2008. "Kaupapa Māori theory is critical and anti-colonial." *Mai Review*, 3(4):1-16.
- Manuelito, Kathryn. 2005. "The role of education in American Indian self-determination: lessons from the Ramah Navajo Community School." *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 36(1): 73-87.
- Martin, Danny B. 2012. "Race, racial projects, and mathematics education." *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 44(1): 316-333.
- McCarty, Teresa L. 2009. "The impact of high-stakes accountability policies on Native American learners: evidence from research." *Teaching Education*, 20(1): 7-29.
- McCarty, Teresa. L., and Fred Bia. 2002. A place to be Navajo: Rough rock and the struggle for self-determination in Indigenous schooling. Sociocultural, political, and historical studies in education. Mahwah, N.J.; London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- McLaughlin, Barry. 1987. *Theories of second-language learning*. London, UK: Edward Arnold.
- McNeley, James K. 1994. "The pattern which connects Navajo and western knowledge." *Journal of Navajo Education*, 12(1):3-14.
- Miller, Robert J. 2006. Native America, discovered and conquered: Thomas Jefferson, Lewis & Clark, and manifest destiny. Westport, Conn.: Praeger Publishers.
- Miller, Susan A., and James Riding In. 2011. *Native historians write back: Decolonizing American Indian history*. Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University Press.
- Moore, William Haas. 1994. *Chiefs, agents & soldiers: Conflict on the Navajo frontier,* 1868-1882. 1st ed. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Navajo Tribe. 1978. *Navajo tribal code: Title 5 through Title 10*. Oxford, NH: Equity Publishing.
 - ——. 1984. *Navajo education policy hearings, February-March, 1984*. Window Rock, AZ: Navajo Division of Education.

——. 1987. Navajo tribal code: Title 5 through Title 10: 1984-1985 cumulative pocket supplement. Oxford, NH: Equity Publishing.

- Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act of 2005, Navajo Nation Code Title Ten and Two §§ 1 et seq.
- Parsons-Yazzie, Evangeline. 1995. "Navajo speaking parents' perceptions of reasons for Navajo language attrition." *Journal of Navajo Education*, 13(1): 29-38.
- Pavlik, Steve. 1985. "A short history of Navajo education." In *Journal of Navajo Education*, 2(2): 25-34.
- Pecos, Regis, and Rebecca Blum-Martinez. 2001. "The key to cultural survival: Language planning and revitalization in the Pueblo of Cochiti." In *The green book of language revitalization in practice*, ed. Leanne Hinton and Ken Hale, 75-82. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Pewewardy, Cornel. 2002. Learning styles of American Indian/Alaska native students: A review of the literature and implications for practice. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 41(3): 22.
- ——. 2005. "Ideology, power, and the miseducation of Indigenous Peoples in the United States." 139-156. In *For Indigenous eyes only: A decolonizing handbook*, ed.

Waziyatawin Angela Wilson and Michael Yellow Bird, 109-126. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

- Phoenix, Ann. 2004. "Neoliberalism and masculinity racialization and the contradictions of schooling for 11-to 14-year-olds." *Youth & Society*, 36(2): 227-246.
- Platero, Paul R. 2001. "Navajo Head Start language study". In *The green book of language revitalization in practice*, ed. Leanne Hinton and Ken Hale, 87-97. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Pollock, Floyd Allen. 1984. *A Navajo confrontation and crisis*. 1st ed. Tsaile, AZ: Navajo Community College Press.
- Prucha, Francis Paul. 2000. *Documents of United States Indian policy*. 3rd ed. Lincoln, NB; London, UK: University of Nebraska Press.

——. 1978. Americanizing the American Indians: Writings by the "friends of the Indian," 1880-1900. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press.

- Reyhner, Jon Allan, and Jeanne M. Oyawin Eder. 2004. *American Indian education: A history*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Riley, Mary, ed. 2004. *Indigenous intellectual property rights: legal obstacles and innovative solutions*. Lanham, MD: Altamira.
- Roessel, Karina A. 2011. The implications of the Navajo nation sovereignty in education act of 2005 on Arizona reservation public schools. Ph.D. Diss. Arizona State University.
- Roessel, Robert A. 1979. Navajo education, 1948-1978, its progress and its problems. Navajo history. 1st ed. Vol. 3, pt. A. Rough Rock, AZ.: Navajo Curriculum Center, Rough Rock Demonstration School.
- Roessel, Ruth, Broderick H. Johnson, and Arizona State University. 1974. *Navajo livestock reduction: A national disgrace*. 1st ed. Chinle, AZ.: Navajo Community College Press.
- Romero-Little, Eunice. 2001. "Indigenous language immersion: The Cochiti experience." Paper Presented at the 22nd Annual American Indian Language Development Institute, Tuscon AZ, June 9th.
- Samoff, Joel. 1996. "African education and development: Crisis, triumphalism, research, loss of vision." *Alberta Journal of Education Research*, 42(2): 121-147.

- Sims, Christine P. 2001. "Native language planning." *The green book of language revitalization in practice*, ed. Leanne Hinton, and Ken Hale, 63-81. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Smith, Graham H. 2003. "Indigenous struggle for the transformation of education and schooling." Keynote address to the Alaskan Federation of Natives Convention, Anchorage, Alaska.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2012. *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. 2nd ed. London, UK; New York, NY: Zed Books.
- Spolsky, Bernard. 1974. American Indian bilingual education: Navajo reading study progress report 24. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico.

———. 2002. "Prospects for the survival of the Navajo language: A reconsideration." Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 33(2): 139-162.

- Suina, Joseph H. 2004. "Native language teachers in a struggle for language and cultural survival." *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 35(3): 281-302.
- Szasz, Margaret. *Education and the American Indian: The road to self- determination,* 1928-1973. 1st ed. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Thompson, Hildegard, and Arizona State University. 1975. *The Navajos' long walk for education: A history of Navajo education*, 1st ed. Tsaile Lake, AZ: Navajo Community College Press.
- Tippeconnic III, John W. 1999. "Tribal control of American Indian education: Observations since the 1960s with implications for the future." In *Next steps: Research and practice to advance Indian education*, ed. John Tippeconnic and Karen Gayton Swisher, 33-52. Charleston, WV: Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.
- United States Commission on Civil Rights. 1975. *The Navajo Nation: An American* colony: A report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights. Washington, DC: The Commission.
- Warner, Sam L. 1999. "Kuleana: The right, responsibility, and authority of Indigenous peoples to speak and make decisions for themselves in language and cultural revitalization." *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 30(1): 68-93.

——. 2001. "The Movement to revitalize Hawaiian language and culture." In *The green book of language revitalization in practice*, ed. Leanne Hinton and Ken Hale, 133-144. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

- Wauneka, Jacquelyn D. 2008. The impact of the No Child Left Behind Act on Arizona public schools on the Navajo Reservation. PhD. Diss. Arizona State University.
- Waziyatawin, Angela. 2005. "Defying colonization through language survival." In For Indigenous eyes only: A decolonizing handbook, ed. Waziyatawin Angela Wilson and Michael Yellow Bird, 109-126. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Werito, Vincent. 2011. *The racialization of Diné youth in education*. M.S. Thesis University of New Mexico.
- Whitbeck, Les B., Gary W. Adams, Dan R. Hoyt, and Xiaojin Chen. 2004. "Conceptualizing and measuring historical trauma among American Indian people." *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 33(3-4): 119-130.
- Whitt, Laurie Anne. 1998. "Biocolonialism and the commodification of knowledge." *Science as Culture*, 7(1): 33-67.
- Williams, Robert A. 2005. *Like a loaded weapon: The Rehnquist court, Indian rights, and the legal history of racism in America*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Wilson, Angela Cavender. 2008. What does justice look like?: The struggle for liberation in Dakota homeland. 1st ed. St. Paul, Minn.: Living Justice Press.
- Wilson, Angela Cavender, and Michael Yellow Bird. 2005. For Indigenous eyes only: A *decolonization handbook*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research.
- Wilson, William H.1998. "I ka'õlelo Hawai'i ke ola, Life is found in the Hawaiian language'." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 132(1): 123-138.
- Wilson, William H. and Kauanoe Kamana. 2001. "Mai loko mai O ka 'I'ini: Proceeding from a dream." *The green book of language revitalization in practice*, ed. Leanne Hinton, and Ken Hale, 147-163. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Wilson, William H., K. Kamana, and Nämaka Rawlins. 2006. "Nawahi Hawaiian Laboratory School." *Journal of American Indian Education*, 45(2): 42-44.
- Winstead, Teresa, Adrea Lawrence, Edward J. Brantmeier, and Christopher J. Frey. 2008. "Language, sovereignty, cultural contestation, and American Indian schools: No Child Left Behind and a Navajo test case." *Journal of American Indian Education*, 47(1): 46-64.
- Wolfe, Patrick. 2006. "Settler colonialism and the elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8(4): 387-409.

Young, Robert W. 1957. The Navajo yearbook. (1961).

Zah, Peterson. 1984. "Blueprint for Navajo education." *Journal of Navajo Education*, 1(3): 2-7.

APPENDIX A

2005 NAVAJO SOVEREIGNTY IN EDUCATION ACT

156

RESOLUTION OF THE NAVAJO NATION COUNCIL

20TH NAVAJO NATION COUNCIL - Third Year, 2005

AN ACT

RELATING TO EDUCATION, ENACTING THE NAVAJO SOVERIGNTY IN EDUCATION ACT OF 2005; AMENDING TITLES TEN AND TWO OF THE NAVAJO NATION CODE

BE IT ENACTED:

Section 1. Enactment of the Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act of 2005

The Navajo Nation Council hereby enacts the Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act of 2005.

Section 2. Purpose

The purposes of the Navajo Sovereignty in Education Act of 2005 are to establish the Navajo Nation Board of Education, to establish the Navajo Nation Department of Diné Education, to confirm the commitment of the Navajo Nation to the education of the Navajo People, to repeal obsolete language and to update and reorganize the existing language of Titles 10 and 2 of the Navajo Nation Code.

Section 3. Amendments to Title 10 Navajo Nation Code

The Navajo Nation Council hereby amends the Navajo Nation Code, Title 10, as follows:

- § 1. Responsibility and authority of the Navajo Nation
 - A. The Navajo Nation has the authority and an inherent right to exercise its responsibility to the Navajo People for their education by prescribing and implementing educational laws and policies applicable to all schools serving the Navajo Nation and all educational programs receiving significant funding for the education of Navajo youth or adults. At the same time, the Navajo Nation recognizes the legitimate authority of the actual education provider, whether state, federal, community controlled, charter, or private. The Navajo Nation commits itself, whenever possible, to work cooperatively with all education providers serving Navajo youth or adults or with responsibilities for serving Navajo students to assure the achievement of the educational goals of the Navajo Nation laws.
 - B. The Education Committee of the Navajo Nation Council has oversight authority over the Navajo Nation Board of Education, Department of Diné

Education, and over the implementation of education legislation. The Committee exercises such powers and responsibilities over Navajo education as are prescribed by its Plan of Operation (2 NNC § 481, et. seq.) and in other Navajo Nation laws. The Education Committee exercises oversight responsibility regarding the recruitment and operation of post-secondary education programs within the Navajo Nation.

- C. The laws and policies of the Navajo Nation are applicable to the maximum extent of the jurisdiction of the Navajo Nation in the operation of all local schools.
- D. The Navajo Nation specifically claims for its people and holds the government of the United States responsible for the education of the Navajo People, based upon the Treaty of 1868 and the trust responsibility of the federal government toward Indian tribes. The Navajo People also claim their rights as citizens of the states within which they reside to a non-discriminatory public education. In exercising its responsibility and authority for the education of the Navajo people, the Navajo Nation does not sanction or bring about any abrogation of the rights of the Navajo Nation or the Navajo People based upon treaty, trust or citizenship, nor does it diminish the obligation of the federal government or of any state or local political subdivision of a state.

§2. Mission Statement

It is the educational mission of the Navajo Nation to promote and foster lifelong learning for the Navajo people, and to protect the culture integrity and sovereignty of the Navajo Nation.