

MONTANA'S Indian Education *for all.* TOWARD AN

As we move into a century in which all eyes seem to be focused outward and globalization has become a key concept, we shouldn't neglect the unfinished business we have here at home. Ms. Starnes, one of the guest editors of this special section and a *Kappan* columnist, has put together a selection of articles centering on Montana's Indian Education for All Act.

BY BOBBY ANN STARNES

GRADUATING seniors in Montana are like most of their counterparts across the United States. If they have been successful students, they have amassed a large amount of information during their 13 years of schooling. They have learned about life in ancient Greece, about the Crusades, Marie Antoinette, Elizabeth I, and Magellan. They know about Columbus' perilous journey to the "New World," Lewis

Eagle photo: *Liquid Library*. Opposite: *Buffalo jump on Northern Cheyenne Reservation, Montana*. (Photo by Robert Warren. © Full Circle Curriculum and Materials.)

BOBBY ANN STARNES writes the bimonthly Thoughts on Teaching column for the Kappan. She is co-founder of Full Circle Curriculum and Materials, a nonprofit organization established to support implementation of Indian Education for All. This year she is a visiting professor in educational studies at Berea College in Berea, Ky. Visit Full Circle's website at www.fullcirclem.org.

and Clark's exploration of the vast "wilderness" west of the Mississippi, the suffering of millions during the Great Depression, and the righteousness of American involvement in World War II. They can recite the words of great American patriots asking for "liberty or death" and admonishing us to "ask not what your country can do for you." They know the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock in 1620 and that Columbus sailed the ocean blue in 1492. They know that America had a Manifest Destiny to "over-spread the continent" and that Texas was once a sovereign nation. They have been taught about the cultures of Australia, China, and other faraway places. And many have learned to speak Spanish, French, or German.

And like children across the country, Montana's students have learned about their state. They know that gold was discovered in Helena's Last Chance Gulch and that there was a struggle between mining moguls for early dominance of the state government. They admire mountain man Jim Bridger and trailblazer John Bozeman. They



EDUCATION WORTHY OF AMERICAN IDEALS

can locate Yellowstone Park on a map and follow the Missouri River's twisted route as it snakes around and through Montana's mountains, valleys, and prairies.

Successful students have learned all of this and much more. Still, there is a prominent gap in their knowledge. And the missing content that creates this gap is both significant and telling. Though the students know much about various historic events in Montana's early settlement, most would be unable to locate the state's seven reservations. They know about remarkable men and women, past and present, from near and far, but they know almost nothing about the remarkable American Indian leaders who live and have lived within their state's boundaries. And they know much about many of the world's sovereign nations but probably have no idea that eight sovereign tribal governments exist today within their state's borders. And almost none of the graduating seniors re-

alize that more than 12 native languages are spoken on reservations and in urban areas throughout Montana.

This gap in students' knowledge demonstrates a commonly recognized phenomenon in the world's education systems — that the stories of history are written by those in power. This may be most clearly illustrated by Winston Churchill's response to a question about how he thought history would remember him. "I expect," he said, "that history will remember me well, for I intend to write it." It is not surprising that most schools — even schools on reservations — emphasize a history and culture that does not include American Indians. That



is, except to the extent that their inclusion serves the story of the nation's glorious growth from a few austere immigrants who fled England in search of religious freedom through its 200-year rise to the position of ultimate world power.

The exclusion of Indians from America's story also excludes them from a prominent place in our collective understanding of the American "we." But that is not because there is no story of consequence to be told. Quite the contrary. American Indian cultures are filled with great thinkers and doers and with histories at least as complex and exciting as those included in the largely Eurocentric body of knowledge acquired by America's graduating seniors. And whether or not we can name Indian contributions to our democracy and our daily lives, they do exist.

Here in Montana, a landmark revision of the state's constitution set in motion a reform effort that could change what the state's graduating seniors know and understand in the near future. When the 100 delegates to the constitutional convention met in 1972, there were no American Indian representatives among them. Yet these delegates drafted a document that included visionary language requiring that all Montanans learn about the history and culture of the state's American Indians. After several false starts and a lawsuit upheld by the Montana Supreme Court, that language will finally be transformed from a moral and ethical ideal into a standard of classroom practice.

Although Indian Education for All (IEFA) is a Montana law, its implications, and the hope it represents, are not contained by the state's borders. Whether or not there are large numbers of Native Americans or reservations in every region of the country, IEFA underscores a national challenge to our education system and to the educators within it. At no time is the need to improve our teaching about Native American history and culture more evident than during the month of November.

Most Americans recall the annual Thanksgiving pageant from their own school experiences. During November we made paper-bag Indian vests and construction-paper headbands, painted our faces, and learned about a people who lived long, long ago. There seems to be no other subject — save, perhaps Columbus — about which we Americans so zealously and unyieldingly miseducate our children — not only in Montana, but in most schools across the nation.

Interestingly and, perhaps appropriately, November is also National American Indian Heritage Month. In his 1991 proclamation naming it such, President George H. W. Bush called upon "the people of the United States to observe this month with appropriate programs and activities." A task far more easily said than done. Thanks in large part to our own consistent miseducation, most educators are

unable to do more than replicate the teaching of bad history, stereotypes, and myths to which we were so carefully exposed as we colored "Indian designs" on our headbands and fashioned toothpick tipis year after year throughout our educational experience.

This year as we celebrate Thanksgiving and National American Indian Heritage Month, the editors and authors of this special section hope that readers across the nation will be inspired to break out of the traditional mode and find new and exciting ways to bring Indian education into their classrooms, schools, and communities. It will not necessarily be easy, but it will be rewarding.

In order to help readers consider IEFA as it was envisioned and developed in Montana and to find linkages to their own schools and communities, we have grouped the articles into three sections. The first three articles address the need for and implications of Indian Education for All. The fourth and fifth outline ways that Montana is preparing to meet the challenges presented by IEFA. And the final two articles help us to uncover universal misunderstandings about Indian peoples and some of the ways these misunderstandings are formed and perpetuated.

UNDERSTANDING INDIAN EDUCATION FOR ALL

Montana State Law MCA 20-1-501, known as Indian Education for All, was passed in 1999 in order to carry out the earlier constitutional requirement. (For a history of the evolution of the law, see the following article in this special section by Denise Juneau and Mandy Smoker Broaddus.) Successful implementation will require attention to three important elements. First, the law is intended to affect "every Montanan, *whether Indian or non-Indian.*" Almost everyone would agree that Native American students need to know their tribal histories. Such instruction is especially important because so many histories, languages, and cultural traditions were lost as a result of federal policies enacted over more than 200 years. These losses affected generations of Indian peoples across time and have lingering consequences today. However, IEFA is not just about Indian peoples learning their own histories and cultures. It is about *all* Montanans. Meeting the law's letter and spirit means that learning the histories, cultures, and contemporary issues of Montana's first peoples is no less important for students who live hundreds of miles from reservations than it is for students living on or near them.

The law's second element relates to the "distinct and unique heritage" of each of the state's 12 tribes. This element underscores the rich diversity within and between

the tribal nations. Many non-Indians do not understand how distinct these tribal groups are. Perhaps as a result of cultural stereotyping, Hollywood images, and a lack of inclusion and accuracy in classroom instruction, many non-Indians think there is *an* Indian culture and *an* Indian language. That is far from the truth. Each of the more than 500 tribal nations has a rich history, culture, and language that uniquely reflect the group's experience lived out over many centuries.

To understand the range of diversity among these tribes, one might consider the 45 nations of Europe. Although all are European, each nation has its own distinct history, culture, language, patriotic practices, and values. We would never think that if we studied Irish history we would then understand all of Europe's history or, for that matter, that we could generalize Irish history to the Spanish, Serbians, or Swedes. Nor would we expect Irish customs to be practiced in Bulgaria or the Netherlands. We also would not expect that because the Germans and French share a border they are natural allies. These understandings are more or less common sense to most of us. That's because we understand that, though these nations share certain cultural and religious practices because of their proximity, they remain independent and unique entities.

American Indian nations are no less unique and independent. They are now and have always been sovereign nations with individual languages, economies, and cultural norms as varied as those of Europe. For eons before the first white settlers arrived, these nations negotiated boundaries, had allies and enemies, engaged in trade, and carried on the enterprises required to support their communities. This uniqueness explains IEFA's requirement that each tribe learn not only its own history and culture, but the histories and cultures of all Montana tribes. Just as the French, German, and Danish peoples, though all European, labor under misconceptions, stereotypes, and gaps in their knowledge and understanding of one another, so, too, do many tribal people in Montana. It is not uncommon to find that Indian people are as divided by generations-old conflicts and as separated by cultural divides as are their non-Indian counterparts.

The third element of IEFA requires that tribal histories and cultures be presented in a "culturally responsive manner." One of the biggest challenges to such a presentation is the lack of culturally responsive materials. Although much has been written about Indians in Montana, little is available from the perspectives of the tribes themselves. And though many materials exist that claim to teach about Indians — especially materials that address Thanksgiving and the "discovery" — few of these could pass the culturally responsive test. A number of stakeholders, including the Montana Office of Public Instruction, Full Circle Curriculum and Materials (which I co-founded), several school districts and teachers, and the tribes themselves are responding to that need.

It is important to understand that IEFA is not a program, a curriculum, or an instructional add-on. It might best be understood as adding layers to what teachers are currently doing in their classrooms. And it will be implemented in schools most richly if teachers and others regard IEFA as a way of thinking or a habit of mind — that is, if their planning processes come to include ongoing questions about how the content they are teaching relates to Indian people in Montana. To help teachers, schools, and communities move in this direction, the Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) worked collaboratively with tribal representatives to develop a set of guidelines to support IEFA implementation. These guidelines are referred to as the "Essen-

tial Understandings Regarding Montana Indians” (see the sidebar on page 189).

The Essential Understandings include seven broad topics that range from the straightforward need to know the

is “because it is the right thing to do.” But what makes it the right thing to do is complex and requires a longer discussion.

IEFA is important for a very pragmatic reason. As James

“Why should we learn about Indians? What do they have to do with us?”

reservations’ names, histories, and locations, to a statement about the nature of history as a story told from the perspective of the teller, to the difficult and complex issues of Indian spirituality and the historical and contemporary impact of government policies on American Indians. They have also served as a basis for a series of social studies standards to be infused into existing instruction. Taken together, the Essential Understandings and the standards provide a framework that will help teachers enrich their instruction and add a wider range of perspectives and experiences to bring Native peoples alive in the classroom.

WHY INDIAN EDUCATION FOR ALL

IEFA is not without its detractors. The most common concern is often posed in the form of a question: “Why Indian education for all? Why not German education for all?” There is quite an easy answer to that question. IEFA is a Montana constitutional requirement, a state law, and a Montana Supreme Court mandate. Because we are a nation of laws, we are required to implement it. If citizens chose to change the constitution, to lobby for a law requiring the inclusion of German history or the repeal of IEFA, they could. In fact, any of these actions would be an appropriate democratic exercise. And, if successful, we would expect to see the legislative changes reflected in the classroom.

Another rather easy answer is that this is not Germany; this is America. The question itself treats Native Americans as if they were just one more in a long line of immigrants who arrived on the shores sometime after Columbus planted Spain’s flag on a West Indies beach. A study of American history must include the history of those whose lineage can be traced back hundreds of years before European seafarers began to wonder if ships might *not* fall off the edge of the world.

Although these are easy answers, they often fail to satisfy those who ask the question. Perhaps that is because their real question is unspoken and one that some might find politically incorrect. If they felt free, they might frame the question: “Why should we learn about Indians (or about *other* Indian nations)? What do *they* have to do with *us*?” Answering that question is more difficult. The short answer

Loewen says in his conversation with Mike Jetty in this special section, our collective and individual ignorance makes us “ethnocentric and stupid about other cultures.” There was a time when the world was smaller and more protected. For example, growing up in my community and school in the Fifties, I never saw — or knew I saw — a person of color, a non-Christian, or a recent immigrant. As a result, I needed less practical knowledge of those who were different from me than my son did. He grew up in and went to school with a highly diverse population and lived in a much bigger and faster world than I. For him, living a well-adjusted life required more and different skills and knowledge than had been required of me. And I imagine that my grandchildren will experience even more diversity and need even better-honed interaction skills and a broader knowledge base just to live successfully in their environments.

Becoming more inclusive, more aware, and more prepared to live our lives well within the social, cultural, and political arenas, then, means becoming less “stupid.” IEFA is not the only answer to life in the rapidly changing times ahead, but it is an important beginning.

Beyond the social implications is a necessity for intellectual rigor. We need to know more in order to create new solutions to old problems. For example, if instruction related to evolution were excluded from the nation’s biology curricula, students’ understandings of how the world works would be severely limited. And their poorly developed understandings would constrain their thinking and performance in scientific endeavors, thus limiting scientific discovery and progress.

Similarly, in our history there are factual truths to be known. If we don’t know them, we can’t make appropriate decisions for our nation or for our lives. Just as a narrow understanding of science limits scientific innovation, narrow understandings of history and diverse cultures limit our awareness of ourselves as a people, our political visions, and our sociocultural growth. And we can see the result of this lack of understanding in our daily lives. For example, because our understandings of the relationships between Indians and the U.S. government are so limited, many of us struggle to understand why mascots such as those featured on the Cleveland Indians’ logo might be of-

fensive. Because we don't know that thousands of Indian people starved to death as a direct result of the government's efforts to control the Plains Indians by exterminating buffalo, we can look at policies divorced from consequences. Because we include Indians in the curriculum either as an afterthought or as they relate to Euro-American history, we cannot carefully study and learn from our historical errors. And because Indians are not included in our national image, we do not include them in our thinking about what it means to be American.

Parker Palmer has observed that "fear fades when people meet the stranger and learn not only that the stranger lacks horns but may even come bearing gifts." Today, many Americans see Indians as "the others" — mostly overlooked, sometimes feared. To the degree that IEFA is successful,

the things that keep us strangers to one another will be diminished. In the process, perhaps we can, at last, expand our understanding of the world beyond our predominantly Euro-American lens to include American Indian world views. A more complete world view could help us reframe taken-for-granted notions that limit our thinking, innovation, and problem solving.

All of these reasons for IEFA are important, but to many of us nothing is more important than the fact that it is morally and ethically the right thing to do. As a nation, we take great pride in the ideals that underlie our national self-image — ideals of liberty, justice, inclusion, and fairness. But these ideals are not easy to uphold; they require great efforts. We've seen ourselves struggle throughout our history to build what the framers of our federal Constitu-

ESSENTIAL UNDERSTANDINGS REGARDING MONTANA INDIANS

ESSENTIAL UNDERSTANDING 1

➤ There is great diversity among the 12 tribal Nations of Montana in their languages, cultures, histories, and governments. Each Nation has a distinct and unique cultural heritage that contributes to modern Montana.

ESSENTIAL UNDERSTANDING 2

➤ There is great diversity among individual American Indians as identity is developed, defined, and redefined by entities, organizations, and people. A continuum of Indian identity, unique to each individual, ranges from assimilated to traditional. There is no generic American Indian.

ESSENTIAL UNDERSTANDING 3

➤ The ideologies of Native traditional beliefs and spirituality persist into modern-day life as tribal cultures, traditions, and languages are still practiced by many American Indian people and are incorporated into how tribes govern and manage their affairs. Additionally, each tribe has its own oral histories, which are as valid as written histories. These histories predate the "discovery" of North America.

ESSENTIAL UNDERSTANDING 4

➤ Reservations are lands that have been reserved by the tribes for their own use through treaties, statutes, and executive orders and were not "given" to them. The principle that land should be acquired from the Indians only through their consent with treaties involved three

assumptions:

- I. Both parties to treaties were sovereign powers.
- II. Indian tribes had some form of transferable title to the land.
- III. Acquisition of Indian lands was solely a government matter not to be left to individual colonists.

ESSENTIAL UNDERSTANDING 5

➤ Federal Indian policies, put into place throughout American history, have affected Indian people and still shape who they are today. Much of Indian history can be related through several major federal policy periods: Colonization Period, Treaty Period, Allotment Period, Boarding School Period, Tribal Reorganization Period, Termination Period, Self-determination Period.

ESSENTIAL UNDERSTANDING 6

➤ History is a story most often related through the subjective experience of the teller. With the inclusion of more and varied voices, histories are being rediscovered and revised. History told from an Indian perspective frequently conflicts with the stories mainstream historians tell.

ESSENTIAL UNDERSTANDING 7

➤ Under the American legal system, Indian tribes have sovereign powers, separate and independent from the federal and state governments. However, the extent and breadth of tribal sovereignty is not the same for each tribe.

tion called “a more perfect union.” We fought a war to end slavery, marched in the streets for a woman’s right to vote, and dispatched troops to Montgomery, Alabama, so black children and white children could go to the same schools and sit at the same lunch counters. None of that was easy; it cannot be. But it was required simply because, in our best moments as a nation and a people, we reject the notion that there is an *us* and a *them*. The America we see in our best dreams has only *we* — we the people.

CHALLENGES TO IMPLEMENTATION

IEFA has not come to Montana easily, and, though bold, adding the constitutional language in 1972 was the easy part. After the largely failed effort to fulfill the constitutional mandate in the Seventies, IEFA might have been lost altogether had it not been for a small group of diligent visionaries who fought to keep it alive. When the law was first funded in the 2004 legislative session and the funding

was increased during a special session in the fall of 2005, many Montanans breathed a sigh of relief that, finally, the hard fight was almost over. The victory was certainly worth celebrating, but funding really signaled only the end of the first phase. Now begins the truly hard and perilous journey — the implementation.

As IEFA begins its first implementation year, there seems to be a strong sense of shared responsibility and good will among those who will make it a reality. And there are many positive and hopeful signs. One is the respectful way the state is working with teachers to implement IEFA. Unlike No Child Left Behind or other carrot-and-stick approaches, IEFA is designed to encourage teachers to enter the fray in ways that are comfortable and appropriate for them within their teaching environments, their skill sets, and their subject areas.

At the same time, some challenges lurk in the shadows. Perhaps the most serious emerged even before the new funds — so hard won — were distributed. Some school ad-

Indian Education for All: THROUGH OUR OWN EYES

The Challenge of IEFA

BY ELLEN SWANEY

THE Indian Education for All (IEFA) Act requires Montana teachers and faculty members to teach Indian history and culture at all levels, from kindergarten through college. Meeting the law’s intent with regard to Montana’s tribal histories is relatively easy. It will be a matter of compiling information about each tribe and integrating it into classroom instruction. Certainly that requires time, patience, and a lot of hard work, but it can be done. Materials are available from the eight tribal governments, the seven tribal colleges, the Office of Public Instruction, the campuses of the Montana University System, and private individuals and organizations. Much harder will be defining how teachers and faculty members effectively teach about the cultures of Montana’s 12 tribes. Our challenge is presenting information in a way that honors the unique culture of each tribe. Salish, Kootenai, Blackfeet,

ELLEN SWANEY (Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes) is director of American Indian/Minority Achievement, Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education, Montana University System, Helena.

Little Shell Chippewa, Cree, Chippewa, Gros Ventre, Crow, Northern Cheyenne, Nakota, and Assiniboine (Fort Belknap and Fort Peck) cultures and languages are quite distinct from one another, so even schools on or near reservations will be teaching about tribal cultures that are different from their own. In addition, tribal peoples have a unique political status in the United States, so our educational materials must convey that as well.

My concern is that instruction might end up trivializing highly complex cultural issues. For example, Indian culture is often presented through the arts, especially our traditional arts such as powwow dancing and beadwork. These visual representations are often the best known and most easily demonstrated aspects of a culture, but they are not *the* culture. Rather, they are a manifestation of a much broader and more complex set of value orientations. To present such a narrow cross section of a culture trivializes the richness and complexity of the lives of Native peoples. It does not begin to touch upon how our Native beliefs, attitudes and values, verbal and nonverbal language, and objects and artifacts affect our views of authority, relationships, action, and time. Our views

ministrators began to speak openly about plans to divert IEFA funds to cover budgetary shortfalls in other areas. Because of legal requirements for local control of schools, IEFA monies go into districts' general funds, and schools are not required to account for their use. Everyone recognizes the serious need for additional school resources. However, there is growing concern that, if IEFA funds are diverted to fill this need, the initiative will suffer a serious setback.

Another concern lies in the need for historically accurate and culturally appropriate materials. Developing these materials from the perspective of Native peoples will not be an easy task. Making the work more difficult are the complexity of the concepts to be addressed, determining what will be included, and creating effective processes for their development. The concepts identified by the Essential Understandings vary greatly in their complexity. Though some can be addressed in a relatively straightforward manner, others are quite thorny. And because the tribes are so

different from one another and so diverse within themselves, coming to agreement about "official" histories will also be difficult. This should not surprise us, because even siblings often cannot agree on their family histories.

IEFA breaks new ground every day. Unlike most new programs or reforms, there is no model. In fact, that is the source of much excitement about the effort. The task of those involved is to bring together all the complex threads into one vision for what IEFA will become. Today, we can see some of the struggle involved in creating that vision. For example, some have expressed the notion that the work of IEFA should be driven almost solely by Indian leaders and educators. Others focus almost completely on the positive benefits to Indian children — and, indeed, research tells us that an education steeped in their own culture will help Indian students perform at higher levels. However, both of these limited approaches take us away from one of the central elements of the law — that IEFA is, in fact, *for all*. We need only look in most American classrooms

tend to be on the opposite end of the spectrum from the values of mainstream American culture, and unfamiliarity sometimes breeds contempt. Educators and students must understand that, while Native perceptions of the world may be different, they are not deficient. The greater the breadth of our knowledge about all the peoples who live on this land, the greater the gain for our nation as a whole.

Moreover, really exploring culture raises thorny issues about the culture of the American school system. Honestly engaging IEFA requires us to consider the political, economic, and power issues involved with including people who are culturally different. Such discussions will be difficult, but anything less will result in superficial treatment of a fundamentally important component of this law.

As an American Indian, I have to continually remind myself that I, like all of us, was schooled within the American education system. I was trained as a teacher within that system. With that background, it can be very difficult even for Indian teachers to step back and see how we might have been damaged by being required to assimilate. We then need to recognize that, as long as we teach within that mainstream cultural system, we may, in turn, be damaging our Indian students, unless we are very cognizant of cultural differences. Some of that damage is evidenced by the current dropout rates among Indian students.

Counteracting this damage will require some changes in teacher education coursework. The Essential Under-

standings of IEFA (page 189) must be infused into teacher education classes, just as they will be integrated into the curricula of elementary and high schools. The current requirement that preservice teachers complete a course in multicultural education is a start, but clearly more needs to be done in order to promote the understandings — the changes of hearts and minds — required to prevent losing so many of our Indian students. Professional development that unlocks the mysteries of intercultural communication styles and emphasizes the impacts of culture on teaching and learning will be vital for all American educators — teachers, principals, superintendents, and school board members — to better equip them to meet the needs of the culturally diverse students, and especially American Indian students, in their schools.

This is groundbreaking work in the field of American education. A group I am involved with, the Montana University System Indian Education for All work group, is currently developing a plan for the implementation of IEFA within the Montana University System campuses. Clearly, Native American Studies departments and schools of education will play vital roles in making these changes. But we are also looking at ways to include Indian education in the coursework of other departments, so that the education of all graduates from Montana's universities will be complete.

Challenges lie ahead, but Montana's system of higher education, together with its elementary and high schools, is working to meet those challenges. **■**

today to see what happens when such decisions are made without meaningful collaboration and a serious commitment to including multiple perspectives.

IEFA's success relies on collaboration between people who have not worked together in the past, who do not know one another well, and who come from widely different cultures. Even under the best of circumstances, collaboration is never easy. When the stakes are high and the work is both demanding and sensitive, real collaboration can feel impossible. And cultural difference is not a small matter. Our cultures permeate us and create certain taken-for-granted social and work habits that may or may not be compatible with those of our colleagues from other cultural groups. Even when we clearly understand and respect people who are different from us, those honest differences can continue to divide us and divert our attention. Perhaps nothing is more hazardous to IEFA than the pos-

sibility that those entrusted with working together from this point forward will not be up to the task of bridging the gap that IEFA is designed to eliminate.

We can expect that the kind of collaborative efforts necessary to implement IEFA will require *all* of us to enter unfamiliar territory. There will be serious disagreements, hurt feelings, and moments of frustration. To expect less would minimize the depth and breadth of the revolutionary vision we are seeking to bring into being. Our commitment must be to say uncomfortable things, to explore new ways of thinking and doing, and to rise above those things that separate us. Indian Education for All won't come quickly. It won't come without cost. But if we are diligent, it will come, and its promise is worth the risk.

1. Parker Palmer, *The Courage to Teach* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998), p. 157. **K**

Indian Education for All: **THROUGH OUR OWN EYES**

Preserving Our Histories For Those Yet to Be Born

BY LINWOOD TALL BULL

SO MANY of our children cannot relate to the histories and lessons they are taught in school today. They are presented stories that do not fit within our cultural teachings. For example, our children cannot relate to the story about George Washington chopping down a cherry tree. Such stories may be told to teach certain values — in this case, not to tell a lie. But they are not teaching *our* most important values. To us, young George's parents should have told him that cherry trees, like all living things, should be treated with respect. The bigger lesson that children learn from young George's story is that it is okay to be destructive, wasteful, and disrespectful of living things as long as they tell the truth about it. That's not a lesson we want our children to learn.

LINWOOD TALL BULL (Northern Cheyenne) is a cultural consultant and Headsman for the Dog Soldier Society, Chief Dull Knife College, Lama Deer, Mont.

Indian Education for All is one of the good things happening in our schools today. Because of it, there is much new interest in learning about Indian people. Every tribe in Montana and throughout the United States has a colorful, interesting history, strong stories and legends, knowledge about plants and healing, and survival skills. Knowing more about each other will help non-Indian and Indian children learn to live together well. When we start to learn more about Indian history and culture, all children in our schools will be getting an education about the best of both worlds.

The Dog Soldiers is an ancient society that has always protected and preserved the ways of our people. As a Headsman for today's Dog Soldiers, I hope we will be leaders in carrying our traditions and customs forward in a way that others can understand and respect. By taking the lead in preserving the past, we will protect the future of those yet to be born. That is why I'm proud to be working on the Tribal Histories Project that will help all Montana schools teach about the Northern Cheyenne people. **K**

Copyright of Phi Delta Kappan is the property of Phi Delta Kappa International and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.