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Stasis and Change in Federal Policy, Regional Texts, and Curriculum: Moving Forward

“Native Americans lost control of their land...due to the expansion of a country.”

“Indians are now living the kind of lives we expect of 20\textsuperscript{th} century Americans.”

Although it would be easy and preferable to believe that the previous two quotes were from the early twentieth century when stereotypes and racialized history were more prevalent, in truth the quotes come from Dale Lambert’s elementary school textbook Washington: A State of Contrast published in 2005. Lambert and many of his contemporaries have continued to treat the history of Native Americans in the Pacific Northwest in a way that discredits their involvement, either by making them absent in the historical text, presenting them as victims of whites and societal advancement, or by portraying Indians as episodes in white history. Lambert’s text therefore presents us with a troubling question: Why has the curriculum and education about Indians remained seemingly unchanged? This seeming stasis within the regional curriculum in many ways is contrary to the slow evolution and progression that occurred within historical scholarship and federal Indian policy, including federal Indian Education policy. Examining curricular change alongside policy and scholarship change demonstrates how far curricular change has lagged behind.

In order to understand the context of the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} century and the significance of the stasis in curriculum it is helpful to review the history of federal Indian policy, including both broad and specifically educational policy. Four main periods emerge in federal Indian policy, and while each are defined by the main debates of each period they also represent a continuum of assimilationist policy with subtle changes throughout. The same periods of assimilation, new tribalism, termination and self-
determination are found within all federal Indian policy, but how each are expressed and the duration of each period varies between the broader federal policy and educational policy.

Assimilation, the first era of federal Indian policy in the twentieth century, came on the heels of the previous policy eras of Indian removal, treaty signing, and the development of reservations. Beginning in the 1880s and continuing until approximately 1930, it rested upon the ideal that “Native Americans must be made to fit into American culture.” Two key acts of legislation during this period, the General Allotment Act of 1887 and the 1924 Indian Citizenship Act, illustrate aspects of the ideology. The General Allotment Act, or the Dawes Act, divided tribal reservations and distributed lands to individuals and families. The Indian Citizenship Act granted United States citizenship unilaterally to all Indians not already citizens. This act did not alter their tribal status, but it did express the government’s intent for native peoples and has been described by some historians as “the logical extension and culmination of the assimilation policy.”

The broader federal Indian policy's emphasis on assimilation from 1880-1930 was accompanied by an educational policy with parallel ideals. Writing in 1939, Lloyd E. Blauch described the previous system and stated “Before 1929 the policy of the Indian Service had been to utilize the schools and their instruction as a means of removing the children from the influence of tribal life and introducing them to white civilization as rapidly as possible.” Four significant acts within educational policy established this policy within bureau schools across the nearly 50 years of the era. These acts initiated funding for boarding schools, established mandatory education for Indian children, enforced mandatory education by withholding rations and subsidized public schools.
Each of the previous acts was implemented with the intent to quickly assimilate Indian students and early in the period federal boarding schools were seen as ideal places for this to occur. Assimilationist policies dominated the boarding school system, but students responded uniquely and did not assimilate as readily or as neatly as policymakers hoped. Rather, cultural innovation, resistance, and the beginnings of Pan-Indian identity developed.

The 1928 Meriam Report is the most well known piece of legislation from the assimilation period, but in many ways it does not closely relate to the policy period of assimilation or that of new tribalism which immediately follows. Rather, this critical examination of the state of Indian education and the conditions within schools is a unique mix of both policy periods. This mixed ideology corresponds with the ideology of the report’s leading author, Dr. W. Carson Ryan, and his blending of assimilationist and progressive educational policies begins to illustrate the continuum of assimilationist thought and its gradual evolution across time.

The second period of Federal policy identified by historians is New Tribalism or the era of Reform. It was initiated in 1933 when John Collier became Commissioner of Indian Affairs and began implementing the Indian Reorganization Act the following year. This act refocused many areas of control previously asserted by the BIA and returned them to the tribes. The period extends until approximately 1954 with the beginnings of the “Termination” era. Often the policies of this period seem directed at righting the wrongs previously committed against Indians and providing them with an increasing voice in their own affairs. At the surface, New Tribalism seems to be a significant departure from the earlier federal policy of assimilation. Although important changes
occurred during the period, less overt assimilation through government organization continued to occur. Tribal culture and organization was encouraged, but there was only one acceptable system—a democratically elected, voting body. Thus, the continuum of assimilationist policy continues.

Just as reforms were occurring within federal Indian policy, this era had many changes and calls for reform within education. Many of these reforms, however, can be traced to before the start of the period in 1933. This increasing awareness of the state of Indian education led to legislation, including the Johnson O’Malley Act in 1934. Premised upon integrating Indian children into public schools, a means of continued assimilation, the act also included provisions for the development of appropriate school curriculum and cross cultural training for teachers. Government reports of the period continued the broader policy trend of examining deficiencies, and additionally pursued appropriate education for Indians that integrated and prepared students for their communities by increasing teacher training and establishing goals.

Termination, the third era identified by historians in federal policy developed after World War II and extended to the mid 1960s. During this era, the BIA began to attempt to further remove itself from reservation life and limit the special rights that Indians had due to their treaties. The government evaluated each reservation and tribe to determine when they could withdraw, and in the case of the Klamath and Menominee terminated the special relationship with many consequences. Termination was accompanied and followed by an era broadly known as relocation which reinforced and extended the policies of termination by encouraging Indian populations to move into urban centers for work. This second policy extended until the 1960s. While relocation and termination
are clearly interrelated, both also have ties to assimilation. The legislation and implementation of both policy periods attempted to assimilate Indians according to how Bureau officials believed Indians should be participating within the economic and political system.

The marker of termination in federal policy was decreasing federal involvement. Ironically however, during termination educational policy decisions actually increased the government’s involvement in students’ lives.\(^\text{13}\) Three acts from 1958 to 1965, including Impact Aid, the Economic Opportunity Act, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act supported students in poverty and attempted to address inequities in Indian Education.\(^\text{14}\) Each of these acts increased funding and programs, predominately through the public school system, and subsequently increased the government’s ties with Indian education. Educational policy during relocation continued to critically examine education as had been done during the era of new Tribalism. This is evidenced by a senate authorized investigation into Indian Education in 1956 and three reports of the Bureau of Indian Affairs written from 1948 to 1953.\(^\text{15}\) As a result of increased involvement and support throughout the period, isolating this period or firmly identifying the educational policy with the broader termination and relocation policies is in many ways a misnomer.

Self determination, the final period of Indian federal policy, began in the mid 1970s and is still continuing. Preceded and accompanied by increasing Indian activism, this period was marked by increasing transfers of authority, and high level of Indian community involvement in their own affairs. It has often been seen as an extension of the IRA governments of the 1930s by historians, but self determination has significance beyond this older policy.\(^\text{16}\) The hallmark act of both the general federal policy and the
educational policy proved to be the Indian Self Determination and Education Assistance act in 1975. The act enabled federal agencies to contract and make grants directly with tribal governments, thus allowing tribes to choose how to best allocate resources. As a period of federal and educational policy, self determination may seem to set itself apart as a unique and distinct period. However, self determination remains part of the continuum of federal policy and demonstrates a rejection of assimilationist policies of previous periods at an economic, political and cultural level.

Although the Indian Self Determination and Education Assistance Act is the most well known act of self determination, policies of self-determination and educational reforms were occurring prior to 1975. These early acts, including Project Tribe in 1969, the 1972 Education Act, and Johnson O'Malley Act reforms in 1974 yielded greater control to communities and tribes, required schools to involve Indian parents and communities in program development, and reformed and increased funding for supplemental programs and culturally relevant and bilingual curriculum. Five other acts from 1975-2001 continued to promote the policies of self determination and reform through increasing community involvement, addressing long standing problems such as high drop out rates, and ensuring cultural relevancy.

In the midst of the policy changes across the 19th and 20th century, changes in historical scholarship and the writing of regional historical texts were also occurring. During the earlier period, extending from the 1880s until 1949, overarching patterns emerge. Each of these patterns places emphasis on understanding native peoples and their history through a white perspective, and these patterns include nostalgia, and emphasis on the pre-contact ways of life. The first pattern, nostalgia, is characterized by the early
books of the period. Much of the history in these texts centers around conflict, and
Conquest of the Coeur D'Alenes, Spokanes and Palouses is an example of this conflicted,
nostalgia motivated history. In 1912, author Benjamin Franklin Manring wrote “This
volume, the result of long research, was primarily suggested through a lingering love of
the pioneer days.” The second pattern in early historical texts places emphasis on pre­
contact ways of life and largely discounts the role Indians played in the settlement and
development of the Pacific Northwest. This pattern is shown differently in different texts
and time periods, but commonly reveals itself through exclusion of Indians in the text, a
single chapter on pre-contact life and customs and later exclusion except when conflict is
discussed.

Following 1950, a slow movement began towards greater and more accurate
inclusion of Indians within regional historical texts. This difference and increasing
inclusion was illustrated through greater recognition of cultural diversity among Indian
groups and cultural change over time. For example, in The Old Oregon Country: A
History of Frontier, Trade, Transportation and Travel rather than describing white
settlers as “discovering the Pacific Northwest” he states “Scattered throughout the Pacific
Northwest on the eve of white intrusion were an estimated 180,000 Indians grouped into
about 125 tribes. Subsequent texts continued to recognize the diversity within the
Pacific Northwest and increasingly acknowledged Indian involvement in the region’s
settlement and development. A contributing factor in the changing nature of historical
texts across the last half of the 20th century was the growing political, economic, and
cultural power of Indians during the era leading up to and following self-determination.
The increasing cultural capital of Indianness preceded significant increases in economic
and political power and directed historians to a new focus and reexamination of Native American history. The increasing economic and political power that began during self-determination further promoted increasing inclusion of Indians within historical texts in authentic ways.

Regional historical texts continue to be written and the best current scholarship attempts to incorporate greater numbers of primary sources, critically examine these documents and previous historical narratives, and portrays the interrelationship between Indians and non-Indians across time. Previous steps taken to involve Indians in the historical narrative across history have been expanded upon, and books such as Alexandra Harmon's *Indians in the Making* examine the relationship between Indians and non-Indians looking for Indian action, not simply the results of their interactions with whites.

Given the changes within federal policy and historical interpretations, the issue of lack of change within curriculum becomes all the more important and perplexing. In 1958, Seattle Public Schools published *Exploring Our City* — a fourth grade social studies text about the city of Seattle prior to contact and into the present. All throughout the book Indians are defined by their interactions with nature and settlers. Joseph Junell, the textbook’s author, even pronounces “It was very quiet in this land. Only a few sounds broke the stillness. You might hear the wind singing in the trees or the waves breaking on the shore. You would also hear the sounds made by the only people who lived here.” Junell emphasized the natural tie between natives and their lands, and by naturalizing them in this fashion he attempts to make them a part of the landscape and subsequently a part of the past rather than a participant in the present. Excluding introductory sections on
the Indian ways of life prior to contact and a description of Chief Seattle’s life, Indians are completely excluded from the narrative of settlement until descriptions of the Indian war. Junell allows only two sides to his discussion of conflict and also labels good and bad Indians when he describes Chief Leschi as “the biggest troublemaker of all” while Chief Seattle is described by his determination for “his people to be friendly with the pioneers.”

The pattern Junell establishes for the treatment of Indians, defining them through their ties with nature and their interactions with non-Indians, sadly and surprisingly continues to be the pervasive model curriculums employ. A 1993 text by Dale Lambert, *The Pacific Northwest: Past, Present and Future*, exemplifies this model by including an entire chapter devoted to Indians entitled “The Original Inhabitants: Native American Cultures” in which he describes the diet, clothing, legends and other aspects of pre-contact culture. Besides four paragraphs in the concluding section describing problems faced by modern Native Americans he excludes any mention of Indians after 1880 throughout the remainder of his book. Even within this section, Lambert establishes the unnecessary duality between “retaining their own way of life and preserving their cultural heritage” and “being gradually assimilated into modern America society.” Lambert claims that Indians cannot be both modern and truly Indian in the previous quote, and in doing so further situates Indians as a part of the Northwest’s past rather than present or future. Marilyn L. Simpson’s *Patterns in Native Washington* continues to illustrate the problematic stasis within curriculum and within her text Indians are placed solidly within the natural world and no mention of Native People outside of pre-contact life patterns. As if to further emphasize her focus on Indians as part of the natural world, she states “In
native Washington plants, animals, and humans were all part of the harmony of life for perhaps as many as 12,000 years.\(^{30}\)

With the inadequacies of modern regional curriculum established, it is not surprising that the Washington State Legislature recently passed a bill within which it "encourage[d] school boards to identify and adopt curriculum that includes tribal experiences and perspectives, so that Indians students are more engaged and learn more successfully, and so that all students learn about the history, culture, government, and experiences of their Indian peers and neighbors."\(^{31}\) Although this move by the legislature shows awareness of a pervasive problem, three areas where vigilance is required emerge if the reforms are to be successful in bringing about productive and meaningful change. These include following previous patterns, otherizing the treatment of native peoples, and determining what curriculum should be.

The first danger, following previous patterns, presents a potential risk when it distinctly locates curriculum in the past and makes overt ties to the politics of the moment. One piece of curriculum that is particularly illustrative of this is the Indian Reading Series. The series was developed and published throughout the 1970s and 1980s.\(^{32}\) Although the legends within the book have not diminished in meaning or quality since the series was last published, the primary error that the Pacific Northwest Indian Reading and Language Development Program made was in situating their rationale and objectives firmly within the moment rather than making it expansive enough to include future generations.\(^{33}\) As the modern Northwest Native American Reading Curriculum continues to develop, it will be important for developers not to isolate the rationale or objectives to
the present, especially during this historically significant period for examination of curricular practices.34

A second danger when attempting to create culturally relevant curriculum is trivializing or otherizing native peoples. One way this occurs is through an emphasis on contributions or “famous firsts.” While this provides heroes and a small window into Indian history, it presents a history of exceptions and does not really show history on Indian terms or the interaction between Indian and non-Indian history. These special cases can be specific people or cultural events, and most often when it is done in this fashion non-Indian history is the dominant narrative and some form of side bar history is employed. Both of these forms of factoid history otherize native peoples, and diminish their contributions by presenting them as episodes in history. While this most often occurs within textbooks, whole curriculum sets can also fall under this category of otherizing. One example is The Life of the Kwakiutl Indians curriculum.35 The curriculum presents an extensive and interactive study of the potlatch system. Although it may be well intentioned, rather than bringing greater meaning and understanding to the potlatch system students leave the unit with knowledge of how to trade blankets and an underdeveloped understanding of the importance of the potlatch for the original people. Not enough context is present, and the result is a disjointed, episodic presentation of the potlatch system.

The final area of importance where clarity is required in bringing reform is determining the appearance and construction of modern curriculum. The current and previous stasis in elementary curriculum increases the importance of this issue and raises specific issues in regards to what to include and how to go about this inclusion. Primarily,
a complex duality is present between the need to understand Indian history separately as more than simply a subset of white history and the accompanying danger of isolating Indian history from history as a whole and turning it into a form of sidebar history. Curriculum needs to show how Indians influenced the course of history and the integration of Indians at every point should occur. With the dual importance of focusing specifically on Indian history and completely including Indians in the narrative established, curriculum and educators must attempt to do both and recognize and balance the pitfalls of each.

The virtual absence of change within curriculum across the 20th century is problematic, especially when seen in light of the slow but significant changes in federal policy and historical scholarship across the same time period. Steps are currently being taken to address this inadequacy in the current curriculum, but for reforms to take place both within curriculum and schools curriculum must be developed or purposefully chosen that demonstrates the importance of Indian history and also contains a narrative in which Indian and white history are incorporated into a meaningful whole. Additionally, context must always be established and both modern and historical Indians should be presented in a way that allows children to understand the continued importance of Indians and see Indians as more than cultural or historical artifacts. Opportunities for students to derive meaning and examine historical perspectives within primary documents should also be present within high quality curriculums. The qualities of high quality curriculum are extensive and set a high ideal for educators and curriculum developers, but these qualities are the direct implications of examining the current curriculum and seeing weaknesses. An examination of regional curriculum, regional history texts, and federal
policy between the late 19th and throughout the 20th century illustrates evolution in some areas and a troubling stasis in others. An examination of stasis within curriculum results in several clear implications for action.

5 Refer to the act of 1885, 1891 and 1893 acts and the 1921 Snyder Act for further information.
8 In regard to assimilation, Ryan believed that “assimilation was a necessary societal objective, but it could and should be accomplished in more humane ways.” He promoted progressive education also, the basic premise of which “was to integrate education with experience. The home, the neighborhood, and the student’s culture were all to be used in the process of education.” See Huff, *To Live Heroically: Institutional Racism and American Indian Education*, 9, and Huff, *To Live Heroically: Institutional Racism and American Indian Education*, 7 respectively.
10 The 1928 Meriam Report began suggesting aspects of New Tribalism and a 1931 Report on the National Advisory Committee on Education continued to establish areas in need of reform.
13 See Donald L. Fixico, *Termination and Relocation: Federal Indian Policy 1945-1960*, 186. for a discussion of why this occurred and the implications of these decisions. For example, were these decisions simply a continuation of the previous era’s policies or an effort to adequately prepare Indian students for termination?
14 In 1967, the Bilingual Education Program began and was later included as an amendment to the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act.
15 Shailer Peterson, *How Well are Indian Children Educated?* (Lawrence, Kansas: United States Indian Service, 1948), Willard W. Beatty, *Education for Cultural Change: Selected Articles from Indian Education 1944-1951* (Chilocco, Oklahoma: U.S Department of the Interior Bureaus of Indian Affairs, 1953), Kenneth E. Anderson et. al, *The Educational Achievement of Indian Children: A re-examination of the Question How Well are Indian Children Educated?* (Lawrence, Kansas: Bureau of Indian Affairs Department of the Interior, 1953). Each of these reports recognizes the deficiencies in Indian education and suggests a way to improve the conditions through assessment and goal setting. A call for a meaningful curriculum that incorporates the community also continues to develop, and is exemplified in Willard Beatty’s *Education for Cultural Change*. 
14


For a discussion of changing cultural capital around this time period see Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (London: Yale University Press, 1998), esp. 95 ff.


Ibid, 92.


Ibid, 477.


Emphasis added.


The new curriculum, the Northwest Native American Reading Curriculum is being developed in concert between OSPI and Evergreen college, and appears to resemble the older curriculum in several ways. Caleb Perkins, interview by Anne Loranger, 17 May 2005.


April 20, 2005 a bill was passed further encouraging school districts to implement tribal history within the curriculum. See www.leg.wa.gov/pub/billinfo/2005-6/Htm/Bills/House... for text. Some curriculum has also begun to be developed that provides more critical thought, context, and meaningful inclusion. See *Native Americans, 1830-1890: Primary Sources* (Westminster, CA: Teacher Created Materials, 2002).
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Regional History: An Assessment of Current Practices, Attitudes and a Model for Change

“The legislature recognizes that this goal has yet to be achieved in most of our state’s schools and districts. As a result, Indian students may not find the school curriculum, especially Washington state history curriculum, relevant to their lives or experiences. In addition, many students remain uninformed about the experiences, contributions, and perspectives of their tribal neighbors, fellow citizens and classmates.”

On April 20, 2005 the Washington state legislature passed a bill that simultaneously assessed the state of tribal and Indian history across Washington State and also reaffirmed a previous goal of bringing local Indians more meaningfully into Washington state curriculum. At the heart of this bill, however, is not the issue of whether or not it should be done, but what meaningful and relevant curriculum should look like. By examining this question in depth and assessing current practices and attitudes towards Indian education I will attempt to develop a foundation for what curriculum should include and a model that demonstrates how it can be done.

In order to develop a model or understand present attitudes and practices regarding regional curriculum, the question of what the representations of Indians within regional curriculum should look like must be addressed. Regional curriculum should be localized, but also give students the tools to understand Indian people as a whole through examining variations across tribal groups and across time. Indians should be described beyond the pre-contact era and modern Indians should be included. In addition, a balance between isolating and integrating Indians in history is necessary. On one side, the need to focus on

Indian history and present it as more than simply a subset of white history is integral. In addition, it is also necessary to integrate Indians into regional history and show how Indians have consistently influenced the course of history. Finally, the ideal in regional curriculum is that Indians would not only be discussed during social studies or in grades when state or local history is discussed. Rather, Indians should be incorporated throughout the curriculum, just as they should be incorporated throughout history. Special care must be taken, however, to ensure that students always understand the context behind the lesson or activity.

With an understanding of how Indians should be presented within regional curriculum we can begin to assess the current state of this presentation. To begin bluntly, in an e-mail correspondence Denny Hurtado, Indian Education Program Supervisor with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, stated, "To be honest with you, not much is being taught about Puget Sound Indians in the classroom." The present system of regional curriculum emphasizes Washington State History in the third, fourth, eighth and eleventh grades. Within these grades, the greatest amount of local and Indian history is taught. There are also some specific subject matter requirements determined by the states. For example, the Washington State Essential Academic Learning Requirements establishes a few specific requirements for the inclusion of Native Americans and has additional areas where Indians could be included to meet the requirements. The interpretation and

---

2 Denny Spokane Hurtado, e-mail to the author, 24 May 2005.
3 For explicit requirements concerning Native Americans see History EALR US1.2.1 and WA1.2.1, also see History EALR 1.1 and 1.3 for EALRs whose standards could be met by a discussing Native American history. http://www.k12.wa.us/curriculumInstruct/SocStudies/historyEALRs.aspx
implementation of these standards, however, is determined by individual districts and most often inclusion of Indians is minimal even in districts with large native populations.\footnote{Bruce Campbell, 2005. Interview by author, 20 May 2005.}

The above outlines the overarching conditions and some of the dissatisfaction concerning Indians within regional curriculum, but for better or worse the representation of Indians within specific schools and classrooms differs. The dissatisfaction concerning the inclusion of Native Americans within education continues to be present at the school and district level, but the inclusion or lack thereof requires a more specific examination.

In a majority of cases, as Marysville School District employee Bruce Campbell describes, "Indians are included exclusively in Social Studies if that." He went on to explain that teachers rely on textbooks to teach regional and Indian history and that this reliance on textbooks is problematic, because "there is so much bias in books, we mostly don't see" and "few teachers monitor texts and/or are sensitive to the issues."\footnote{Bruce Campbell, 2005. Interview by author, 20 May 2005.} The previous example presents a worst case scenario, but Miriam Ebinger, a former third grade teacher with the Ferndale school district, demonstrated an improvement of the previous model in a former classroom. A packet was received from the district to cover during social studies time. She covered all of the included material, but rather than leave it at this, her class also went to a museum for a hands on exhibit examining what life was like for Indians prior to contact, brought in family artifacts (several of her students were Lummi Indians), and integrated reading about Native Americans into literacy instruction.\footnote{Miriam Ebinger, 2005. Interview by author, May 25.} Even with these improvements, she still identified a desire to go more in depth into the history and make it more personal and accessible for her students. The model her classroom provides is a definite step in the right direction, but the absence of modern Indians from
her discussion, and the limited interdisciplinary focus demonstrate areas where continued improvement would be valuable.

Each person within education that I talked to in regards to the inclusion of Indians within education expressed dissatisfaction with the present state of inclusion. This was the same for Miriam Ebinger as it was for primary teachers at Lowell School who remarked that the only inclusion of Indians within their classroom they could isolate was "a character from the Great Body Shop and a few books about the lives and adventures of Native Americans." This dissatisfaction with current conditions points to a desire by teachers and administrators for change, but for most teachers the amount of time required to plan and teach more lessons about Native Americans, and the simple lack of knowledge about Native Americans or how to precede keeps them from moving beyond this dissatisfaction.

This dissatisfaction with the current state of inclusion within education goes beyond practicing teachers. This is clearly illustrated by the pre-mentioned bill sponsored by Representative John McCoy and passed by the legislature on April 20, 2005. This bill further encouraged districts to incorporate tribal history within their curriculum and established a standard both for what should be included and why it is necessary. At the same time, because it does not make this inclusion a requirement the difficulty of implementation may prevent forward movement.

After assessing the conditions statewide, and the current attitudes and practices within local schools it becomes necessary to take a step forward. What follows is a model for how Native Americans can begin to be incorporated into the curriculum in a way that is localized, inter-disciplinary, and shows Indian history both alone and integrated into history as a whole.

---

7 Martin Mulholland, e-mail to the author, 13 May 2005.
Model Curriculum

It is typical in one of the late elementary grades to have a science unit on salmon. Although this unit does not explicitly call for the incorporation of local Indians, they can be incorporated in a meaningful way across the different disciplines. Although additional connections to math, art, music and other subjects could be found and implemented, the following model focuses on incorporating Native Americans into science, literacy, and social studies.

Science

In talking about salmon, conservation efforts and what is needed to have healthy salmon runs will likely be brought up. When this happens, local tribes could be meaningfully brought into the discussion by teaching students how Indians implemented sustainable practices prior to and during early white settlement. For example, not having traps at the mouths of rivers, and moderating their catch to ensure salmon would be able to spawn. In addition, discussion of Indian activism, and support/taking the lead in conservation efforts would also be valuable.

While talking about the lifecycles of salmon, Indians could also meaningfully be brought in by talking about all of the different names the Tlingit have for the different salmon lifecycles. This site (www.ankn.uaf.edu) also has many other resources for bringing salmon, native peoples and native knowledge into the curriculum.

For resources see:

- “The Lummi Indian Tribe and Life with Salmon” http://www.sustainable.org/casestudies/washington/WA_af_lummi.html
- “Salmon, the Lifegiving Gift” http://content.lib.washingotn.edu/aipnw/miller2.html
- “Alaska native Knowledge Network” http://www.ankn.uaf.edu

Literacy

There are many important aspects of literacy, and one that is especially important later in elementary school is comprehension. Through studying the legend “Coyote Spreads Salmon Along the Columbia River” students will utilize comprehension strategies and further their knowledge about Washington tribes and salmon. Before, during, and after the legend has been read use questions to help further student understanding. For example:

---

1 In addition to being valuable for comprehension, some school districts also require the study of myths. For example, the Bellingham school district requires myth study in the third grade.
• How does this legend explain the origins of salmon, their migration, and their greater numbers at some locations rather than others?
• Does it leave you with any unanswered questions about where salmon originated from?
• What does this legend have to say about Indians prior to white settlement? Modern Indians?
• How has this legend adapted to current conditions? Why is it important that it is a living document and has something to say about modern problems such as dams?

For an extension, have students write about how legends are valuable to help us understand Native Americans and salmon in both the past and present. This will require students to synthesize the information from the previous text and think critically.

Social Studies

Social Studies is a very broad subject, as a result what follows covers many different areas. The first lesson idea focuses on the cultural importance of salmon to native peoples in Puget Sound as seen through the first salmon ceremony and the second focuses on civics and history through examining the battle over treaty fishing rights.

First Salmon Ceremony

The goal of this study is to enable students to see the cultural importance of salmon to local tribes prior to white settlement and continuing into the present day. This will be accomplished through examining photographs, People of Cedar and Salmon, and recent newspaper articles. Throughout the different sources have students report on how the ceremony was being performed, how its importance is/is not shown, and how/if any changes have occurred.

Sources:
- “Lummis Salute Salmon” May 28, 2005 The Bellingham Herald
- “Tulalip Tribal Members Show their Respect for the Salmon.” June 24, 2004 Seattle Times
- Google Search Images: first salmon ceremony

Treaty Fishing Rights

Within this study of treaty fishing rights students will be exposed to primary sources and examine parallel events across white history and Indian history. Context is especially important when examining related events across a historical time period, so special note will be given to areas where context is necessary and sources for teachers to begin developing this context are noted. The sequencing of these lessons follows:

• Develop or remind students of the importance of salmon to native peoples on a cultural and subsistence.
• Examine the Point Elliot Treaty, specifically article 5. In small groups or as a whole class have students discuss their understanding of this article and its implications for native fishing. What does it say about the importance of fishing to
tribes if it is included in the treaty provisions? Is it fair to both the tribes and the settlers? Develop a class standard for implementation of this article of the treaty.

- Look at the implementation of this article of the treaty between the treaties ratification in 1859 and the 1974 Boldt decision. Include treaty violations, early court cases, and continued Indian involvement in fishing for subsistence and profit.
- Examine increasing activism throughout the 1960s and early 1970s. Compare and contrast Indian activism to non-Indian activism. Compare and contrast Indian activism in general to specific activism in regards to fishing rights.
- Examine the Boldt decision and investigate whether or not it can be seen as a byproduct of Indian activism. Examine the Boldt decisions immediate impacts and the continued impacts into the present day.

Helpful Sources for developing context:


Author's Note: December 5, 2005

Following finishing this paper, I actually had a chance to implement and further develop the unit on treaty fishing rights along with a partner, Christopher Burke. While developing the unit for presentation to students, I realized that the above outlines are in many cases incomplete. Especially in the Treaty Fishing Rights example, and in others, not enough context is scheduled to be developed.

When I presented the lessons on treaty fishing rights to students we first presented a lesson on conflict resolution and treaties, and then followed this lesson with another whose purpose was to simply introduce students to Indian life prior to and leading into white settlement. Both of these lessons helped the 5th and 6th grade students we were working with have a basis for understanding. Our next step was to have a seminar, a student led discussion, looking at the Point Elliott treaty specifically. We also laid the groundwork for this understanding, and students summarized the treaty before talking about it as a group. With all of this background, students were prepared for the seminar and were able to effectively engage the document, examine the multiple perspectives within it, and think critically about how fair the treaty was and how it might have been implemented. Through presenting these lessons, my ideas concerning how students best learn history were confirmed. Students learn best and build the greatest degree of understanding when they actively engage information, have a context for understanding, and can see and discuss multiple perspectives.