Sovereignty and Survival: The Living Presence of Native Nations

Introduction

Native American history is often treated as a brief prelude to United States history, a story that begins with European arrival and quietly fades away by the nineteenth century. This framing is deeply misleading. Indigenous peoples have lived on and shaped the lands now called the United States since time immemorial, maintaining complex societies, political systems, and historical traditions long before colonization. One way this continuity is preserved is through practices such as the winter count, a visual calendar used by Plains tribes like the Yanktonai to record significant events each year between first snowfalls. A single winter count can span decades, even generations, offering a powerful reminder that Native histories are not abstract or forgotten, but carefully remembered and continuously renewed.

There is no single, unified Native American history. Instead, there are hundreds of distinct histories, each belonging to a sovereign nation with its own language, traditions, timelines, and relationships with neighboring peoples. What connects these diverse stories is not a shared origin, but a shared experience of settler-colonialism. Unlike traditional colonialism, which involves one nation ruling another from afar, settler-colonialism seeks to remove Indigenous peoples entirely and replace them with a permanent settler population. This system, rather than a single historical moment, forms the backbone of United States history and continues to shape the political, legal, and social realities Native nations face today.

Understanding Native American history also requires careful attention to language and identity. Terms such as Indigenous, Native American, and American Indian each carry different meanings, histories, and limitations. Some, like American Indian, remain embedded in treaties and federal law, while others, like Native

American, emerged in the twentieth century as alternatives to older misnomers. Still, no single term can fully encompass the diversity of Indigenous identities, and many Native people prefer to identify themselves by their specific nation or traditional name, such as Diné rather than Navajo. Identity, ultimately, is personal, shaped by culture, community, and individual choice rather than imposed labels.

The consequences of settler-colonialism extend into how race and Native identity have been defined by the United States government. In the nineteenth century, federal policies attempted to collapse hundreds of Indigenous nations into a single racial category, introducing concepts like blood quantum to measure Native identity as a fraction that could be reduced over generations. These measures were designed to dispossess Native people of land and limit treaty obligations, yet they failed in their ultimate goal. Native nations endure, and today millions of people identify as American Indian or Alaska Native, navigating complex questions of citizenship, enrollment, and belonging.

Why Native American history matters goes beyond correcting omissions in textbooks. When Native history is reduced to a short chapter beginning in 1492 and ending in the 1800s, it reinforces the false belief that Indigenous peoples vanished or exist only in the past. In reality, oral traditions preserve knowledge stretching back thousands of years, such as the Klamath account of the eruption that formed Crater Lake, an event confirmed by modern geology. Past and present are inseparable, woven together like strands of a braid. Ignoring this history not only distorts the past, but also obscures the roots of contemporary Native struggles and achievements.

To understand the United States fully, Native American history must be recognized as central rather than peripheral. Indigenous nations predate the U.S.

itself, with political systems such as the Haudenosaunee Confederacy demonstrating forms of governance that existed long before American democracy. Native people are not relics of history. They are here, sovereign, resilient, and actively shaping the future, even as they continue to resist erasure imposed by centuries of settler-colonialism.

Tribal Sovereignty Explained

The concept of tribal sovereignty is often misunderstood or entirely overlooked, yet it is central to understanding the political and legal status of Native nations in the United States. The Chinook Indian Nation provides a clear example of this complexity. Although the Chinook have maintained a continuous culture along the Columbia River for generations, the United States government does not federally recognize them as a sovereign nation. Historically, the Chinook were highly skilled fishers who relied on salmon not only for sustenance but for cultural and spiritual identity. Their First Salmon Ceremony, which involved cooking and eating the season's first fish and returning its bones to the river, reflected a reciprocal relationship with the natural world. This ceremony continues today, demonstrating that Chinook culture is living and ongoing despite the lack of federal acknowledgment.

Tribal sovereignty refers to the inherent, pre-existing right of Native nations to govern themselves and their territories. In the United States, there are 574 federally recognized Native nations, a number that far exceeds the number of U.S. states. While the terms "tribe" and "nation" are often used interchangeably, the word "nation" more clearly reflects this sovereign status. Native nations governed themselves long before European colonization, exercising authority over lawmaking, citizenship, and land management. The Chinook Nation, for example, was politically organized well before the formation of the United States and even assisted Lewis and Clark during their westward expedition.

Importantly, tribal sovereignty is not granted by the United States government, but rather recognized by it. This recognition is embedded in U.S. law, including the

Indian Commerce Clause of the Constitution, which authorizes Congress to regulate commerce with Indian tribes and implicitly acknowledges them as sovereign governments. Early Supreme Court decisions, known collectively as the Marshall Trilogy, further affirmed this status. In Worcester v. Georgia in 1832, the Court declared that Native nations are distinct political communities with inherent rights to self-governance, and that only the federal government, not individual states, may engage in policy-making related to them.

At the same time, this legal framework introduced significant limitations. The Marshall Trilogy also defined tribes as "domestic dependent nations," meaning that while they retain inherent sovereignty, they exist within U.S. borders and under federal oversight. This classification created a system of quasi-sovereignty, in which Congress holds plenary power over Native nations. Under this authority, Congress can expand or restrict tribal powers and determine which tribes receive federal recognition. The Chinook Nation illustrates the instability of this system. Although they signed treaties in 1851, Congress never ratified them. The Chinook were later terminated under the Western Oregon Indian Termination Act of 1956, briefly regained recognition in the early 2000s, and then lost it again during the George W. Bush administration.

When tribal sovereignty is recognized, it allows Native nations to exercise meaningful self-governance. Tribes can create and enforce laws, determine citizenship criteria, operate their own court systems, police their lands, and regulate trade and economic development. Sovereignty also enables tribes to provide essential services, including healthcare and emergency response. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the Indian Health Service played a critical role in supporting many Native communities. Recognized tribes also have authority over land use, including hunting, fishing, and

gathering rights on lands held in trust by the federal government. Without recognition, tribes like the Chinook face significant barriers, such as limited access to healthcare services and the requirement that members purchase fishing licenses despite deep ancestral ties to the land and waterways.

Despite these benefits, tribal sovereignty remains heavily constrained. Congress has repeatedly delegated authority to states, often without tribal consent. Public Law 280, passed in 1953, transferred jurisdiction over certain legal matters from the federal government to six states, including Oregon and California. This law reduced tribal authority over criminal and civil cases while simultaneously cutting federal funding for tribal courts. Even fully recognized tribes face restrictions, as they cannot declare war, sign international treaties, or issue their own currency. These limitations reflect a long history of federal policies aimed at undermining Native sovereignty through displacement, termination, and cultural erasure.

The struggle for recognition continues into the present. In 2017, the Chinook Nation sued the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs in an effort to regain federal recognition, but as of 2024, they have not succeeded. Their case underscores a broader truth: Native sovereignty predates the United States and does not depend on federal acknowledgment for its legitimacy. Instead, recognition determines whether that sovereignty can be exercised in practice. The nation-to-nation relationship between Native nations and the United States remains legally complex, politically fraught, and deeply shaped by historical injustices that continue to affect Native communities today.

Myths and Misconceptions About Native Americans

Public understanding of Native Americans has long been shaped by myths rather than historical reality. One modern example of this disconnect appeared during Super Bowl XXVI, when the former name and imagery of the Washington football team drew renewed criticism from Native activists. Vernon Bellecourt of the American Indian Movement publicly rejected the use of feathers, chants, and stereotypical imagery, arguing that these portrayals were not honors but acts of disrespect. Supporters of the team often claimed the name and symbols were meant to celebrate Native people, yet this belief rested on myth rather than lived Native experience.

One of the most enduring and influential myths is that of the "First Thanksgiving." Popular depictions portray a peaceful shared meal between Pilgrims and Native Americans, suggesting harmony and mutual goodwill. In reality, the land where the Pilgrims settled was Patuxet, the homeland of the Wampanoag people. By the time the Pilgrims arrived, European diseases had already devastated the Wampanoag population, killing as many as ninety percent of the community. The settlers themselves survived in part by stealing food from Wampanoag homes and graves, promising repayment that never occurred. While Wampanoag leader Ousamequin did form an alliance with the Pilgrims, this decision was strategic rather than benevolent, made in response to threats from rival tribes and colonial pressures.

The feast that later inspired the Thanksgiving myth was neither planned nor mutual in the way it is commonly imagined. The Pilgrims did not originally invite the Wampanoags, and it was only after gunfire drew attention that Wampanoag men arrived and helped provide food. Any sense of peace was temporary. Tensions eventually escalated into King Philip's War, one of the deadliest conflicts in early

American history. The Thanksgiving narrative, however, erases this violence. Historians such as David Silverman argue that the myth emerged for political reasons, promoted during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and again during Reconstruction to foster national unity while diverting attention from slavery and colonial violence. This narrative places an emotional burden on Native communities by trivializing trauma and reinforcing the false idea that colonization was peaceful and that Native people no longer exist.

These misconceptions extend beyond early history into popular culture, particularly through Western films and television. Media portrayals often depict Native Americans only as figures of the past, reinforcing the myth of the "Vanishing Indian." In reality, millions of Native Americans live in the United States today. Yet this invisibility has real consequences. Studies show that many Native people feel unseen and uncared for by the broader public, and stereotypes contribute to discrimination, mental health struggles, and anti-Native racism. These portrayals appear not only in films but in school plays, costumes, and everyday imagery that reduce Native cultures to caricatures.

Sports mascots represent one of the most visible and contested forms of stereotyping. Teams such as the Kansas City Chiefs and Atlanta Braves use Native imagery and chants like the "Tomahawk chop," which mimic outdated and offensive portrayals of Native warfare. While organizations often claim these mascots are meant to honor Native people, their origins lie in eras focused on assimilation and cultural erasure. Such representations frame Native identity as historical symbolism rather than as belonging to living communities. Research consistently shows that

exposure to these stereotypes lowers self-worth among Native youth and increases rates of depression.

The former name of the Washington football team illustrates how language itself can perpetuate violence. The term has a documented history tied to bounty programs that paid for the deaths of Native people. Although some Native individuals disagree on its offensiveness, many view it as deeply harmful. Activist Suzan Shown Harjo has recalled hearing the term used during attacks on Native children, underscoring the gap between the so-called "noble Indian" myth and the realities Native communities face.

Economic myths further distort public perception. Native Americans are often portrayed either as wealthy due to casinos or as impoverished recipients of government handouts. In reality, not all tribes operate casinos, and those that do are heavily regulated under federal law. Casino profits must be directed toward healthcare, education, public safety, and infrastructure, and most tribal casinos generate modest revenue. The image of the "rich casino Indian" gained popularity in the 1990s through media portrayals, yet it does not reflect the economic conditions of most Native nations.

Similarly, the idea that Native people rely on government handouts ignores historical context and legal obligations. Some tribes receive compensation for land and resource use as part of treaty agreements. While tribes themselves do not pay federal taxes as sovereign nations, individual Native citizens do pay federal income taxes. Native students generally finance college through loans and grants like other students, with some accessing Native-specific scholarships. Programs such as the Indian Health Service exist not as charity but as the result of treaty obligations,

though they remain chronically underfunded and provide significantly less support than other federal healthcare programs.

These myths are not harmless misunderstandings. They conceal the violence of colonization, distort public knowledge, and perpetuate racism that affects Native communities today. While recent years have seen progress, including the renaming of the Washington football team in 2022 following decades of Native activism, meaningful change requires continued effort. Replacing myths with accurate history and authentic Native voices is essential to understanding both the past and the present of Native America.

What Makes Someone Native American?

Ideas about what it means to be Native American are often shaped by appearance rather than reality. Many people assume that Native identity can be recognized visually, expecting darker skin, long hair, traditional clothing, or other stereotypical traits. In practice, these assumptions quickly fall apart. Native people live modern, diverse lives. They may wear business suits or jingle dresses, write computer code or teach ancestral languages, have buzzcuts or braids, and come from mixed racial backgrounds. A person with an Ojibwe mother and a British father may have pale skin and blond hair and still be fully Native. The central truth is simple: you cannot tell whether someone is Native American just by looking at them.

This misunderstanding stems in part from the false belief that there is a single Native culture or identity. Before colonization, North America, often called Turtle Island by Indigenous peoples, was home to hundreds of distinct tribal nations. Each had its own language, spiritual beliefs, ceremonies, foods, clothing styles, and social

structures. Comparing these cultures as if they were interchangeable ignores this diversity. The Kwakiutl potlatch of the Pacific Northwest, for example, bears no resemblance to the Muscogee Green Corn Ceremony of the Southeast. Treating Native cultures as a monolith reflects colonial thinking rather than Indigenous reality.

European colonization deeply disrupted Native identity, reshaping how belonging, culture, and even spirituality were defined. Prior to contact, Native spiritual traditions varied widely, but many shared a worldview that emphasized interconnectedness, the idea that all living beings are relatives rather than resources. This philosophy is captured in the Lakota phrase Mitákuye Oyás'iŋ, meaning "all my relations." Colonizers brought Christianity with the belief that Native people needed saving, often equating conversion with cultural superiority. Missionaries such as John Eliot learned Indigenous languages in order to convert Native communities and established so-called praying towns, where Native converts were required to cut their hair, wear Puritan clothing, abandon traditional beliefs, and separate from their families. These efforts fractured communities and imposed lasting cultural trauma.

Today, Native religious identity reflects both survival and adaptation. Roughly two-thirds of Native Americans identify as Christian, while others continue traditional practices or blend the two. Some churches incorporate Indigenous traditions into Christian worship, using sweetgrass instead of incense or drums instead of organs. Individual families often reflect this blending as well, such as elders who speak their Native language fluently, wear traditional clothing, and attend Christian services regularly. These combinations are not contradictions but evidence of cultural perseverance.

Language is another critical marker of Native identity, and one that has been systematically attacked. Hundreds of Native languages were lost after European contact, particularly due to American Indian boarding schools established in the late nineteenth century. Native children were forcibly removed from their families, prohibited from speaking their languages, and punished for using their Native names. The trauma of these schools continues across generations. Yet language revitalization efforts demonstrate resilience. One powerful example is Jessie Little Doe Baird, who helped revive the Wôpanâak language of the Wampanoag people. Guided by dreams, prophecy, archival materials, and linguistic training, she rebuilt a language that had not been spoken fluently for generations. Her daughter became the first native speaker of Wôpanâak in seven generations, a profound act of cultural reclamation.

Tribal membership further complicates definitions of Native identity. Before colonization, tribes determined belonging through kinship, adoption, marriage, and community ties, systems that were flexible and inclusive. Over time, the U.S. government imposed formal enrollment standards, forcing tribes to adapt to externally defined rules. Today, each tribe sets its own criteria, often relying on historical records such as the Dawes Rolls. These records are deeply flawed, as many Native people refused to sign them out of fear or protest, and individuals were frequently restricted to registering with only one tribe.

The concept of blood quantum intensified these problems. Introduced by the U.S. government, blood quantum measures Native identity as a fraction of ancestry, such as one-quarter Native blood. Requirements vary by tribe, but the system is controversial because it reduces identity to mathematics, excludes children of enrolled parents, and limits access to citizenship, healthcare, scholarships, and

religious protections. Its underlying purpose was colonial, to reduce the number of legally recognized Native people over time and thus limit federal obligations. Some tribes have begun rejecting blood quantum altogether, choosing instead to redefine belonging on their own terms. DNA tests, despite popular belief, cannot determine tribal membership, as no genetic marker corresponds to a specific Native nation.

Federal recognition adds yet another layer. The United States currently recognizes 574 tribes, a status that provides legal protections, access to federal benefits, and services such as healthcare through the Indian Health Service. Proof of ancestry is often documented through a Certificate of Degree of Indian Blood. Unrecognized tribes, however, face serious obstacles despite their long histories. Groups such as the Winnemem Wintu struggle to protect sacred lands and traditions because they lack legal standing, and are often dismissed as illegitimate by the federal government.

Ultimately, Native identity is not a single checklist of appearance, culture, or legal status. It exists at the intersection of culture, law, ancestry, and community, and it varies from person to person and nation to nation. The defining characteristic that emerges across these differences is perseverance. Despite centuries of efforts to erase Native cultures, Indigenous peoples continue to protect and reclaim their languages, traditions, legal rights, and sense of belonging, asserting their identity on their own terms rather than those imposed upon them.

Why Land Matters to Native Americans

Most people understand a personal attachment to place, whether it is a lake visited every summer, a childhood neighborhood, or a familiar stretch of land that

feels like home. For Native Americans, this connection runs far deeper. Land is not simply where life happens, but is woven into language, traditions, spirituality, and ancestry. These relationships stretch back thousands of years, forming the foundation of Native identity and cultural continuity.

For many Native nations, identity is inseparable from place. The Yuki have lived in what is now California since time immemorial, while the Cherokee, despite being forcibly removed from the Southeast, remain spiritually bound to their ancestral homelands. This connection goes beyond physical geography. Trees, rocks, water, animals, seasons, and even the stars are understood as part of an interconnected living system in which humans are not separate or dominant. Across many Native cultures, land is viewed as a living whole rather than a collection of resources. The Potawatomi word emingoyak, meaning "that which has been given to us," reflects this worldview, encompassing sunlight, food, water, medicine, and shelter. Care is reciprocal: the land sustains the people, and the people are responsible for caring for the land. Writer and botanist Robin Wall Kimmerer describes land not as property, but as identity, home, library, and gift.

These beliefs are expressed through land-based traditions that reinforce mutual responsibility. Among the Coast Salish, the First Salmon Ceremony marks the annual return of salmon and honors a sacred agreement between humans and the natural world. Salmon offer themselves as food, and in return, people sing, dance, pray, clean the rivers, and return the first salmon's bones to the water to ensure renewal. In California, basket weaving traditions similarly connect people to place. Weavers gather native grasses and plants from specific landscapes, and the patterns woven

into baskets encode stories, histories, and ties to homeland. The act of weaving becomes a physical expression of relationship to the land itself.

Language further preserves these connections. Many Native languages reflect intimate knowledge of local environments. In Lushootseed, spoken around the Puget Sound, words often echo the sounds of nature, such as names for rivers or saltwater that mimic water moving over rocks or waves breaking. In Ojibwe, the word onaabani-giizis names the month of March as "the hard crust on the snow moon," embedding seasonal observation directly into language. The Haudenosaunee number system reflects their creation story, with numbers referencing Sky-Woman, her daughter, and her grandsons. These linguistic structures carry ecological knowledge and spiritual meaning that trace back since time immemorial.

Despite common U.S. origin stories that depict North America as an empty wilderness, the land was inhabited, shaped, and carefully managed by Native nations. Archaeological evidence, including 23,000-year-old footprints found in what is now New Mexico, confirms ancient human presence. Indigenous societies developed complex trade networks and engineering feats, such as the Hopewell Earthworks in Ohio, which incorporated materials transported from as far away as the Gulf Coast and the Rocky Mountains. Native environmental practices demonstrated deep ecological understanding. The Zuni created moisture-trapping farming grids in arid landscapes, while the Hidatsa practiced seasonal migration that preserved soil fertility. Controlled burning was widely used to prevent catastrophic wildfires and encourage the growth of useful plants, shaping ecosystems that supported biodiversity.

Settler colonialism violently disrupted these relationships. Colonizers introduced epidemic diseases, invasive species, and systems of land seizure that fragmented tribal territories. Allotment policies divided communal lands into individual parcels, opening the door for non-Native ownership and further dispossession. While Western legal traditions often treat property as sacred, Native worldviews understand land itself as sacred. Forced separation from ancestral lands severed spiritual, cultural, and ecological ties, with consequences that continue today.

In recent decades, Native nations have worked to reclaim land and restore stewardship. The Onondaga Nation, which lost more than two million acres in New York, regained over one thousand acres around the headwaters of sacred Onondaga Lake in 2022. The Iowa Tribe has recovered roughly one-third of its ancestral land and established a tribal national park dedicated to preservation and education. These land returns have enabled ecological restoration, including the return of species such as bison, eagles, swans, and herring, the removal of invasive plants, and the revival of forests, grasslands, and river systems.

For Native communities, land is not merely territory, but home, spirit, responsibility, and future. Restoring land affirms tribal sovereignty, reinforces cultural continuity, and creates opportunities for younger generations to reconnect with ancestral knowledge. As Iowa Tribal Vice Chairman Lance Foster stated, “This is our land forever.” The enduring relationship between Native peoples and their lands remains a powerful testament to resilience, stewardship, and survival.

What Do Native Cultures Have in Common?

Archaeological discoveries often reveal intimate details of daily life, and Native American sites are no exception. Alongside jewelry, pottery, and tools, archaeologists have uncovered dice made from bones and pottery shards, stickball equipment, and toys created purely for play. These objects remind us that ancient Native communities valued joy, competition, and recreation, and that playfulness has long been part of Native life. Far from being trivial, these artifacts reveal cultural continuity, connecting past and present Native peoples through shared experiences of learning, community, and fun.

Although Native nations are extraordinarily diverse, certain values and worldviews create common ground across cultures. One of the most misunderstood of these is humor. Popular stereotypes often depict Native people as stoic or solemn, yet humor has always been central to Native life. Games and toys were not only recreational but educational, teaching cooperation, conflict resolution, and relationship building. Laughter is often described as "good medicine," a source of healing for the mind, body, and spirit. Scholar Vine Deloria Jr. famously argued that humor reflects the soul of a people, and Native humor is frequently dark, satirical, irreverent, and sharp. It serves an important social function, reminding individuals that no one stands above the community. Contemporary Native writers and comedians continue this tradition, using humor to build connection and resilience, whether through memoirs, online memes, or community storytelling.

Humor has also played an educational and spiritual role. Among Pueblo peoples, sacred clowns known as Koshares exaggerate bad behavior to teach moral lessons, using laughter to guide social conduct. These figures were also believed to hold

spiritual power, such as the ability to bring rain. Early European observers often misunderstood or dismissed this humor, particularly when clowns openly ridiculed colonizers, reinforcing colonial misconceptions that Native cultures lacked complexity or wit. In reality, humor has long been a strategy for survival, allowing Native communities to cope with centuries of oppression while maintaining balance and perspective.

Modern media has begun to challenge these misunderstandings. For generations, books, television, and film portrayed Native Americans as humorless or violent, stereotypes that shaped public perception and produced real-world consequences in areas such as law enforcement and mental health. Indigenous-led media projects have helped shift this narrative. Shows like Reservation Dogs and Rutherford Falls center Native voices and reflect lived experiences with authenticity and humor. Indigenous comedians and activists, including Dallas Goldtooth, use humor as both cultural affirmation and political commentary, reclaiming representation through laughter.

Another unifying principle across Native cultures is reciprocity, the belief in mutual interdependence. Play, humor, and diplomacy often intersect within this framework. Games such as chunkey were not merely entertainment but tools for diplomacy, fostering alliances and peaceful interaction between tribes. Reciprocity operates on the principle of shared responsibility, the understanding that caring for others ensures collective strength. This worldview is embodied in the story of the Peacemaker and Hayo'wetha, whose efforts to end cycles of violence led to the formation of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy. Under the Great Law of Peace,

formerly warring nations united, symbolized by the Tree of Peace, demonstrating the power of forgiveness, cooperation, and unity.

This interconnected philosophy extends beyond human relationships to include the natural world. The Lakota phrase Mitákuye Oyás'iŋ, meaning "all my relations," expresses a worldview in which people, animals, elements, and even symbolic or spiritual entities are bound together. From this understanding emerges the principle of the honorable harvest. Across Native cultures, harvesting practices emphasize asking permission, taking only what is needed, ensuring regeneration, and offering gratitude in return. These practices reflect a sustainable ethic rooted long before modern environmental movements, reinforcing respect for land and life.

Generosity further strengthens these systems of relationship and care. Ceremonies such as the potlatch, whose name comes from Chinuk Wawa meaning "to gift," celebrate giving as a form of wealth. Potlatches function not only as social and spiritual gatherings but also as economic and legal systems that redistribute resources and honor communal responsibility over individual accumulation. Kinship systems reinforce these values. In Cheyenne culture, for example, family roles are clearly defined, humor is encouraged, especially among in-laws, and the health of the family is understood as inseparable from the health of the tribe.

Despite centuries of colonization and cultural suppression, these shared values have endured. Humor, reciprocity, generosity, diplomacy, and kinship continue to shape Native communities today. While colonization often dominates narratives of Native history, these foundational principles reveal continuity rather than disappearance. The persistence of these values illustrates how Native cultures remain

rooted in joy, relationship, and resilience, sustaining strength across generations and affirming a living, dynamic present.

The Real Impacts of Archaeology on Native Americans

The history of archaeology and anthropology in the United States cannot be separated from the violence of colonialism, and few stories illustrate this more clearly than that of Minik, a young Inuit boy brought from Greenland to New York in 1897. Explorer Robert E. Peary transported six Inuit to the United States, along with barrels of bones taken from Inuit graves. Although anthropologist Franz Boas had initially suggested bringing a single individual for study, Peary brought six for reasons that were never fully explained. Upon their arrival, thousands of people paid to see them, turning living human beings into spectacles. Minik's experience exposes a disturbing pattern in which Native peoples were treated as objects of study rather than as human beings with families, cultures, and rights.

Anthropology, the study of what it means to be human, and archaeology, its subfield focused on the physical remains of the past, developed within colonial contexts. These disciplines were often used by European and American scholars to study the Indigenous peoples they were actively displacing. Stealing land and stealing bodies became intertwined practices. Native people were frequently viewed as specimens, their cultures something to be collected before presumed extinction, rather than as living societies with their own systems of knowledge and history.

From the late eighteenth century through much of the twentieth, the disturbance of Native graves was widespread and normalized. It is estimated that between the 1780s and the 1970s, as many as one million Native graves were disturbed in the

United States. Even figures celebrated in American history participated in this practice. Thomas Jefferson excavated a burial mound near his home without consulting the Native people who visited the site. By the nineteenth century, grave robbing had become a profitable scientific enterprise. Native skulls were bought and sold, museums competed to expand their collections, and Native remains were displayed alongside dinosaur fossils. Collecting bones became a hobby not only for scientists but for doctors, social elites, and even youth organizations.

Some anthropologists used these stolen remains to promote explicitly racist theories. Aleš Hrdlička, one of the most prominent physical anthropologists of his time, stole hundreds of remains from Alaska alone and amassed a personal collection of roughly twenty thousand skulls. Others openly described Native Americans as biologically inferior. Even Boas, despite arguing for cultural equality, participated in grave robbing, describing the work as unpleasant while continuing to do it. The harm caused by these actions was not accidental but systemic.

Minik's personal tragedy reveals the human cost of this system. After being brought to New York, Minik and the other Inuit were housed in the basement of the American Museum of Natural History, where they were studied and observed by the public. Four of the six died of tuberculosis, including Minik's father, Qisuk. The museum staged a fake funeral for Minik, while Qisuk's body was secretly dissected and stored for study. Hrdlička examined and published research on the remains. For years, Minik attempted to reclaim his father's body, even appealing directly to President Theodore Roosevelt, but his requests were denied. Minik died during the 1918 influenza pandemic, and at the time of his death, his father's remains were still held by the museum.

For nearly two centuries, Native peoples were treated as research subjects rather than as communities with rights to their ancestors and cultural heritage. Anthropologists often claimed they were "salvaging" disappearing cultures, yet Native communities never vanished and continued to preserve their own histories, traditions, and knowledge. Researchers frequently ignored Native perspectives, operating on a one-sided expectation of trust that had not been earned.

Resistance and reform began to take shape in the mid-twentieth century. In the 1960s, the American Indian Movement emerged, challenging the exploitation of Native peoples and protesting the display of human remains. This activism helped drive legal changes, including landmark legislation in 1966, 1979, and most significantly the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990. NAGPRA requires federally funded institutions to consult with tribes and return ancestral remains and cultural items upon request. While the law marked a major shift, its limitations remain clear. It applies only to federally funded institutions, and claims of uncertain tribal origin are often used to delay or deny repatriation. Hundreds of thousands of Native remains are still held in collections today.

Beyond legislation, new approaches to research have emerged that seek to undo the harms of the past. In the 1970s, collaboration between archaeologists and the Makah Tribe demonstrated that respectful, ethical archaeology was possible. After a storm exposed an ancient village site, the tribe invited archaeologists to assist under tribal leadership. Over more than a decade, tens of thousands of artifacts were excavated, interpreted using both oral history and scientific methods, and retained by the tribe, which now curates them. This project helped inspire broader movements toward decolonized archaeology and anthropology.

Decolonized approaches emphasize research conducted with, for, and by Indigenous peoples, grounded in respect for tribal sovereignty and Indigenous knowledge systems. Once considered contradictory, Indigenous anthropology has become a powerful tool for reclaiming narratives and controlling cultural heritage. Scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith has argued that when Indigenous people become the researchers, research itself is transformed.

In recent years, institutions have begun to acknowledge their role in these harms. In 2021, the American Anthropological Association issued a formal apology for the discipline's treatment of Native peoples. Minik's father's remains were finally returned in 1993, nearly a century after they were taken. These steps represent progress, but they do not erase the damage done. Archaeology and anthropology have profoundly affected Native peoples in life and in death, and while activism and Indigenous leadership have reshaped the field, the work of justice, accountability, and repatriation is far from complete.

Introduction to Indigenous Knowledge

Stories from the Potawatomi people describe trees as beings that communicate, plan, and decide how to grow together. For generations, these accounts were dismissed by Western science as metaphor or myth. Yet modern botanists now confirm that trees share information through chemical signals and underground fungal networks. This convergence raises a fundamental question: how did Indigenous peoples understand these relationships long before Western scientists developed the tools to measure them? The answer lies not in mysticism, but in different ways of knowing.

Western science is a powerful and valuable method for understanding the world. It has explained phenomena ranging from particle physics to evolution and even everyday processes like how popcorn pops. However, problems arise when science is treated as the only valid path to knowledge. Indigenous peoples have often been labeled as anti-science, despite their deep empirical understanding of ecosystems, medicine, engineering, and astronomy. The issue is not a rejection of science, but the narrowness with which science has historically been defined. Ways of knowing are the methods cultures use to discover, interpret, and transmit knowledge. Indigenous knowledge systems are built on long-term observation, lived relationship with the Earth, and responsibility to future generations.

Botanist and writer Robin Wall Kimmerer explains that Western science has long assumed objectivity and neutrality, often privileging what looks familiar or human-like. Early scientists overlooked plant communication because plants did not behave in ways they expected. Only when researchers adopted new frameworks did they begin to recognize that plants were, in fact, exchanging information. This shift highlights an important truth: all knowledge is shaped by perspective. Indigenous worldviews often emphasize respect, reciprocity, and relational accountability, and observation extends beyond instruments to include oral histories, stories, and intergenerational memory.

One powerful example of Indigenous knowledge preserved outside Western explanation is the medicine wheel. These ancient stone structures, found across the Plains of the United States and Canada, are typically circular with spokes radiating from a central mound. Some are thousands of years old, yet archaeology alone has not fully explained their purpose. Possibilities include astronomical observation,

ceremonial use, or memorialization. Oral histories provide crucial context. Elders from the Blackfoot Confederacy, including John Wolf Child, shared stories of his ancestor Makoyepuk, a warrior and chief associated with a medicine wheel that no longer exists. These narratives help interpret surviving structures, demonstrating that artifacts without Indigenous knowledge tell only part of the story.

Indigenous peoples were not only observers of the natural world, but innovators and engineers. The Inuit developed kayaks nearly four thousand years ago, perfectly adapted to Arctic waters. The Haudenosaunee created lacrosse long before European contact, embedding physical skill, diplomacy, and spirituality into sport. The Chumash people of coastal California navigated open ocean routes between the Channel Islands and the mainland over eleven thousand years ago. They built tomols, sophisticated canoes made from redwood planks sealed with pine tar, relying on generational knowledge that redwood resisted rot and endured saltwater. These vessels are not relics of the past, as tomols are still constructed and used by the Chumash today.

For much of modern history, Western institutions dismissed Indigenous knowledge as unscientific, but that dismissal is increasingly being challenged. A Mi'kmaw philosophy known as Etuaptmumk, or Two-Eyed Seeing, offers a path forward. Articulated by Elder Albert Marshall, this approach encourages seeing the world through both Indigenous knowledge and Western science at the same time, using the strengths of each. Together, they provide a more complete understanding than either could alone.

This braided approach is embodied by figures such as Nicole Mann, the first Indigenous woman in space and a member of the Wailaki of the Round Valley Indian

Tribes. During her 157-day mission aboard the International Space Station, she conducted spacewalks, studied plant growth to support long-term space travel, and spoke with Native students, including those at the Flathead Indian Reservation. Her work reflects an Indigenous understanding of place, connection, and responsibility, even beyond Earth itself.

Two-Eyed Seeing is also shaping environmental science and conservation. Research shows that biodiversity declines more slowly on Indigenous-managed lands, with lower rates of deforestation and pollution. Indigenous ecological knowledge has proven especially effective in land stewardship. The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes manage over four hundred thousand acres in Montana, including the CSKT Bison Range. Using controlled burns, a traditional practice, they stimulate plant growth, reduce wildfire risk, and create healthy grazing land for bison. The land, taken from the tribes in the early twentieth century, was returned to tribal control in 2020 after decades of advocacy. The Bison Range Museum now educates the public about tribal history and ecological practices, and land return itself has been proposed as a meaningful climate solution.

Indigenous peoples have studied, shaped, and sustained the world since time immemorial. They listened to trees, observed the movement of stars, engineered technologies suited to their environments, and developed ethical systems grounded in reciprocity. Today, Native scientists, educators, and leaders continue to braid Indigenous knowledge with Western science, passing it forward to future generations. As one guiding principle reminds us, knowledge weighs nothing, and it is worth carrying all that we can.

What Are the Fish Wars and Why Do They Matter?

In 1945, a fourteen-year-old Nisqually boy named Billy Frank Jr. was arrested while checking fishing nets along the Nisqually River. As officers dragged him away, he shouted, "Leave me alone! I live here!" This arrest was the first of more than fifty Billy Frank Jr. would endure over his lifetime for the act of fishing. What began as a struggle for survival would grow into one of the most important Native civil rights movements of the twentieth century, known as the Fish Wars.

For Native nations, food is far more than sustenance. Traditional foodways are inseparable from identity, spirituality, and responsibility to the natural world. Among the Nisqually, salmon are sacred gifts from the Creator, central to cultural life and ceremony. Across Native North America, communities developed seasonal diets tied to local ecosystems, marking time through food, such as the Algonquin "Strawberry Moon" in June or the Shawnee "Pawpaw Moon" in September. Preservation methods allowed food to be stored year-round, from acorn flour carefully prepared by California tribes to dried meats and fish. Agricultural knowledge flourished as well, especially through the Three Sisters, corn, beans, and squash, grown together for mutual support and symbolic of interdependence, a system cultivated for generations by nations such as the Haudenosaunee and Cherokee.

Colonization violently disrupted these food systems. Forced removals stripped Native peoples of nearly all their traditional foodlands, while federal boarding schools separated children from their families, languages, and ancestral diets. Students were fed poor rations and punished for eating food grown on school farms. At the same time, settlers exploited Native food sources to weaken resistance. The destruction of the buffalo is one of the starkest examples. For the Great Sioux, who called

themselves the Pte Oyate, or Buffalo Nation, the buffalo was central to survival and spirituality. Yet U.S. military policy actively encouraged extermination, reducing the buffalo population from tens of millions to fewer than one hundred by 1887. The goal was explicit, to starve Native nations into submission and force treaty compliance.

Fishing rights became a similar battleground in the Pacific Northwest. In the mid-nineteenth century, treaties between the United States and tribes such as the Nisqually required Native nations to cede vast territories, but they explicitly retained the right to fish at their usual and accustomed places. By the mid-twentieth century, however, salmon populations were collapsing due to logging, mining, dam construction, and industrial overfishing. Rather than targeting offshore commercial fleets responsible for most of the damage, Washington State enforced new regulations almost exclusively against Native fishers along riverbanks, whose nets accounted for a small fraction of the total catch.

Billy Frank Jr. initially viewed fishing as an act of survival rather than protest. Over time, he came to understand that his arrests were not merely personal but political, rooted in the conflict between federally protected treaty rights and state laws that ignored them. Native activists began staging fish-ins, acts of nonviolent civil disobedience in which they deliberately fished in defiance of state regulations. These protests were met with violence, harassment, and mass arrests, but they also attracted national attention and support from figures such as Marlon Brando.

The struggle culminated in the 1974 Boldt Decision, a landmark court ruling that affirmed treaty rights and held that Native nations in Washington State were entitled to half of the harvestable fish. The decision recognized tribes not as special interest groups but as sovereign nations whose treaty agreements carried the force of law. It

reshaped fisheries management and confirmed that treaty rights were living promises, not historical relics.

Food sovereignty remains a central issue today. It refers to the right of a people to define and control their own food systems, closely tied to cultural sovereignty. Frybread captures the complexity of this struggle. Created during the forced relocation of the Navajo Nation in the 1860s using government rations of flour, lard, and sugar, frybread emerged from necessity. Over time it spread to many tribes. For some, it symbolizes colonization and its links to modern health challenges. For others, it represents resilience, survival, and community, the ability to create something nourishing from almost nothing.

Across the country, Native-led initiatives are restoring traditional food systems. The Muckleshoot Food Sovereignty Project hosts harvest festivals, maintains community gardens, and teaches preparation of foods such as salmon and elk. The Cherokee Nation distributes heirloom seed packets to its citizens. Collaborative efforts like the Three Sisters Project bring together Native gardeners and researchers to grow corn, beans, and squash using traditional methods. Native chefs and educators are also reclaiming foodways through restaurants, cookbooks, and online platforms. Mariah Gladstone, creator of Indigikitchen, teaches traditional cooking methods and dishes such as pemmican and manoomin, connecting nutrition to history and land.

The legacy of the Fish Wars endures. Native communities have always relied on land- and water-based food systems, and colonization sought to destroy those systems as a means of control. Reclaiming food traditions is therefore an act of resistance and cultural survival. The Nisqually River and its salmon remain under

threat today, now co-managed by the state of Washington and Native nations. Billy Frank Jr. continued defending treaty rights until his death in 2014. He was posthumously awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom, and a national wildlife refuge now bears his name. His life stands as a reminder that the fight for food, land, and sovereignty is inseparable from the fight for justice.

The Truth About Columbus's "First Contact"

The story of Christopher Columbus's arrival in 1492 is often taught as a singular moment of discovery, a clean beginning to American history. In reality, this narrative obscures the complexity, violence, and continuity of Indigenous presence in the Americas. When Columbus first encountered the Taíno people on the island of Hispaniola, present-day Haiti and the Dominican Republic, he met a thriving society numbering more than three million people. Within a century, Spanish records declared the Taíno extinct. Yet Taíno descendants, traditions, and cultural practices persist today, revealing that disappearance was not biological but bureaucratic and political. The erasure of the Taíno is emblematic of broader inaccuracies embedded in the myth of the "New World."

The concept of "first contact" itself is misleading. It suggests a single, definitive meeting between Europeans and Native peoples, when in fact there were hundreds of such encounters across different regions and centuries. Columbus's voyage represents only the first contact between the Spanish Empire and the Lucayan people of the Bahamas, a branch of the Arawak. Long before 1492, Norse explorers encountered the Thule people in Greenland. Alaska and Hawaii experienced entirely separate moments of European contact, and in the Pacific Northwest, Coast Salish peoples

first encountered non-Natives in 1805 through the Lewis and Clark expedition. Treating Columbus's landing as the beginning of Indigenous history ignores millennia of life that existed before and continued long after European arrival.

Equally flawed is the idea that Columbus "discovered" America. Columbus did not set out to find a new continent but to reach Asia by sailing west, based on a deeply flawed understanding of the Earth's size. Funded by Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, his mission was driven by the pursuit of wealth and the spread of Catholicism. When he landed in the Bahamas, he believed he had reached India and claimed the land for Spain. The Lucayan people who lived there were neither lost nor unknown to themselves, yet Columbus kidnapped several and labeled them servants. The language of discovery falsely implies empty or unclaimed land, erasing Indigenous sovereignty and presence.

This logic was formalized through the Doctrine of Discovery. In 1493, Pope Alexander VI issued the papal bull Inter Caetera, declaring that lands not inhabited by Christians could be claimed by Christian rulers. This decree, one of several that formed the Doctrine of Discovery, provided legal and moral justification for European colonization and the seizure of Indigenous lands. Its influence extended far beyond the fifteenth century, shaping United States westward expansion and holding legal weight in American courts as recently as 2005. Under this doctrine, Indigenous humanity and land rights were systematically denied.

The arrival of Europeans triggered catastrophic population loss among Native peoples, often attributed solely to disease. So-called virgin soil epidemics, including smallpox and measles, devastated communities with no prior exposure. Estimates suggest Indigenous populations declined by as much as ninety percent. Yet focusing

exclusively on disease obscures the full scope of violence. Epidemics occurred alongside war, enslavement, forced labor, and starvation. In many cases, disease was not an accident of contact but part of a broader system of exploitation and destruction.

One of the most explicit examples of this violence occurred in California following the discovery of gold in 1848. Settler expansion unleashed a campaign of violence known as Indian hunting. In 1851, California Governor Peter Burnett openly acknowledged that a war of extermination was underway. Both the state and federal governments funded this campaign, spending nearly two million dollars to support it. As a result, California's Native population plummeted from approximately 350,000 at first contact to fewer than 18,000 by 1880. This was not an unintended consequence of progress but a deliberate act of genocide.

Despite these assaults, Indigenous peoples were never passive victims. Early interactions with Europeans often involved diplomacy, trade, and strategic alliances. Algonquin, Innu, and Wendat nations allied with the French, exchanging furs for weapons and goods. British colonists, by contrast, were more likely to pursue direct control over land and people, prompting armed resistance. Pontiac's Rebellion in 1763 united multiple Native nations against British expansion in the Ohio Valley and Great Lakes, leading to King George III's Proclamation Line of 1763. Later, the Lakota Sioux resisted U.S. encroachment on the sacred Black Hills, culminating in the Battle of the Little Bighorn in 1876, where Native forces defeated Custer's cavalry. Although the United States later seized the Black Hills illegally, the Lakota never relinquished their claim. In 1980, the Supreme Court ruled in favor of the Sioux Nation, awarding

financial compensation, which the Lakota refused. As scholar Nick Estes stated, the Black Hills are not for sale because the people themselves are not for sale.

The story of the Taíno further demonstrates how erasure operates through what has been called paper genocide. After a 1565 census listed only two hundred Indigenous people on Hispaniola, the Spanish declared the Taíno extinct. Yet earlier, in 1533, Spanish authorities freed enslaved Native people but not Africans, prompting colonizers to reclassify Taínos as African in order to retain them as laborers. In the nineteenth century, Puerto Rican census categories offered only "white" or "non-white," further erasing Indigenous identity. Despite this, Taíno culture survived through oral traditions and practices such as baking casabe, a yuca flatbread still made today.

Modern science has confirmed what Indigenous communities always knew. Genetic studies in the early 2000s found that significant percentages of people in the Caribbean carry Indigenous ancestry, including over half of Puerto Ricans. In 2016, ancient DNA from a thousand-year-old Taíno tooth in the Bahamas confirmed continuity between pre-contact and present-day Indigenous Caribbean peoples. In 2010, Puerto Ricans were finally allowed to self-identify as American Indian or Alaska Native on the U.S. census, a small but meaningful reversal of centuries of bureaucratic erasure.

The truth about Columbus's "first contact" is that there was no single beginning and no clean break. Colonization unfolded through countless encounters, each reshaping Indigenous lives in different ways. Its impacts continue today, as Native nations resist erasure, reclaim land, and assert historical truth. Understanding this history requires abandoning myths of discovery and extinction and recognizing

Indigenous presence, resistance, and survival as ongoing realities rather than chapters that have already closed.

From the Trail of Tears to Wounded Knee

In 1973, more than two hundred Indigenous activists occupied the town of Wounded Knee, South Dakota, the site of the 1890 massacre in which U.S. troops killed roughly three hundred Lakota men, women, and children. The occupation lasted seventy-one days and drew national attention as federal authorities admitted to firing over half a million rounds of ammunition. Two Native men were killed during the standoff. Despite the violence, the occupation was also marked by ceremonial dances, songs, and prayers. Many of the participants were members of the American Indian Movement, and their central demand was simple and profound, that the United States honor its treaty obligations with Native nations.

Those demands traced back to the Treaty Era, a period from the mid-eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth century when nearly four hundred treaties were signed between Native nations and the United States. These agreements were intended to formalize relationships and land arrangements, but most were signed under coercion, confusion, or outright deception. Treaties frequently redrew boundaries, forced Native peoples from ancestral lands, and were later ignored or violated by the federal government. While treaties remain legally binding, enforcement steadily weakened as U.S. expansion intensified.

The reservation system emerged alongside these violations. Beginning in the mid-nineteenth century, the United States confined tribes to designated reservations, often after forced relocation. The Appropriation Bill for Indian Affairs in 1851 funded

a more structured reservation system, and in 1871 Congress unilaterally ended the practice of making treaties with Native nations. Although existing treaties technically remained valid, the ban made them increasingly difficult to enforce. By the end of the Reservation Era, most tribes had lost the majority of their land or had been relocated far from their homelands.

Misunderstandings about land ownership predated the United States itself. In 1626, Dutch colonists allegedly purchased Manhattan, known as Manahatta, from the Lenape. The popular story that the island was traded for twenty-four dollars in trinkets is misleading. The account comes from a secondhand source, and the exchange was likely closer to a thousand dollars in value. More importantly, the two sides held fundamentally different views of land. Europeans understood land as private property to be owned permanently, while the Lenape viewed it as communal, shared, and managed by extended families. As Johanna Gorelick of the National Museum of the American Indian has noted, the meaning of the exchange itself remains in question.

Following the American Revolution, tensions escalated as colonists pushed westward into Native territories, provoking violent retaliation. In the early years of the United States, the federal government was militarily weak and pursued treaties framed as peace and friendship agreements. One of the earliest, the 1778 treaty with the Delawares or Lenape, promised statehood and sovereignty in exchange for military cooperation. The United States failed to uphold these promises, setting a pattern that would repeat for generations. As Lakota leader Red Cloud later observed, the government promised to take Native land and then did exactly that.

As U.S. power grew, treaties increasingly focused on land acquisition rather than coexistence. In the Southeast, tribes such as the Cherokee, Creek, Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Seminole resisted removal, determined to retain fertile lands that had become highly valuable for cotton production. In 1814, U.S. forces under Andrew Jackson defeated the Creek Nation at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, resulting in the cession of twenty million acres. Faced with overwhelming military force, many tribes concluded that resistance was futile and signed deeply unfavorable treaties.

The passage of the Indian Removal Act in 1830 marked a turning point. Although presented as voluntary, removal was enforced through threats, bribery, and violence. The Treaty of New Echota in 1835, signed by a small faction of Cherokee leaders without the consent of the majority, ceded millions of acres of Cherokee land. Most Cherokee, led by Principal Chief John Ross, rejected the treaty as fraudulent. In 1838, federal troops forcibly removed Cherokee families at gunpoint, sending them west on what became known as the Trail of Tears. Of the roughly one hundred thousand people removed across multiple tribes, an estimated fifteen thousand died from disease, exposure, and starvation.

U.S. expansion into the western territories intensified conflict with Plains tribes. In 1868, a treaty established the Great Sioux Reservation, encompassing sixty million acres. When valuable resources were discovered on Lakota land, the United States began reclaiming it in violation of the treaty. By the end of the Reservation Era, only about twenty percent of the original reservation remained. Conditions on reservations were harsh, marked by drought, poor farmland, restrictions on hunting, the destruction of the buffalo, and aggressive policies of cultural assimilation, including forced adoption of Western clothing and Christianity.

These pressures culminated in the Wounded Knee Massacre of 1890. Following the killing of Sitting Bull, U.S. troops surrounded a Miniconjou Lakota camp. When a gun discharged accidentally, soldiers opened fire, killing approximately three hundred Lakota people, many of them women and children. The massacre became a symbol of the brutality of U.S. Indian policy and the violent consequences of broken treaties.

The return to Wounded Knee in 1973 revived national awareness of this history. The occupation reframed treaties not as artifacts of the past but as living legal agreements that could still be enforced. In the decades since, Native nations have increasingly used treaties to win legal victories over land, water, and resource rights. The movement also inspired later generations of activists. Some participants in the 1973 occupation would go on to stand at Standing Rock in 2016, opposing the Dakota Access Pipeline and asserting sovereignty over Native land and water.

From the Trail of Tears to Wounded Knee, the throughline of Native history is not disappearance but resistance. Treaties remain the legal foundation of the relationship between Native nations and the United States, and efforts to enforce them continue today. What began as survival has evolved into sustained movements for sovereignty, land, and justice, carried forward by new generations determined to hold the United States accountable to its promises.

The History of America's Indian Boarding Schools

In 2024, President Joe Biden issued a formal apology on behalf of the federal government for its role in forcibly separating Native American children from their families and placing them in boarding schools for more than a century and a half. The apology marked the first time a sitting U.S. president directly acknowledged this

policy at the national level. Responses within Native communities were mixed. Some expressed relief at hearing the harm publicly named, while others emphasized that words alone could not repair the damage. As Rosalie Whirlwind Soldier of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe stated, an entire generation and future had been destroyed, and an apology without action was not enough.

The boarding school system emerged in the late nineteenth century after decades of broken treaties, warfare, and forced removal. By the 1880s, many white reformers who had once called themselves "Friends of the Indian" abandoned efforts to honor treaties or return land. Instead, they embraced assimilation as the solution to what the U.S. government referred to as the "Indian problem," a term that framed Native presence as an obstacle to settler expansion. After treaties failed, wars proved costly, and reservations did not erase Native identity, assimilation was promoted as the final answer. The goal was to eliminate Native claims to land by erasing cultural difference and reshaping Native people into settlers in behavior, belief, and appearance.

This philosophy was most aggressively implemented through Native boarding schools. A central figure in this effort was Richard Henry Pratt, a former U.S. Army officer who began experimenting with cultural erasure while overseeing Native prisoners of war. He cut their hair, dressed them in military uniforms, and banned traditional practices. In 1879, Pratt founded the Carlisle Indian Industrial School in Pennsylvania, the first federally run off-reservation boarding school. Carlisle became the model for dozens of similar institutions across the country. Thousands of Native children were taken from their families, often sent hundreds or thousands of miles away, and forced to abandon their languages, religions, names, clothing, and cultural

identities. Resistance was met with beatings, and many children suffered malnutrition, disease, and abuse. Hundreds died while enrolled, and those who survived often returned home unable to communicate with their families or fully reconnect with their communities.

Some Native parents initially sent children to these schools voluntarily, believing education might help them survive in a changing world. Many others were coerced or outright forced, with schools sometimes requiring parents to surrender legal custody. Resistance was punished harshly. In 1894, nineteen Hopi men were imprisoned at Fort Alcatraz for refusing to send their children to boarding schools. Native intellectuals and writers also criticized the system. Zitkala-Ša described the so-called civilization imposed by boarding schools as shallow and violent, an imitation that erased Native strengths rather than engaging them. Her critiques led to her dismissal by Pratt, who labeled her work worthless.

Boarding schools alone, however, did not fully achieve the government's assimilation goals. While children were targeted, adults remained culturally connected to their communities. To address this, reformers turned to land policy. Senator Henry Dawes, another self-identified Friend of the Indian, helped draft the General Allotment Act of 1887, commonly known as the Dawes Act. This law broke up communal tribal lands into individual allotments, typically up to 160 acres per person. The stated purpose was to promote private land ownership, farming, and domestic life modeled on white settlers. Any remaining land, labeled surplus, was opened to non-Native settlement. Those who accepted allotments were offered U.S. citizenship in exchange for giving up tribal citizenship.

Allotment was imposed unevenly and often violently. The Omaha Nation experienced it before 1887, prompting Chief Ongpatonga, also known as Big Elk, to warn his people that their culture would collapse if the policy continued. The Yankton Sioux resisted allotment because their land was better suited for communal grazing than individual farming, yet federal authorities used military force to impose it. The results were devastating. Before the Dawes Act, Native nations controlled roughly 138 million acres of land. By 1934, they had lost nearly two-thirds of it.

Allotment also reshaped Native identity through bureaucratic means. Tribal rolls were created, and blood quantum was introduced as a way to measure Native identity. These determinations were often arbitrary and based on appearance rather than community ties. Mixed-race individuals were frequently granted immediate control of their land, while those labeled “full-blood” were forced to wait decades. Many families were unable to pay property taxes and were compelled to sell their allotments, resulting in checkerboard land ownership within reservations. On the Nez Perce Reservation, for example, only a small fraction of the land remains in tribal or member ownership.

The combined effects of boarding schools and allotment produced deep and lasting harm. Land parcels became increasingly fractionated over generations through inheritance, sometimes leaving hundreds of co-owners for a single piece of land. The trauma inflicted by boarding schools persisted across families and communities. Dr. Denise Lajimodiere of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa has described these policies as cultural genocide, recounting punishments that included language bans, forced washing with lye soap, and physical abuse. Survivors and their descendants continue to experience the consequences.

Healing, however, is ongoing. Many Native communities emphasize that language is medicine and culture is treatment. Tribal-run schools now teach Native languages and traditions that were once forbidden, reclaiming what earlier policies sought to destroy. By the late nineteenth century, Native communities had already endured centuries of exploitation and loss. Assimilation and allotment were framed as benevolent reforms, yet they resulted in cultural erasure and massive land dispossession. Despite this, Native resistance never ceased, and today tribes continue the work of restoring languages, land, and cultural identity, carrying resilience forward across generations.

The Termination Act Explained

In the early 1950s, the Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin appeared to be in a rare position of stability. After a sixteen-year legal battle, the tribe won a major case against the United States government for mismanagement of their forest, securing 8.5 million dollars in compensation in 1952. More importantly, they gained control over how their forest would be logged, allowing them to practice sustainable management rooted in generations of ecological knowledge. While individual tribal members were not wealthy, the tribe had something many Native nations did not at the time, a financial safety net and a functioning economic base. That security, however, was short-lived.

U.S. policy toward Native nations has never followed a straight line. Instead, it has swung back and forth between limited recognition and active erasure. After the devastating Allotment and Assimilation Era of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the federal government briefly shifted course during the Reorganization

Period, attempting to reverse some of the damage caused by land loss and forced cultural suppression. By the 1950s, however, the pendulum swung again. The United States entered what became known as the Relocation and Termination Era, reviving assimilationist strategies under new names. Relocation pushed Native people into cities, while termination sought to dissolve tribes entirely by ending their legal existence.

The federal motivation behind these policies was largely financial. In the aftermath of World War II, the government looked for ways to cut costs, and Native programs became a target. The Bureau of Indian Affairs funded schools, healthcare, roads, and other services that were not charitable benefits but obligations guaranteed by treaties in exchange for land. By eliminating tribes as legal entities, the federal government could claim it no longer had treaty responsibilities to uphold.

Relocation began in 1952 through programs run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Native people were encouraged to move to major cities with promises of job training, housing assistance, and education. The Indian Relocation Act expanded these incentives, covering moving expenses and offering limited support during transition. In practice, relocation functioned as assimilation under a different name. Those who moved were separated from their communities, languages, and cultural support systems. The long-term hope behind the policy was that Native people would blend into the urban population, leading to the disappearance of tribes, reservations, governments, and treaties altogether.

Termination made this goal explicit. Passed in 1953, the Termination Act declared that Native Americans would be subject to the same laws, privileges, and responsibilities as other U.S. citizens. While this language sounded egalitarian, its

effect was devastating. Federal recognition of tribal sovereignty was withdrawn, reservations were dissolved, tribal governments dismantled, and federal support abruptly cut off. If Native nations no longer legally existed, the United States argued, it no longer owed them anything.

Native leaders fiercely opposed termination. The National Congress of American Indians proposed an alternative approach, gradual federal assistance that would allow tribes to build sustainable economies without destroying their governments. Despite public advocacy and media attention, their proposal failed, and termination became official policy alongside relocation.

The Menominee were among the first tribes targeted. Federal officials labeled them "ready" for termination because of their financial stability. In 1954, Senator Arthur V. Watkins visited the tribe and presented what appeared to be a vote on how settlement funds would be distributed. Buried within the agreement, however, was consent to termination. By the time many Menominee members realized what they had agreed to, it was too late to reverse the decision.

The consequences were immediate and severe. Tribal property was transferred to a corporate entity called Menominee Enterprises Incorporated, in which individual members held only small shares. The reservation itself was converted into Menominee County, which quickly became one of the poorest counties in Wisconsin. Without federal funding, the tribal hospital closed, schools and utilities deteriorated, and one hundred fifty workers lost their jobs when the lumber mill could no longer afford necessary renovations. Within seven years, the corporation was on the brink of bankruptcy, and many families were forced to sell land simply to survive.

The Menominee experience was not unique. In 1958 alone, forty-four tribes in California were terminated. Congress promised infrastructure support but failed to deliver, leaving many communities landless and impoverished. Nationwide, one hundred nine Native nations were terminated during the 1950s and 1960s. In total, 1.3 million acres of Native land were lost, and approximately eleven thousand people, about three percent of the Native population at the time, lost recognition and access to services.

Relocation and termination reinforced one another. As people were pushed into cities, fewer remained on reservations to resist termination. At the same time, terminated tribes lost resources that might have allowed members to stay, forcing even more people to relocate. Between 1950 and 1968, more than two hundred thousand Native Americans moved to urban areas. Many encountered low-paying jobs, housing discrimination, racism, and profound isolation. For those whose reservations had been dissolved, returning home was no longer possible.

Despite the damage, termination did not erase Native peoples or nations. Among the Menominee, resistance took organized form. In 1962, they created a nonprofit organization to preserve their tribal name. In 1964, nearly eight hundred Menominee petitioned President Lyndon Johnson to repeal termination, though their request was ignored. In 1970, a grassroots group called DRUMS, Determination of Rights and Unity for Menominee Stockholders, formed under the leadership of Ada Deer and James Washinawatok. Through sustained activism and political pressure, they succeeded.

In 1973, Congress officially restored the Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin. Ada Deer became the first woman to lead the Menominee and later the first Native woman

to head the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Her work demonstrated that Indigenous peoples were not powerless subjects of policy, but political actors capable of changing it. Other tribes followed, including the Klamath Tribe in 1986, though often without full restoration of land. Many tribes gained state recognition, while others remain unrecognized despite decades of advocacy.

Relocation and termination were designed to assimilate Native people, dismantle Native nations, and relieve the federal government of its treaty obligations. Both policies failed in their stated goals but succeeded in inflicting lasting harm. While some tribes have reclaimed recognition, the scars remain visible in land loss, poverty, and disrupted governance. The era that followed, self-determination, emerged directly from this failure, as Native nations asserted their right to shape their own futures rather than accept erasure imposed by federal policy.

The Native Civil Rights Movement

Alcatraz Island, long known as a symbol of isolation and confinement because of its history as a federal prison, became the setting for a turning point in modern Native American history. In November 1969, Native activists transformed "The Rock" into a place of resistance and vision. The occupation of Alcatraz did more than draw attention to injustice, it helped catalyze a new era in the relationship between Native nations and the United States, an era whose effects continue to shape policy and activism today.

The occupation was organized by Indians of All Tribes, a multi-tribal coalition formed in response to generations of broken treaties, forced removals, assimilation policies, and land loss. By the 1960s, Native communities had endured the failures of

the Indian Reorganization Act and the devastation of the Termination Era, which dismantled tribal governments and severed federal recognition. Activism surged through movements such as the Red Power Movement and organizations like the American Indian Movement, as Native people demanded visibility, sovereignty, and accountability. When Indians of All Tribes occupied Alcatraz for nineteen months, they asserted that the island, originally home to the Muwekma Ohlone people, was Indigenous land. Leader Richard Oakes framed the occupation as a moral test for the United States, challenging the government to confront its history and commit to meaningful change.

The impact of Alcatraz reached the highest levels of government. Within a year of the occupation, President Richard Nixon publicly rejected termination policies and announced a shift toward restoring tribal authority and sovereignty. This marked the beginning of what is now known as the Self-determination Era, which emerged in the late 1960s and continues today. The core goals of self-determination included honoring treaties, reaffirming tribal sovereignty, and expanding tribal control over governance and resources on Native lands. While Alcatraz accelerated these changes, the roots of self-determination extended earlier. In the early 1960s, the Zuni Nation successfully used existing legal mechanisms to replace Bureau of Indian Affairs employees with elected tribal leaders, demonstrating that tribes could effectively manage their own affairs. Nixon later cited this example to support broader policy reform.

These ideas were formalized in 1975 with the passage of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, which allowed tribes to contract with the federal government to run programs previously controlled by federal agencies.

Through this framework, tribes gained greater authority over schools, healthcare clinics, emergency services, and social programs. Although federal oversight did not disappear and bureaucratic processes remained complex, day-to-day decision-making increasingly shifted to tribal governments. Federal agencies were also required to consult with tribes when policies directly affected them, reinforcing the government-to-government relationship.

Education became one of the most visible areas of transformation. Boarding school models rooted in assimilation gave way to culturally grounded approaches. Tribal management of former Bureau of Indian Affairs schools allowed communities to replace punishment and erasure with healing and continuity. At schools such as Riverside Indian School, once notorious for suppressing Native identity, students were now encouraged to learn their languages, histories, songs, dances, and traditional clothing. Alumni returning as teachers strengthened community ties and helped repair generational harm. Elsewhere, culturally informed curricula improved educational outcomes. In Alaska, Yup'ik Elders connected mathematics to traditional salmon rack geometry, while in the Navajo Nation's Rock Point community, full immersion in the Navajo language across subjects supported both language revitalization and higher achievement in math and English.

Self-determination also reshaped child welfare policy. In 1978, Congress passed the Indian Child Welfare Act in response to the widespread removal of Native children from their families and communities. The law prioritized placing children with relatives, tribal foster agencies, or members of the child's nation. Studies have shown that these placements lead to greater stability, higher educational and employment outcomes, and lower rates of incarceration and housing insecurity in adulthood.

ICWA recognized that protecting children also meant protecting culture, sovereignty, and community continuity.

Despite its successes, self-determination has not been without challenges. Not all tribes benefited equally, particularly those whose federal recognition had been terminated and not yet restored, leaving them without access to funding and programs under new policies. Governance and oversight issues also emerged. In the 1980s, a congressional investigation documented cases of fraud, corruption, and mismanagement within both the Bureau of Indian Affairs and some tribal governments. In response, Congress amended self-determination laws to strengthen tribal control and accountability. An amendment in 1988 protected tribal contracting authority, and later changes made Tribal Self-Governance permanent within the Department of the Interior and the Department of Health and Human Services, increasing flexibility and oversight in how funds were managed.

More than fifty years after the occupation of Alcatraz, the legacy of the Native civil rights movement remains active. At a 2015 anniversary event, former occupier Jonny Bearcub described Alcatraz not as an ending, but as a beginning, a moment that gave Native people permission to assert their rights more boldly. That momentum continues today in efforts ranging from land and treaty rights advocacy to food sovereignty initiatives. Organizations such as the National Association of Food Distribution Programs on Indian Reservations now work with the U.S. Department of Agriculture to improve access to fresh and traditional foods, reflecting how increased tribal control can directly improve community health and well-being.

The Native civil rights movement transformed U.S. policy by replacing termination and forced assimilation with self-determination and tribal governance. It strengthened education, protected Native children, and reaffirmed sovereignty. At the same time, unresolved issues remain, including unrecognized treaties, unceded lands, and enduring structural injustices. Activism, policy reform, and community leadership continue to push these conversations forward, guided by the belief that self-determination is not a completed chapter, but an ongoing process shaped by Native voices, resistance, and vision.

Introduction to Federal Indian Law

Federal Indian law is often described as a tangled mess, and for good reason. It is not a single statute or court case, but a vast web of treaties, laws, executive orders, administrative decisions, and judicial rulings that span centuries. These rules exist because Native nations never surrendered their sovereignty when the United States was formed. Instead, they entered into relationships with the federal government as distinct political communities. The result is a separate and highly complex legal framework that continues to shape the daily lives of Native individuals, communities, and nations.

One modern example illustrates how this complexity plays out in real life. In 2010, the Haudenosaunee Nationals lacrosse team planned to travel to the United Kingdom for the World Lacrosse Championships. Lacrosse was invented by the Haudenosaunee, and the team had traveled internationally for decades using Haudenosaunee passports. This time, however, the United States refused to recognize those passports as valid for reentry, arguing that the Haudenosaunee were not a

"real" nation capable of issuing a "real" passport. The United Kingdom would not admit the team without a guarantee that they could return home. Rather than accept a one-time exception that undermined their sovereignty, the players chose to miss the tournament. Understanding why this happened requires understanding federal Indian law.

At its core, federal Indian law governs every legal decision that affects Native people. It exists because tribes retained their inherent right to self-govern after the founding of the United States. Under this system, tribes are considered domestic dependent nations. They are sovereign, but Congress has the power to limit or redefine the boundaries of that sovereignty. These shifting limits create legal gray areas that make the system difficult to navigate and often inconsistent in its outcomes.

At the individual level, federal Indian law can determine something as basic as whether a Native person's government-issued document is recognized. The Haudenosaunee lacrosse team's experience shows how sovereignty can be acknowledged in theory but denied in practice. Their refusal to compromise was not symbolic, it was a direct assertion of nationhood and self-governance, even at personal cost.

The individual impact of federal Indian law is even more visible in the crisis of Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women. Indigenous women face rates of violence far higher than the national average, and most perpetrators are non-Native. Because tribal authority over non-Indians is limited, tribes often cannot fully prosecute those who commit crimes on tribal land. Jurisdictional confusion creates loopholes where violence goes unpunished. Amendments to the Violence Against Women Act have

granted tribes limited authority to prosecute certain crimes committed by non-Indians, but those powers remain restricted. The result is a system in which Indigenous women are treated differently under the law, investigations move more slowly, and cycles of violence persist.

At the community level, federal Indian law hinges on legal identity. The law applies specifically to "American Indians," a legal term meaning enrolled members of federally recognized tribes. Many Native people belong to tribes that are not federally recognized, whether because recognition was never granted or was taken away through termination policies. These individuals are excluded from many protections and services, despite their cultural and historical ties. Each tribe determines its own membership criteria, and DNA tests alone cannot establish tribal citizenship. Recognition status does not affect whether Native people are U.S. citizens, but it has enormous consequences for access to resources and legal protections.

One of the central pillars of federal Indian law is the trust responsibility. Since the nineteenth century, the U.S. government has claimed a legal and moral obligation to protect tribes and their members, an obligation rooted in treaties, the Constitution, and federal statutes. This responsibility is administered largely through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which funds infrastructure, education, emergency services, environmental programs, and climate resilience efforts on reservations. For example, the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community has received federal support to revive clam gardening, a traditional practice that strengthens ecosystems and protects shorelines from climate impacts. Such support, however, is only available to federally recognized tribes, leaving hundreds of unrecognized nations without access to assistance.

At the land level, federal Indian law governs what is known as Indian Country. This term refers both to cultural homelands and to a legal designation for land held in trust by the federal government for tribes. Approximately fifty-six million acres are held in trust, with the federal government retaining legal title while tribes are the intended beneficiaries. This arrangement creates additional barriers, as tribes face more restrictions on land use than private landowners. Even so, treaties remain powerful legal tools. In 2014, the Supreme Court affirmed that a Crow tribal citizen had the right to hunt elk off-reservation on national forest land, upholding treaty guarantees that predated state authority.

Federal Indian law is not static. It continues to evolve as tribes assert sovereignty, challenge restrictive interpretations, and push for recognition of treaty rights. The Haudenosaunee Nationals eventually returned to international competition, traveling to Ireland in 2022 where their passports were accepted and stamped. Their experience underscores the central truth of federal Indian law, that sovereignty persists, even when it is contested. While the system remains complex and often unjust, it is also a space where Native nations continue to defend their rights, define their futures, and assert their place as self-governing peoples.

The Era of Native Urban Relocation

A famous photograph of Native men standing calmly on steel beams high above New York City captures a moment that has come to symbolize Native presence in urban America. Many of these men were Mohawk ironworkers, often called "Skywalkers," whose skill and fearlessness helped build the modern skyline. Their

work shaped one of the most iconic cities in the world, yet Native people are rarely associated with urban spaces in popular memory. That absence raises an important question, why do conversations about Native history so often overlook cities, when Native people have long lived and worked within them?

The answer lies in federal policies of the mid twentieth century that attempted to erase Native identity by severing people from their lands and communities. During the Relocation and Termination Era of the 1950s and 1960s, the United States pursued two parallel strategies. Termination stripped more than one hundred tribes of federal recognition, while relocation encouraged Native individuals to move from reservations to cities in the name of assimilation. Together, these policies sought to make Native nations disappear by dissolving sovereignty and dispersing people into the urban population.

Relocation policies were shaped by post World War II priorities. As the federal government redirected resources toward military spending, Native programs were increasingly viewed as too costly. Dillon S. Myer, then commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, argued that reservations were overcrowded and undeserving of investment. He promoted relocation as a solution that would supposedly offer Native people opportunity while freeing reservation land for taxation or sale. In 1953, the BIA launched the Relocation Program, promising paid transportation, short term financial support, job training, and access to good schools and housing in cities.

The reality was far different. Native people who relocated often found themselves confined to low paying jobs, scarce housing, and neighborhoods shaped by discrimination and racism. Cultural isolation compounded these challenges, as people were separated from extended family networks and community support

systems. Many wanted to return home but could not afford the journey back, while others found that termination policies had eliminated the reservation they once knew. Between 1953 and 1973, roughly one hundred thousand Native people were relocated to cities such as Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Cleveland. Success was measured simply by whether participants remained in cities after a year, not by their quality of life. The unspoken goal was invisibility, to remove Native people from the government's responsibility by absorbing them into urban America.

Today, understanding how many Native people live in cities remains difficult. The 2020 United States Census reported that nearly seventy percent of people identifying as American Indian or Alaska Native live in urban areas, while a 2017 housing report suggested the opposite. These contradictions stem from differences between self identification and tribal enrollment. Census categories include Indigenous ancestry from across the Americas, while tribes define citizenship through their own criteria. This gap fuels misconceptions and complicates funding decisions. Urban Native communities often face higher poverty and unemployment rates, yet the Indian Health Service allocates only a small fraction of its budget to urban clinics. In response, organizations such as the National Urban Indian Family Coalition have encouraged Native participation in the census to ensure visibility and access to resources.

Despite the hardships of relocation, Native people in cities did not disappear. Instead, they found one another and built new forms of community. Urban spaces became centers of intertribal organizing, giving rise to movements such as the Red Power Movement and the American Indian Movement. These efforts filled gaps left by government neglect and created networks of mutual aid, cultural expression, and

political activism. One powerful example is Little Earth in Minneapolis, founded in 1973 as the first subsidized housing complex to give preference to Native residents. Today, it remains home to roughly one thousand people from more than thirty Native nations and offers services ranging from food programs and health access to cultural events, urban farming, and elder mentorship.

These developments also sparked debates about Pan Indianism, the blending of multiple tribal identities into shared urban Native communities. Some scholars worried this would dilute distinct traditions and sovereignty, while others argued that unity across tribes created strength and resilience. Scholar Sydney Ann Beckmann suggests that this debate misses a deeper issue, the assumption that Indigenous life belongs only on reservations. In reality, Native culture adapts and thrives wherever Native people live, including cities.

More than fifty years after relocation officially ended, Native presence in urban America remains strong. Cities did not erase Native identity, they reshaped it. As writer Tommy Orange observed, the city made Native people new, and they made it theirs. Urban Native communities continue to redefine what it means to belong, proving that Native history is not confined to the past or to rural spaces, but is alive and evolving in the heart of modern cities.

The History of Alaskan and Hawaiian Statehood

At first glance, the political map of Native America reveals something strange. Nearly forty percent of all federally recognized tribal nations are located in Alaska, while none are located in Hawai'i. Both places sit far from the continental United States, and both entered the Union in 1959, yet their Native peoples have been treated

in radically different ways under U.S. law. Understanding why requires tracing how Alaska Natives and Kanaka Maoli experienced colonization, statehood, and the question of sovereignty.

Alaska is vast, larger than Texas, California, and Montana combined, and Alaska Native peoples have lived there for at least ten thousand years. Their lives were shaped by subsistence practices rooted in hunting, fishing, and gathering, adapted to harsh winters and demanding landscapes. These communities were culturally diverse, including Athabascans in the interior, Inupiat and Yup'ik peoples in the north and southwest, Aleut and Alutiiq peoples along southern island chains, and Haida, Tlingit, Tsimshian, and Eyak peoples along the southeastern coast. Long before the United States existed, these nations had established deep relationships with the land and its ecosystems.

Colonization in Alaska followed a different path than in the lower forty eight states. Russian traders were the first Europeans to exert control, and in 1867 the United States purchased Alaska from Russia for $7.2 million. While often framed as a land deal, Alaska Natives insisted that their land was never sold, ceded, or conquered. They argued that the United States had purchased Russia's claim, not Indigenous land itself. Alaska's political status shifted from military district to mining district and finally to U.S. territory in 1912, all while Native land claims remained unresolved. Although mass forced removals were not carried out as they were elsewhere, Alaska Natives still faced discrimination, segregation, and violence. During World War II, hundreds of Aleuts were forcibly interned, and racial exclusion signs were common. Activists such as Elizabeth Peratrovich played a critical role in challenging these injustices, helping secure a landmark 1945 anti discrimination law.

When Alaska became the forty ninth state in 1959, tensions escalated. The Statehood Act allowed Alaska to claim over one hundred million acres of land labeled vacant or unreserved. Alaska Natives rejected this language, noting that these lands were central to hunting, fishing, and survival. In response, Native leaders formed the Alaska Federation of Natives in 1966 and successfully demanded a freeze on land transfers until Native claims were addressed. The result was the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971, which exchanged Native claims to the entire state for forty three point seven million acres of land and nearly one billion dollars. Unlike treaties in the lower forty eight, this settlement funneled land and funds into Native corporations rather than reservations. Even so, it did not initially grant federal recognition. That recognition finally came in 1993, when the United States acknowledged 229 Alaska Native entities as sovereign, explaining why such a large share of federally recognized tribes are now located in Alaska.

The story in Hawai'i unfolded very differently. Kanaka Maoli, the Native Hawaiian people, descend from Polynesian navigators who settled the islands more than two thousand years ago. They built complex agricultural systems, supported by terraces, irrigation canals, and ecological knowledge, and grounded their society in spiritual relationships with land and ancestral spirits known as ʻaumakua. Their worldview is preserved in the Kumulipo, a creation chant that traces the origins of life and the universe.

European contact in Hawai'i began in 1778 and proved devastating. Disease wiped out more than eighty percent of the Native population. By the nineteenth century, American and European settlers dominated the economy through sugar plantations and accumulated immense political power. In 1891, Liliʻuokalani ascended

the throne as the first and only queen of Hawai'i. Her authority, however, was sharply constrained by white businessmen who had already stripped voting rights from Native Hawaiians and concentrated power in settler hands. In 1893, a group of settlers, backed by U.S. troops, overthrew her government. She surrendered to prevent bloodshed, and Hawaiian sovereignty was dismantled. The royal palace became a government building, English replaced Hawaiian in schools, and cultural suppression intensified.

The United States annexed Hawai'i in 1898, claiming the islands had willingly ceded sovereignty, despite petitions signed by tens of thousands of Kanaka Maoli opposing annexation. Over the next six decades, settlers from the mainland arrived in large numbers, eventually outnumbering Native Hawaiians. In 1959, Hawaii voted to become a state. Although the vote passed overwhelmingly, most voters were non Native residents, leading many scholars to argue that the process violated international standards of decolonization. In 1993, Congress issued a formal apology acknowledging that the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom was illegal and that sovereignty was never surrendered. Yet the apology carried no legal force. A later Supreme Court ruling clarified that it did not create new rights or restore land, leaving Kanaka Maoli without federal recognition.

Today, Alaska Natives and Native Hawaiians share histories of dispossession, cultural suppression, and inequality, but their legal positions diverge sharply. Alaska Natives possess federal recognition and a framework for sovereignty, even if imperfect. Kanaka Maoli remain unrecognized, divided between those who seek recognition as a tool for justice and those who argue that the Hawaiian Kingdom still exists under occupation and should be fully restored. Together, their histories reveal

how statehood did not bring equal outcomes and how the meaning of sovereignty continues to be contested in places far from the continental United States.

A History of Indigenous Women

Indigenous women have always held sacred and powerful roles within their communities, long before European contact reshaped the Americas. They were not only mothers, aunties, and grandmothers, but also healers, spiritual leaders, diplomats, and warriors. Across Native oral traditions, divine female figures appear as protectors of land and sea, embodiments of creation and destruction, and keepers of balance between life and death. These stories reflect the deep respect many Native nations held for women as central to social, spiritual, and political life.

Before colonization, Native societies had diverse and complex understandings of gender and power. Many tribes were matriarchal or matrilineal, meaning women held authority in decision making and lineage passed through the mother's line. In Diné society, for example, mothers and grandmothers served as clan matriarchs with final authority over land, livestock, crafts, and household wealth. While men often handled intertribal diplomacy or warfare, women controlled clan affairs and economic resources. Spiritual leadership was not restricted by gender, as both men and women could become Medicine People. Diné teachings emphasize balance and equality, a value embodied in the story of Asdzą́ą́ Nádleehé, or Changing Woman, who described herself and the Sun as equal in worth, one of earth and one of sky.

Native women also played active roles in warfare and defense. Some tribes recognized women as warriors and leaders in battle. Running Eagle of the Blackfeet led war parties, and Buffalo Calf Road Woman of the Northern Cheyenne fought

during the Battle of the Little Bighorn, where oral histories credit her bravery as pivotal. Beyond the battlefield, women often served as diplomats and peacemakers. One of the most influential was Jikonsaseh, a woman who lived along a war road during a time of intense conflict among the Haudenosaunee nations. By offering food, shelter, and mediation, she helped lay the foundation for peace. When the Peacemaker shared his vision of unity through a confederacy, Jikonsaseh became known as the Mother of Nations, helping establish governance rooted in balance, consensus, and shared responsibility between men and women.

It is important to recognize that there was no single Native model of gender roles. Some societies divided labor strictly by gender or placed greater power with men, while others elevated women's authority. Many Native cultures also recognized identities beyond a strict male female binary. Among the Diné, Nádleehi individuals embodied both masculine and feminine energies and were considered sacred. In Hawaiian culture, Māhū people existed between genders and served as spiritual and cultural bridges. These perspectives contrasted sharply with European gender norms and were often misunderstood or erased by colonizers.

Colonization violently disrupted Native gender systems. European settlers rejected women's authority and deliberately worked to dismantle it. Scholar Paula Gunn Allen argued that as long as women held unquestioned power, conquest would fail. Colonizers understood that weakening women destabilized entire nations. Violence against Native women was not accidental but strategic, targeting life givers to fracture communities. Matrilineal systems, such as those among the Choctaw, were marginalized, and women's leadership was replaced with imposed patriarchal structures. In the twentieth century, this violence took bureaucratic form through

forced sterilizations. During the 1970s, at least one in four American Indian women were sterilized without consent, including dozens under the age of twenty one.

The legacy of this disruption is visible today. Before colonization, violence against Native women was rare, but it is now alarmingly common. Nearly all violence committed against Native women is perpetrated by non Natives, a reality intensified by jurisdictional gaps that limit tribal authority. Federal data shows homicide remains a leading cause of death for Native women and girls, though these numbers are likely underreported due to misclassification and neglect. The crisis of Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women has drawn attention to these injustices and the ongoing consequences of colonial legal structures.

Native women have long been at the forefront of resistance and reform. Leaders like Ladonna Harris built national advocacy networks, while Elouise Cobell uncovered massive federal mismanagement of Native trust funds and led a historic legal victory that returned billions of dollars to Native people. More recently, Deb Haaland played a central role in passing the Not Invisible Act, creating mechanisms to address the epidemic of missing and murdered Indigenous people. Native women's influence has also extended beyond Native communities. Early suffragist Matilda Joslyn Gage credited Haudenosaunee women with inspiring her vision of gender equality, calling their system of justice among the most advanced she had ever seen.

Despite centuries of violence, erasure, and oppression, Indigenous women remain leaders, healers, and protectors of their nations. Their resilience continues to shape movements for sovereignty, justice, and cultural survival. The history of Indigenous women is not only a story of loss, but one of enduring strength, balance, and power that continues to influence the world today.

Modern Tribal Governments Explained

Modern tribal governments are living political systems that operate with real authority, not symbolic power. This reality became especially visible in 2024, when all nine Native nations in South Dakota banned Governor Kristi Noem from entering tribal land. The decision followed her removal of Native American history from state education standards, derogatory comments about Native youth, and accusations against tribal leaders. The incident raised a fundamental question for many Americans: can tribal governments legally do that? The answer is yes. Federally recognized tribes are sovereign governments with the authority to regulate their lands, enforce laws, and restrict entry, even for state officials.

Tribal governments are distinct political entities whose sovereignty predates the United States. While they are subject to certain federal laws, they retain inherent rights to self govern. This sovereignty allows tribes to make and enforce laws within their territories, define citizenship, regulate land use, issue business licenses, collect taxes, and operate courts and public services. Conflicts arise because tribal, state, and federal governments overlap geographically but not hierarchically. When disputes occur, sovereignty is often tested through legal and political confrontation, as seen in struggles over pipelines, casinos, and education standards.

A major turning point in modern tribal governance came with the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, passed during the New Deal. The law was intended to reverse decades of destructive federal policy that had stripped Native nations of land, wealth, and political power. Within fifty years prior to the act, Native communities had lost roughly ninety million acres. The IRA aimed to restore tribal self governance, but

it did so through a framework shaped by U.S. political values. Traditional Native governance often relied on consensus, extensive discussion, and collective agreement. In contrast, the IRA required tribes to adopt written constitutions, majority rule voting, and elected councils modeled after the U.S. system in order to receive federal funding.

Native responses to the IRA were mixed. Seventy seven tribes rejected it outright, viewing it as another form of outside control. One hundred eighty one accepted it, reorganizing their governments under its guidelines. These choices led to two common modern governing structures. Some tribes operate under a modern structure that closely resembles the U.S. system, with a constitution approved by the Secretary of the Interior, an elected tribal council as the legislative branch, a tribal chairperson as the executive, and in many cases a tribal court system. This structure allows tribes to negotiate with state and federal governments, pass laws, and enforce regulations with clear separation of powers.

Other tribes adopted hybrid systems that blend traditional governance with modern institutions. The Crow Tribe is a well known example. Although it initially rejected the IRA, it later incorporated executive, legislative, and judicial branches while preserving a General Council that includes every adult tribal member. Any member can propose legislation, and measures require a two thirds majority to pass. This higher threshold reflects older consensus based traditions and ensures broad community support, rather than narrow majority control.

In the current self determination era, tribal governments manage many programs that were once run by federal agencies. They oversee schools, healthcare clinics, emergency services, utilities, roads, and communication systems, often using federal

funds administered through tribal control. While self determination has expanded local authority, it has also introduced new challenges. Federal funding is spread across multiple agencies, creating bureaucratic complexity. Consultation requirements are not always honored, and accessing grants can be slow and uneven. Despite these barriers, tribes continue to assert control over their futures.

Ongoing sovereignty disputes highlight both the power and limits of modern tribal governments. The 2016 conflict over the Dakota Access Pipeline is one of the most visible examples. The pipeline was routed beneath Lake Oahe near the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe reservation, threatening the tribe's primary water source. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers approved the project without meaningful tribal consultation. Although the tribe sued, the courts allowed construction to proceed. The pipeline remains operational, but the legal and political fight continues, symbolizing the unfinished struggle for tribal consent and environmental justice.

Tribal sovereignty is also exercised through economic enterprises, particularly gaming. Under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, tribes can operate casinos and enter compacts with states, with federal law overriding conflicting state policies. In 2019, when Oklahoma Governor Kevin Stitt attempted to block the automatic renewal of tribal gaming compacts, tribes challenged the move in court and won. The ruling reaffirmed that tribal authority, when grounded in federal law, cannot be overridden by state officials.

Modern tribal governments are not relics of the past, nor are they uniform systems imposed from outside. They are adaptive institutions shaped by history, law, culture, and ongoing resistance. Each nation balances tradition with innovation, independence with cooperation, and sovereignty with survival inside a larger U.S.

framework. The ability of tribes to ban a sitting governor from their lands is not an exception, it is a reminder that Native nations remain governments in their own right, exercising authority that has never been surrendered.

Keeping Native Languages Alive

The Inupiat people of Alaska offer a powerful example of how Indigenous communities are reclaiming their languages through innovation rather than nostalgia. In 2014, the Cook Inlet Tribal Council released the video game Kisima Inŋitchuŋa, meaning "Never Alone." The title reflects a core Indigenous belief that humans, animals, land, and ancestors exist in relationship with one another. Co-created by Iñupiaq elders, storytellers, and youth, the game follows Nuna, a young Iñupiaq girl, and her fox companion as they navigate an Arctic world shaped by traditional stories. The entire narrative is told in the Iñupiaq language, making the game not just entertainment but an act of resistance against cultural erasure. By embedding language into gameplay, it invites younger generations to reconnect with their heritage through a medium that feels relevant and accessible.

Language is far more than a tool for communication. For Indigenous peoples, it carries oral histories, spiritual teachings, governance systems, and ecological knowledge developed over thousands of years. As Dene Elder Paul Disain explained, language is the window through which a people see the world. When that window closes, a part of collective identity disappears with it. Today, scholars estimate that more than 90 percent of Native languages could become extinct by 2050 if current trends continue. Before European colonization, North America was one of the most linguistically diverse places on Earth, with hundreds, possibly thousands, of distinct

Indigenous languages spoken across the continent. These were not dialects of a shared tongue, but fully developed systems of thought, each encoding unique ways of understanding the world.

Indigenous languages reveal culture in ways translation cannot fully capture. English idioms reflect values shaped by competition and individual achievement, while many Native languages encode relationships, balance, and responsibility directly into grammar. In Anishinaabemowin, spoken by the Ojibwe, Odawa, and Potawatomi peoples, words are categorized as animate or inanimate. Rivers, trees, rocks, and even foods like apples can be grammatically animate, reinforcing the idea that the natural world is composed of beings rather than objects. This structure reflects a worldview grounded in kinship with the land. Similarly, in the Diné language, the concept of hózhó expresses harmony, balance, beauty, and peace all at once. It functions as a greeting, a prayer, and a guiding principle for life. There is no single English word that can replace it, which shows how much meaning is lost when a language disappears.

The near extinction of Native languages was not accidental. Colonization introduced a deliberate campaign of linguicide, the systematic destruction of Indigenous languages. European settlers and later the U.S. government viewed Native languages as barriers to assimilation. The most devastating tool in this effort was the federal Indian boarding school system. Beginning in the late nineteenth century, Native children were forcibly removed from their families and placed in institutions designed to erase their identities. Their hair was cut, their clothing confiscated, and their names replaced. Speaking their Native language was punished through violence, isolation, or deprivation. Elder Bill Wright recalled returning home unable to

understand his grandmother when she spoke their language, responding to his Native name by insisting his name was Billy. His story illustrates how deeply assimilation fractured family bonds and interrupted cultural transmission.

By the 1920s, the majority of Native children were enrolled in these schools, many suffering abuse, neglect, or death. A federal report released in 2024 confirmed at least 973 student deaths, though the true number is likely much higher. The trauma did not end when the schools closed. Survivors often chose not to teach their languages to their children, believing silence was safer than passing on something that once brought punishment. This fear contributed to the collapse of language fluency within a single generation. Language loss has since been linked to higher rates of poverty, substance abuse, and suicide, underscoring that linguicide harms not only culture but community health.

Despite this history, Indigenous nations continue to resist erasure and reclaim their voices. Alaska's declaration of a linguistic emergency in 2018 acknowledged the urgency of protecting its Native languages. Projects like Never Alone show that revitalization does not mean returning to the past unchanged. It means carrying ancestral knowledge forward using the tools of the present. When Indigenous languages survive, they preserve ways of thinking about balance, responsibility, and relationship that the world desperately needs. Keeping these languages alive is not only about words. It is about sustaining entire ways of seeing and being in the world.

The Land Back Movement Explained

In 2020, members of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy took direct action in Caledonia, Ontario, by occupying land slated for a major housing development. They

argued that this territory had been promised to them and later taken without consent. By digging trenches, erecting barriers, and blocking nearby infrastructure, they made the site impossible to ignore. They renamed it 1492 Land Back Lane, a deliberate reference linking Columbus's arrival to centuries of land theft. Their occupation raised a central question that defines the Land Back movement as a whole, what does Land Back actually mean, and does it work.

Land Back is often misunderstood as a single demand or tactic, but it is better understood as a broad framework for decolonization. At its core, it refers to Indigenous efforts to reclaim authority over land and natural resources that were taken through broken treaties, legislation, court decisions, and outright violence. It is about sovereignty, the right of Native nations to govern their territories and make decisions about land use, development, and stewardship. In practice, Land Back can involve court cases to enforce treaties, political advocacy to change land policy, voluntary transfers by private landowners, or direct action such as blockades and occupations when other avenues fail.

In recent years, land acknowledgements have become common in schools, museums, and public events. These statements name the Indigenous nations whose land is being used, often as a gesture of respect. While some are sincere, many Native thinkers criticize acknowledgements that are not paired with action. Without returning land, sharing decision making power, or providing resources, acknowledgements can feel hollow. As writer Sena Crow has noted, Indigenous communities need resources, not apologies. Land Back emerges as a response to this gap between symbolic recognition and material change.

How Land Back unfolds depends greatly on who currently controls the land. When land is privately owned, some non Native landowners have chosen to support Indigenous sovereignty voluntarily. This can include returning land directly, selling it below market value, or paying ongoing contributions known as settler rent. Settler rent reframes residence on Indigenous land as something that carries responsibility, with funds directed toward language revitalization, land stewardship, and community programs. Importantly, Land Back organizers emphasize that the movement is not about mass eviction or repeating the violence of colonization in reverse. In one example, when the Pomo Tribe bought back coastal land in California, the previous owner was allowed to remain in his home for the rest of his life under a mutual agreement. This approach prioritizes repair and continuity rather than punishment.

Much of the land involved in Land Back efforts is controlled not by individuals but by governments. National parks, forests, and preserves often sit on land that was never properly ceded. In these cases, tribes frequently turn to the courts, seeking full ownership, co management, or guaranteed access for ceremonies and subsistence practices. One such case involved the Jemez Pueblo and the Valles Caldera in present day New Mexico. After more than a decade of litigation, a 2024 settlement returned over 3,000 acres within the preserve to the Pueblo while maintaining public access through a shared management arrangement. For the Jemez, the victory was not only legal but cultural, allowing them to return to ancestral lands for songs, dances, and teachings that predate the United States itself.

Land Back is also deeply connected to environmental restoration. Indigenous worldviews often emphasize reciprocal relationships with the land, where caring for ecosystems is both a responsibility and a way of life. Colonization disrupted these

systems by removing Native communities and replacing diverse land practices with industrial extraction and monoculture agriculture. Hawaii offers a clear example. Before U.S. annexation, Native Hawaiians maintained highly productive food systems, including engineered fish lagoons that fed large populations. After land seizure and plantation agriculture took hold, these systems collapsed. Today, Hawaii imports the vast majority of its food, creating vulnerability not only for Native communities but for the entire population. Indigenous activists argue that restoring Native land stewardship is essential for ecological resilience and climate stability, not just historical justice.

The struggle at 1492 Land Back Lane reflects both the promise and the limits of the movement. The Haudenosaunee have pursued justice through courts and political channels for generations, rooted in promises made by the British Crown in the eighteenth century. When a new housing development threatened the last remaining open land in the area, many felt those channels had failed. The occupation became both a protest and a living community, with ceremonies, shared meals, and ongoing cultivation of the land. Police raids and arrests followed, but the pressure ultimately led developers to cancel the project. Even so, as of 2024, there is still no comprehensive settlement addressing broader Haudenosaunee land rights in the region. A small group of land defenders remains on site, committed to staying for as long as it takes, even for generations.

The Land Back movement does not offer a single solution, nor does it unfold the same way everywhere. It can mean years of court battles, negotiated agreements, voluntary returns, or direct confrontation. What unites these efforts is a shared goal, to undo land theft, restore Indigenous relationships with territory, and reaffirm

sovereignty. Land Back insists that land is not merely a commodity, but the foundation of culture, survival, and responsibility. In that sense, it is not only about the past, but about shaping a more just and sustainable future.

Hollywood, Pretendians, and Cultural Appropriation

From the earliest days of American cinema, Native people have been portrayed through the narrow and damaging lens of the "Cowboys and Indians" trope. These images did not originate with Hollywood alone. In the late nineteenth century, shows like Buffalo Bill's Wild West, filmed by Thomas Edison using the kinetoscope, staged reenactments of supposed frontier battles. These performances framed Native people as either violent enemies or romantic relics of a vanished past. Although wildly inaccurate, they shaped public imagination so powerfully that they became the foundation of the American Western genre.

For many Americans, Western films were their first and only exposure to Native peoples. On screen, Native characters were flattened into stereotypes, bloodthirsty warriors, drunken side figures, mystical healers, silent elders, or invented roles like the "Indian princess," a fantasy with no grounding in Native cultures. Films such as Stagecoach reinforced constant fear of Native violence, even misnaming entire peoples, as when "Apache," a Spanish label, replaced the self name Indé, meaning simply "the people." These portrayals discouraged audiences from seeing Native people as real, living communities with diversity, humor, and complexity.

Behind the scenes, Hollywood compounded this harm through redface. Although thousands of films featured Native themes, Native actors were usually relegated to uncredited background roles or low pay. Major Native characters were

routinely played by white actors pretending to be Indigenous. Redface refers not only to makeup, but to a systemic casting practice that excluded Native people from telling their own stories. Without Native advisors, filmmakers dressed actors in generic feathered headdresses and buckskin, flattening hundreds of distinct cultures into one invented image. Sacred items like warbonnets, which hold deep ceremonial meaning for some Plains nations and are earned rather than worn casually, were treated as costumes. This disrespect continues today when such items appear at festivals or parties.

Native actors were often trapped in a double bind. Accepting stereotyped roles meant reinforcing harmful images, but refusing them meant watching non Native actors take those roles and the limited income that came with them. One of the most famous beneficiaries of this system was Iron Eyes Cody. Marketed as "America's Favorite Indian," he appeared in more than a hundred films and television shows. In reality, he was born Espera de Corti to Italian immigrant parents. By reinventing himself as Native, he gained fame and authority in a space that systematically excluded actual Native people.

Iron Eyes Cody represents a broader phenomenon known as pretendianism, the false claiming of Native identity. Pretendians have appeared not only in Hollywood, but also in academia, art, and politics. They often gain access to scholarships, jobs, grants, and platforms intended to support Native communities. The controversy surrounding Elizabeth Warren illustrates this harm. Despite referencing Cherokee heritage for years and releasing a DNA test showing a distant ancestor, the Cherokee Nation emphasized that DNA does not establish citizenship. Tribal belonging is

determined by tribes themselves, based on relationships, history, and responsibility, not genetic fragments.

At the same time, Native scholars warn against aggressive identity policing. Many families were forcibly disconnected from their cultures through boarding schools, adoption, and displacement. Genuine reconnection can be painful and complex. This is why tribal sovereignty matters so deeply. Each nation decides who belongs, and belonging is defined not only by ancestry, but by accountability and contribution to the community.

Pretendianism overlaps with cultural appropriation, the extraction of symbols, stories, and styles from marginalized cultures by dominant groups in ways that exploit or distort them. Warbonnets worn at music festivals, Native themed sports mascots, and Halloween costumes turn sacred or living identities into caricatures. Even when people claim no harm is intended, the effect is to sever objects from their meaning and to treat Native people as relics of the past. As Cherokee scholar Adrienne Keene has argued, these acts participate in ongoing systems of power that continue to harm Native communities today.

Economic exploitation is also part of appropriation. Non Native companies profit from selling dreamcatchers, jewelry, and designs labeled as "Native inspired," while Native artists struggle for recognition. The Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990 was created to address this by making it illegal to market goods as Native made unless they truly are. Cultural theft is not only disrespectful, it can also be fraudulent.

Despite this long history of misrepresentation, meaningful change is underway. More Native writers, directors, actors, and producers are shaping stories from within their communities. Shows like Reservation Dogs present Native life as funny, messy,

and real, created entirely by Native talent. Films such as Killers of the Flower Moon involved extensive consultation with Native communities, with actors like Lily Gladstone emphasizing that no single voice can represent all Native peoples. Authentic representation emerges from collaboration, not tokenism.

Hollywood helped create and cement false images of Native Americans, but it can also be a space of repair. When Native people tell their own stories, control their own images, and are supported rather than replaced, representation becomes richer and more honest. The shift away from stereotypes and toward lived reality shows that cultural harm is not inevitable. It is the result of choices, and it can be undone by better ones.

Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Climate Change

In Alaska, many Native communities do not need headlines or scientific reports to recognize climate change, they see it directly in the land, the ice, and the animals. Sea ice that was once stable and reliable in winter has become "rotten," too thin to travel across safely. Seals, belugas, and salmon are shifting their migration timing, and coastlines are eroding so quickly that entire villages face the possibility of displacement within a single generation. These observations are not abstract warnings, they are real time, place based evidence of how climate change is already reshaping daily life.

These changes highlight the importance of Traditional Ecological Knowledge, often called TEK. TEK refers to environmental knowledge developed over long periods of living in close relationship with a specific place and passed down through stories, practices, and lived experience. It is not a collection of isolated techniques,

but a system for noticing patterns, understanding relationships, and making decisions that keep landscapes productive and resilient. The word “traditional” does not mean outdated; it means grounded in long memory, repetition, and accountability to the land.

One way to see TEK in action is by examining how different Indigenous communities solved similar problems using local ecology. Around the Great Lakes, boat builders used birch bark sheets wrapped around cedar frames, sealing the seams with pine sap mixed with animal fat. In Arctic regions, boat makers built frames from driftwood or whalebone and stretched sealskin over them, creating vessels light and flexible enough to withstand collisions with ice. The goal was the same, safe travel across water, but the solutions were entirely shaped by local materials and conditions.

TEK also emphasizes a relational, big picture understanding of ecosystems. Rather than isolating a single species or variable, many Indigenous knowledge systems focus on webs of connection. Inuit Elders may describe how an increase in beavers leads to more dams, which reduces salmon spawning habitat, which lowers salmon populations, which in turn affects belugas that depend on those fish. This is ecological systems thinking rooted in observation and lived experience rather than abstract modeling.

Indigenous fire knowledge in California offers another clear example of TEK guiding climate solutions. Nations such as the Hupa, Yurok, Karuk, and Mono used cultural burning, low intensity, intentional fire, to manage their landscapes. These burns encouraged the growth of useful food and medicine plants and created spacing between trees that helped prevent large, destructive wildfires. Settlers misunderstood these landscapes, assuming they were naturally open and dismissing Indigenous fire

practices as primitive. In 1850, California outlawed intentional burning while also forcibly removing tribes from their lands. Combined with logging and dense replanting, this suppression of "good fire" helped create forests that now behave like matchsticks under hotter, drier conditions. Recent policy shifts allowing tribes to resume cultural burning reflect a growing recognition that Indigenous fire knowledge was not only valid, but essential.

Climate change also affects communities unevenly. Coastal and far northern Native nations are often among the first and hardest hit because their homelands are closely tied to sea ice, fisheries, and intact ecosystems. When ice becomes unsafe and animal migrations shift, the loss is not only economic. It is cultural, because hunting, fishing, and gathering are practices that carry identity, teaching, and community relationships. This reality connects to the concept of solastalgia, the grief and distress caused by unwanted environmental change in one's home place. For communities already burdened by colonial disruption, environmental loss can intensify mental health risks.

Displacement raises some of the clearest environmental justice concerns. As of 2024, dozens of Alaska Native villages face imminent threats from erosion, and several have already chosen to relocate. Similar climate driven relocations are underway in parts of Washington State, where tribal nations are planning moves away from rising seas and flooding. These communities are paying the earliest costs of a crisis they did not create.

From an Indigenous perspective, environmental justice is not only about policy reforms or court decisions. It is about restoring balance in relationships that have been pushed out of alignment, relationships with land, water, animals, and among

people. This understanding is evident in the Ojibwe relationship with manoomin, or wild rice. Manoomin thrives in cool, shallow waters shaped by long, freezing winters, conditions that climate change is making less common. Its decline is also tied to dams, pollution, commercial harvesting, disease, and other overlapping pressures. TEK insists that this cannot be treated as a single cause problem; it requires looking at entire watersheds, historical land use, and long standing relationships.

Collaborations between tribal experts and academic researchers offer models for how TEK and Western science can work together. Partnerships such as those at Lac du Flambeau emphasize watershed level analysis, historical records, and long term community observation rather than short term or isolated studies. Even when definitive answers remain elusive, the method itself demonstrates a more responsible approach, one grounded in relationship building, broader context, and respect for generational knowledge.

Across the country, tribal nations are already applying these principles through housing efficiency projects, climate adaptation plans that restore food security and habitat, and seed keeper networks that return ancestral crops to their communities. The deeper lesson is that solutions to climate change are not only technological. They are relational. If climate change is, in part, the result of broken relationships with the living world, Traditional Ecological Knowledge offers tools for repairing those relationships and choosing a future shaped more by balance than by collapse.

Conclusion: Retracing the Trail Forward

A clear pattern emerges from this history. Native American history is not a finished past but a living, ongoing reality shaped by land, sovereignty, culture, and survival. From the foundations of Indigenous governance to struggles over land, language, representation, and environmental stewardship, each theme shows how deeply the legacy of colonization continues to influence the present. Colonization was not a single moment in time but an enduring system designed to remove Indigenous peoples from their lands, suppress their cultures, and undermine their political authority. Its effects remain embedded in modern laws, institutions, and landscapes.

Yet this history is not defined solely by dispossession. It is equally a history of resilience, adaptation, and resistance. Native nations have continuously asserted their sovereignty through self-governance, legal action, cultural revitalization, and direct defense of their lands. Language revitalization efforts, the Land Back movement, and the ongoing exercise of tribal authority demonstrate that Indigenous communities are not passive survivors of history but active shapers of their futures. Traditional Ecological Knowledge further reveals that Indigenous ways of knowing are not outdated traditions, but living systems of knowledge capable of addressing contemporary crises such as climate change.

This broader perspective challenges the myths that have long shaped public understanding of Native peoples. It dismantles the idea that Indigenous cultures exist only in the distant past or as simplified images in popular culture. Instead, it presents Native nations as contemporary political entities, cultural innovators, and environmental stewards whose authority and knowledge are essential to a more just

future. True understanding requires moving beyond symbolic recognition toward meaningful engagement, respect for sovereignty, and accountability for historical and ongoing harms.

Ultimately, engaging seriously with Native American history is not about revisiting the past for its own sake. It is about recognizing how the present was built and deciding what kind of future to create. The path forward depends on whether society continues patterns of erasure and extraction or chooses to restore relationships grounded in responsibility, balance, and respect.

Works Cited

1. Jim, Che. Introduction to Native American History. Crash Course Native American History, episode 1, Crash Course, 6 May 2025.
2. —. Tribal Sovereignty Explained. Crash Course Native American History, episode 2, Crash Course, 13 May 2025.
3. —. Myths and Misconceptions About Native Americans. Crash Course Native American History, episode 3, Crash Course, 27 May 2025.
4. —. What Makes Someone Native American? Crash Course Native American History, episode 4, Crash Course, 3 June 2025.
5. —. Why Land Matters to Native Americans. Crash Course Native American History, episode 5, Crash Course, 10 June 2025.
6. —. What Do Native Cultures Have in Common? Crash Course Native American History, episode 6, Crash Course, 17 June 2025.
7. —. The Real Impacts of Archaeology on Native Americans. Crash Course Native American History, episode 7, Crash Course, 1 July 2025.
8. —. Introduction to Indigenous Knowledge. Crash Course Native American History, episode 8, Crash Course, 8 July 2025.
9. —. What Are the Fish Wars and Why Do They Matter? Crash Course Native American History, episode 9, Crash Course, 15 July 2025.
10. —. The Truth About Columbus's "First Contact". Crash Course Native American History, episode 10, Crash Course, 29 July 2025.
11. —. From the Trail of Tears to Wounded Knee. Crash Course Native American History, episode 11, Crash Course, 5 August 2025.

12. —. The History of America's Indian Boarding Schools. Crash Course Native American History, episode 12, Crash Course, 12 August 2025.

13. —. The Indian Reorganization Act Explained. Crash Course Native American History, episode 13, Crash Course, 26 August 2025.

14. —. The Termination Act Explained. Crash Course Native American History, episode 14, Crash Course, 2 September 2025.

15. —. The Native Civil Rights Movement. Crash Course Native American History, episode 15, Crash Course, 9 September 2025.

16. —. Introduction to Federal Indian Law. Crash Course Native American History, episode 16, Crash Course, 23 September 2025.

17. —. The Era of Native Urban Relocation. Crash Course Native American History, episode 17, Crash Course, 30 September 2025.

18. —. The History of Alaskan and Hawaiian Statehood. Crash Course Native American History, episode 18, Crash Course, 7 October 2025.

19. —. A History of Indigenous Women with Lily Gladstone. Crash Course Native American History, episode 19, Crash Course, 14 October 2025.

20. —. Modern Tribal Governments Explained. Crash Course Native American History, episode 20, Crash Course, 21 October 2025.

21. —. Native Languages and the Indian Education Act. Crash Course Native American History, episode 21, Crash Course, 4 November 2025.

22. —. The Land Back Movement Explained. Crash Course Native American History, episode 22, Crash Course, 11 November 2025.

23. —. Hollywood, Pretendians, and Cultural Appropriation. Crash Course Native American History, episode 23, Crash Course, 25 November 2025.

24. —. What Can a Prophecy Tell Us About Climate Change? Crash Course Native American History, episode 24, Crash Course, 2 December 2025.