



Hearing the Story: Critical Indigenous Curriculum Inquiry and Primary Source Representation in Social Studies Education

Author: Christine Rogers Stanton

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published in Theory & Research in Social Education on October 1, 2012, available online:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/00933104.2012.723242>.

Stanton, C. R. (2012). Hearing the story: Critical Indigenous curriculum inquiry & primary source representation in social studies education. Theory & Research in Social Education, 40(4), 339-370. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2012.723242>

Made available through Montana State University's [ScholarWorks](http://scholarworks.montana.edu)
scholarworks.montana.edu

Hearing the Story

*Hearing the Story: Critical Indigenous Curriculum Inquiry
and Primary Source Representation in Social Studies Education*

Christine Rogers Stanton

christine.rogers1@montana.edu

Abstract

Although primary source accounts provide students with direct access to the experiences of historical participants, they can reinforce the dominant culture historical narrative if misrepresented by teachers, curriculum publishers, or scholars. The author demonstrates the importance of adhering to guidelines presented by critical Indigenous scholars when evaluating resources that incorporate primary accounts attributed to Native Americans. To illustrate the potential for critical Indigenous theory to inform curricular decision-making, the author analyzed three resources that incorporate Chief Joseph's surrender speech according to: (a) their respect of Native peoples, (b) their recognition of discursive positionality, and (c) their honoring of the complexity of Native knowledge systems. Results demonstrate the potential for social studies resources, even those that include accounts from historically marginalized peoples, to reinforce the hidden curriculum, to position peoples using discourse, and to perpetuate the myth of objectivity in historical inquiry. Implications for scholarship and teaching practice are included.

Keywords: Chief Joseph, Native Americans, Critical Indigenous Theory, Primary Sources

*Hearing the Story: Critical Indigenous¹ Curriculum Inquiry
and Primary Source Representation in Social Studies Education*

I am tired of fighting. Ta-hool-hool-shute is dead. Looking-Glass is dead. The old men are all dead. It is the young men who say "Yes" or "No." He who led on the young men is dead. It is cold, and we have no blankets; the little children are freezing to death. My people, some of them, have run away to the hills, and have no blankets, no food. No one knows where they are—perhaps freezing to death. I want to have time to look for my children, and see how many of them I can find. Maybe I shall find them among the dead. Hear me, my chiefs! I am tired; my heart is sick and sad. From where the sun now stands I will fight no more forever. (Hinmatóowyahtq'it's² surrender speech, as cited in Zinn & Arnove, 2004, pp. 146-147)

Several years ago, a Native elder at a workshop for practicing teachers explained, “Chief Joseph didn’t say ‘Listen to me, my chiefs.’ He said, ‘*Hear* me, my chiefs.’ There is a reason for that.” As this elder emphasized, there is a difference between superficially “listening” to a person and genuinely “hearing” the story that person shares. Genuine hearing honors the teller and recognizes the authenticity of his/her experience, since it demands a broad understanding of and respect for the experiential context. In terms of Native history, that context is “much more complex and complicated than it is normally presumed to be” (Fixico, 1997, p. 117).

Unfortunately, the use of primary accounts in social studies classrooms may fall short of engaging learners in the “historical thinking” (Wineburg, 2001, p. 7) or the “epistemology of complexity” (Kincheloe, 2001, p. 183) needed to *hear* the story of diverse experiences. The way these accounts are presented by teachers is only part of the challenge, since curriculum resources may not appropriately represent the accounts in the first place. In the case of Native primary

accounts, specifically, these inaccurate representations reinforce the dominant culture myth (McCoy, 2004), inhibit social justice, and limit the potential for responsive historical thinking.

Indigenous elders, scholars, and teachers have shared key epistemological, historical, and pedagogical insights to inform the incorporation of primary accounts into social studies curriculum. The purpose of this article is to introduce social studies educators, teacher educators, scholars, and curriculum developers to critical Indigenous theory as a means to guide the evaluation of supplemental curriculum resources and to promote responsive use of Native primary source accounts. To illustrate the potential for critical Indigenous theory to inform curricular decision-making, I analyzed three resources that incorporate the surrender speech of Hinmatóowyalahtq'it (Chief Joseph). Overarching questions guiding this work include:

1. How can critical Indigenous theory guide the review of supplemental curriculum resources, such as resources that incorporate Joseph's "surrender speech?"
2. How do supplemental curriculum resources contextualize and represent Native primary accounts?
3. What can responsive teachers do to respectfully and accurately share the experiences and histories of Native peoples as a means to advance social justice social education?

Chief Joseph: Reality and Myth

One of the 500 plus Indigenous nations officially recognized by the U.S. government, the Nimi'ipuu, or Nez Perce³, traditionally called parts of present day Idaho, Montana, Washington, Oregon, and Wyoming home (Nez Perce Tribe, 2009). Although the initial interactions with Whites were peaceful, members of the tribe lost trust in the U.S. government in the mid-1800s during the enforcement of the Relocation Act, which forced Native peoples onto reservations. The Act and several subsequent broken treaties divided the Nez Perce.

In 1877, several hundred Nimi'ipuu men, women, and children left their assigned reservation in Idaho, bound for the Northern Plains, where they had hoped to join forces with the Crow or Lakota or to escape to Canada (Guthrie, 2007; National Park Service, 2011a). After being pursued over 1,000 miles by U.S. Army forces, the group's leaders recognized the direness of the situation, especially given the approaching winter. On October 5th, the Nez Perce surrendered less than 50 miles from the U.S.-Canadian border (Guthrie, 2007). The Nimi'ipuu leader often credited with the formal surrender, and for saving his people, is most well known as Chief Joseph.

Born in 1840, Hinmatóowyahtq'it (Chief Joseph) grew up and inherited Nimi'ipuu leadership duties during this turbulent time in Native history (McCoy, 2004). His father, a political leader of the Wallowa band of the Nez Perce, was initially eager to work with White settlers and policymakers. While Hinmatóowyahtq'it was still very young, this spirit of collaboration faded, replaced by a call to reinvigorate traditional Nez Perce language and practices in response to the broken treaties. As a result, the young Joseph grew up learning the traditional Nez Perce ways and language.

As is often the case with Native history, the popular Chief Joseph myth has been shaped and defined by dominant culture norms. For example, collective leadership models, while not uncommon in Native America, were unfamiliar to European and Euro-American policymakers and military personnel in early America (Deur, 2009; Swagerty, 2005; White, 1991). Like his father, Hinmatóowyahtq'it became a village leader, and he was recognized for his oratorical skills among his people. As a result of his comfort speaking for the band, it is likely that U.S. military leaders assumed he was the person responsible for decision making—the White leaders often “created. . . *the Chief*” (Deloria, 1988, p. 204) that would be fit the demands of European style negotiations processes. In reality, Joseph contributed to the decision making, but the Nez Perce did

not consider him a war chief or singularly powerful leader (Guthrie, 2007; Nerburn, 2005). Ironically, although many non-Natives of the time had difficulty understanding collective leadership models, they had no trouble assuming that Joseph's famous "I Shall Fight No More, Forever" speech represented the experiences and beliefs of Joseph, the Wallowa band, the Nez Perce tribe, and—to an extent—Native peoples as a whole. This overgeneralization promoted misunderstanding about Native peoples and inaccurately represented Joseph's own views. Despite the words popularized by his speech, Joseph did not, and never intended to, "surrender" that October day in the Bear Paw Mountains of Montana (Nerburn, 2005). Instead, he continued to advocate for the rights of the Nez Perce until his death in 1904.

Historical inaccuracies, such as the misinformation regarding Nez Perce leadership and the Wallowa band's surrender, have greatly informed the way today's students, teachers, and scholars understand both Native history and contemporary Native experience (Loewen, 1995; McCoy, 2004). Translation also shapes and reshapes Native accounts. For example, several non-Native translators, including the interpreter Ad Chapman—a person Joseph "did not trust" (Nerburn, 2005, p. 269), contributed to the various retellings of the speech that led to the version most familiar today. Despite the "questionable circumstances" that surround its documentation (Guthrie, 2007, p. 510), the speech remains a popular, if not tokenistic, Native primary account within K-12 history curriculum across the United States (Sanchez, 2007; Sewall, 2000). As a result, overemphasis on the inaccurate "Joseph myth" has silenced other Nez Perce voices and impeded the influence of Native peoples today (McCoy, 2004, p. 151).

Native Histories in Social Studies Education

Many exciting developments have influenced social studies education in recent years, including an increased emphasis on the use of primary source documents in K-12 classrooms

(Cleary & Neumann, 2009; Eamon, 2006; Fresch, 2004) and culturally responsive education, or the inclusion of the experiences, knowledge, and ways of sharing knowledge of diverse peoples (Gay, 2000). These two trends, especially when associated with historical thinking, promote a more complete and socially just view of events within history education.

In today's schools, many students learn about documents, speeches, and artifacts important to non-dominant cultures, instead of learning exclusively about the "great documents" as defined by a few powerful members of the dominant culture (Cleary & Neumann, 2009, p. 70). Teachers, too, have benefitted because of increased emphasis on primary sources. In today's teacher education programs and professional development workshops, social studies educators learn about the selection and use of such materials, which allows them to enhance critical thinking and inquiry in their classrooms. Additionally, primary source materials help teachers uncover their own misconceptions about events. For example, a study conducted by Waring and Torrez (2010) demonstrates the potential for primary resources to "challenge assumptions" as teacher candidates question the way they learned about history (p. 301).

Recognizing diverse "challenges and perspectives" is the essence of "culturally responsive teaching" (Gay, 2000, p. 1). While today's classroom teachers are more aware and prepared in terms of working with diverse learners and integrating cultural knowledge into their curriculum, resistance to culturally responsive teaching continues, especially when dominant culture norms appear to be threatened (Nieto, 2004). As a result, teachers and schools may continue to over-emphasize the "great documents" while marginalizing or ignoring other important primary source accounts (Cleary & Neumann, 2009, p. 70).

In addition to diminishing the minority⁴ voice, individuals who select the great documents (see, for example, Hirsch, 1988) further politicize curriculum by identifying resources that

complement existing, dominant culture views of history. For example, accounts that promote nonviolence and/or assimilation into the dominant culture tend to receive more curricular attention than voices of resistance (Stanton, in press). Furthermore, key contextual information is often neglected or misconstrued in order to soften or isolate accounts of resistance. As a result, the traditional, dominant culture historical narrative (i.e., the story told and retold as a means to preserve power systems) continues to drive much of what we believe about social studies education, while other story-experiences, including those of Native peoples, remain overshadowed, misrepresented, and unheard (Levstik & Barton, 2010; McCoy, 2004).

When guided appropriately, students in classrooms that incorporate primary documents can learn about often-neglected perspectives and develop “dispositions and strategies,” such as context building and empathy, which help them interpret both historical and contemporary events (Yeager & Foster, 2001, p. 17). As Cleary and Neumann (2009) explain, expanded and dedicated use of primary sources allows “average documents” to play a more central role in today’s social studies classrooms (p. 70). History education, in particular, can serve as a “tool for changing how we think” (Wineburg, 2001, p. ix), particularly if it incorporates the interpretive structures utilized by historians.

Mere inclusion of diverse perspectives is not enough to promote social studies education that is culturally responsive on a transformative level. Historians recognize that resources, including primary accounts, are “only a shell” of the broader “text” of the experience (Wineburg, 2001, p. 66), and that a deeper hearing is essential to more accurately and completely honor the experiences of diverse peoples. Some educators, as Cleary and Neumann (2009) emphasize, assume that primary documents will “speak for themselves” (p. 74) and fail to consider this broader context or, as Wineberg (2001) notes, to “move beyond the literal” (p. 78).

Understanding Native primary accounts depends upon both a literal and a complex cultural interpretation. For example, literal elements and deeper cultural values are simultaneously affected through the act of transforming oral history—especially that shared in an Indigenous language—to written English text. Vizenor (1995) explains, “The stories that are heard are not the same as the silence of the written word” (p. 6). During an oral telling, there is the potential for interaction between teller and hearer; such interactivity diminishes when the experience is captured on paper. Additionally, written text often utilizes “the language of dominance” (Vizenor, 1995, p. 6) and Westernized organizational strategies, despite the fact that many Native storytellers organize story-experiences in various ways, including circular, dynamic structures (Erdoes & Ortiz, 1984). Although social studies education has progressed, in many ways the use of primary documents simply tells the same story, in the same way, and—to a large extent—by the same storyteller.

A key component of effective and responsive social studies education is the ability of teachers to promote historical thinking, through which students recognize that their established ways of thinking are inherited, experiential, and inadequate in terms of fully reading historical experiences (Freire, 1972/2000; Wineburg, 2001). Wineburg (2001) argues that learners rarely develop a context for primary documents on their own, borrowing that context, instead, from their own contemporary social experience—an experience that is built upon decades of social stratification. Historical thinking engages learners in the process of investigating experiences—their own experiences, the experiences of sources, and the experiences of the individuals who craft, write, and represent historical events—as a means to more fully understand the evolving historical narrative.

Unlike historians, students do not regularly apply a “sourcing heuristic,” which hinges upon the investigation of a document’s source while reading the document itself (Wineburg, 2001,

p. 76). Instead, students “see history as a closed story,” especially if information regarding the representation of experience is not immediately accessible, as is often the case in textbooks and other curricular resources (p. 79). As a result, students neglect subtext (that which is assumed but unwritten) and metadiscourse (the broader context that includes information regarding author and source positionality), so they rarely consider complex issues of context, authenticity, and perspective (p. 77).

To think historically and responsively, students must recognize that there is much more to the story than the written words. For example, students must come to understand that “the making of history is a dynamic process” (Wineburg, 2001, p. 160). Unfortunately, historical dynamism is challenging to articulate to learners, especially given its seemingly capricious nature. This same abstractness, however, supports a new “formation of historical narratives” (p. 51) as lesser-known primary accounts take center stage, are re-translated, or are otherwise re-envisioned.

Theoretical Framework: *Hearing the Call for Critical Theory in Curriculum Inquiry*

Since curriculum inquiry is directly connected to classroom practice, it is particularly powerful in terms of influencing teaching, learning, and the reproduction of dominant culture social studies narratives. Critical curriculum inquiry, specifically, considers the effect of dominant culture norms on “curriculum decisions” (Short, 1991, p. 18). According to critical theorists across the social sciences, including Freire, McLaren, and Giroux, such decisions can reinforce or dismantle colonizing power structures (Kincheloe, 2006; Scott, 2008; Smith, 1999).

Educators themselves potentially reinforce these power structures, since they may accept “the existing order of things as given” (King, 1991, p. 135) within the curriculum. VanSledright (2002) explains that, in today’s classrooms, “more often than not, the interpretive and rhetorical machinery behind the illusion of direct correspondence is left unexamined” (p. 1091). Therefore,

teachers may reinforce—purposefully or inadvertently—a “hidden curriculum” that solidifies dominant culture knowledge and perpetuates injustice in today’s classrooms and communities (Delpit, 1995; Freire, 1972/2000; Nieto, 2004).

In order to investigate these power structures, critical curriculum inquiry utilizes discourse analysis to consider the literal meaning of words and phrases, as well as the underlying assumptions and intentions of that text and the experiences it claims to represent (Mule, 1999). Issues concerning positionality (of the source, translator, and reader, among others) and authenticity of voice and purpose are often at the center of critical curriculum inquiry. For example, Milner (2007) explains that the misrepresentation, exploitation, and silencing of people of color results from the privileging of dominant culture views, because “multiple and varied positions, roles, and identities are intricately and inextricably embedded in the process” of education and educational research (p. 389). In other words, unless scholars and educators consider the ways the various contributors, including those individuals who are members of the dominant culture, shape the representation of primary accounts, we will continue to misrepresent, exploit, and silence people of color in our curriculum and work.

Advocates of Critical Race Theory, or CRT (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995), and Tribal Critical Race Theory, or TribalCrit (Brayboy, 2005), emphasize that hearing counter-narratives—the story-experiences of non-dominant culture peoples—is the essential first step toward decolonization, social justice, and transformation both within classroom settings and beyond. According to the tenets of CRT and TribalCrit, the original storyteller’s voice (words, meaning, tone, etc.) must remain at the center of these counter-narratives. In many cases, this is the main goal of primary source integration into K-12 curriculum.

For Indigenous peoples, the primary source trend in social studies education comes with mixed blessings. Although it encourages teachers, who in the United States are predominately White, to hear the often ignored stories of Native peoples, the trend also tends to force those stories to fit into a pre-established version of what history should be, as defined by the dominant culture. As a result, the revised counter-narratives simply become chapters in the dominant culture narrative.

Critical Indigenous scholars expand on the views of curriculum inquiry and counter-narrative, arguing that responsive historical understanding acknowledges the nature of story-sharing, narrative as experience, collective memory, and power relationships (Archibald, 2008; Bishop, 2008; Brayboy, 2005; Grande, 2004; Smith, 1999). For example, Grande (2004) encourages scholars to utilize “Red Pedagogy” (p. 11), which looks to leadership from within and across Native communities as a means to articulate decolonized understandings of history, education, and politics. Archibald (2008) explains that Native community members can guide scholarly work and educational planning through “storywork” (p. 3), which draws upon traditional narratives and holistic contexts as a means to work respectfully with and in Native communities.

Generally, critical Indigenous scholars demand recognition of oral storytelling as a legitimate representation of historical knowledge, which, in turn, requires an awareness of the limitations of translation and written language in terms of encompassing Indigenous experience. As Wilson (1997) notes, “our traditions must not be evaluated in Western terms; rather, they should be appreciated and utilized for what they do contribute to the understanding of the American Indian past” (p. 114). Critical Indigenous scholars emphasize that *hearing* Native story-experiences requires guidance by tribal members and other Indigenous leaders. Simply reading a

written, isolated account does not provide the tribal, cultural-linguistic, or collective context that many Native scholars consider essential.

For example, Bishop, a Maori scholar, emphasizes that an attention to the “discursive positioning,” or the way written narratives are “shaped by power relations” (2008, p. 452), must be included in the analysis of materials that claim to represent Indigenous experience. While critical discourse analysis encompasses many aspects of language use, textual structure, and authorship, the study presented in this article focused specifically on aspects identified by critical Indigenous scholars, including recognition of Indigenous language as intertwined with cultural understanding and source positioning in relationship to dominant culture translators, writers, and audience members. Often, such discursive positioning is subtle: It may rely more on what is not said, such as failure to mention the influence of translation, than what is directly stated.

While critical Indigenous theory emphasizes solidarity between groups, it also recognizes the uniqueness of those different groups. Therefore, resources should acknowledge diversity within and between Native communities to demonstrate historical and contemporary cultural understandings. Such recognition honors tribes as sovereign entities, which simultaneously compromises generalizability in scholarly work. As a response, scholars in the field tend either to focus on specific examples as connected to specific communities or to share broad ideas that offer guidance for fellow scholars. Several of these shared guidelines offer a means to mobilize critical Indigenous theory in terms of curriculum inquiry, specifically. As scholars, educators, and curriculum developers, we can analyze materials to determine their:

- respect for the peoples, communities, and traditions who contributed to or are described in the resource;
- recognition of discursive positioning; and,

- honoring of the complexity of Native knowledge systems, collective memory, and the oral history of Native communities.

Evaluating curriculum resources based on these tenets provides educators with information regarding which resources to use and how to integrate those resources into classroom practice.

Methods: Connecting Curriculum Inquiry to Critical Indigenous Theory

For this study, the above tenets guided evaluation of three resources—*Voices of a People's History of the United States* (Zinn & Arnove, 2004), website materials provided by the Nez Perce National Historical Park (National Park Service, 2011a, 2011b, 2011c, 2011d, 2011e; National Park Service Museum Management Program, n.d.), and online resources supporting the *New Perspectives on The West* PBS documentary (The West Film Project, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2001d)—and their representation of Joseph's "I Will Fight No More Forever" speech. The resources were selected based on their reputation in the field of multicultural education (for an expanded list of responsive resources, see Rios & Stanton, 2011) and their widespread popularity and accessibility. Study of the resources also included analysis of accompanying materials, such as lesson plans, descriptive overviews, and related accounts.

Voices of a People's History of the United States (2004) is a book edited by Howard Zinn and Anthony Arnove. The work compiles primary accounts in a format that complements Zinn's *A People's History of the United States* (1980), which was a finalist for the National Book Award. Zinn also created the *Young People's History of the United States* (2009), a text that is aimed at younger readers. A companion website, the Zinn Education Project (Teaching for Change & Rethinking Schools, 2012), provides access to lesson plans, links, videos, and other resources, including a teacher's guide (Olson-Raymer, 2006), to support use of *Voices of a People's History of the United States*. The Zinn Education Project is managed by the *Rethinking Schools* and

Teaching for Change organizations—two organizations well known for their active role in social justice education and critical pedagogy.

The website of the Nez Perce National Historical Park, which is under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service (NPS), includes Virtual Museum Collections that draw upon resources related to Nez Perce traditional life, “contact and change” periods, and contemporary life. Since the website is managed by the NPS, the information is considered part of the public domain; as such, it is easily accessible to teachers. The site also provides curriculum guides and field trip planning materials. While the Nez Perce tribe does not manage the Park or the website, the NPS considers the tribe “a key partner,” employs tribal members, and consults tribal members during “major projects” (NPS, 2011c). Furthermore, materials for the curriculum guide were developed in collaboration with tribal elders, leaders, and educators.

The final resource consists of materials to supplement the Public Broadcasting System (PBS) documentary *New Perspectives on the West*. The documentary, which was produced by two non-Native filmmakers as well as N. Scott Momaday (Kiowa), consists of eight parts, several of which focus extensively on Native peoples. Episode Six, “Fight No More Forever,” addresses the 1874 to 1877 timeframe and includes coverage of events surrounding Joseph’s surrender speech. The supporting website includes lesson plans, an “interactive biographical dictionary,” and a link to the Archives of the West, a resource that brings together digital versions of primary source materials such as eyewitness accounts, speeches, photographs, and statements (The West Film Project, 2001d). A variety of people, including members of the Nez Perce tribe, were involved in aspects of the documentary production and the creation of website resources (The West Film Project, 2001c). Additional resources, including a curriculum guide, can be obtained at a cost from PBS, although only the freely accessible materials were evaluated for this project.

The three resources were analyzed based on Gay's (2004) argument that curriculum resources must present complete and accurate representations of the real experiences of diverse peoples. Because the speech itself does not differ significantly from resource to resource, supplemental information, such as introductory or interpretive materials, footnotes, lesson suggestions, teachers' guides, and other explanatory material, formed the bulk of analyzed data.

To facilitate evaluation according to guidelines identified by critical Indigenous theorists, an analytical framework was created (see Table 1). This framework was applied first to the contextualization of the speech by the resource as a whole (i.e., what are the goals of the resource developers, and do those goals reinforce or counter the dominant historical narrative?) and then to each individual resource element using discourse analysis methods on a line-by-line level.

Insert Table 1 about here

The text and other materials that preface or follow Joseph's speech—or those that are proximally referenced (e.g., links to teacher resources from the speech webpage, footnotes guiding readers to another section of the same resource, etc.)—were reviewed word by word as a means to consider literal meaning. Words such as “English” and “Chief” prompted closer contextual analysis given their potential to reinforce popular misconceptions related to Hinmatóowyalahtq'it's language usage and leadership role. Additionally, specific omissions—for example, failure to mention Joseph's interpreter—were noted. Such omissions within the metadiscourse signal an assumption that the reader has previously accessed such background information, a lack of content understanding on the part of the curriculum developers, and/or the potential for curriculum to reinforce myths that bolster the dominant culture historical narrative.

Findings: Hearing and Listening

Resource Goals

Both the stated and implied purposes of the resources provided general information related to the positionality/bias of the resource developers, especially with regard to their views of Joseph as a hero or leader within and beyond the dominant historical narrative. For example, the *Voices of a People's History of the United States* text, as a whole, is presented with the primary goal of advancing previously undermined and unheard historical perspectives as a response, or counter-narrative, to what Zinn and Arnove (2004) call the “orthodox histories, mass media, standard textbooks, the controlled culture” (p. 24). The collection articulates a desire to position “the voices of struggle” in their deserved place within the historical narrative of the nation (Zinn & Arnove, 2004, p. 28).

Although the resources that are accessible on the NPS website do not directly challenge the dominant historical narrative, efforts to honor the presence and continued influence of the Nez Perce (“the Nez Perce are still here” and “the stories of the Nez Perce have been part of this landscape since time immemorial; they have always been here”) (NPS, 2011d) are clear. Additionally, the Virtual Museum Exhibit claims to “tell the story of the Nimiipuu or Nez Perce” (NPS Museum Management Program, n.d.), pointing to a recognition of counter-narratives as a means to question the completeness of the dominant culture narrative.

The *New Perspectives on the West* resources also demonstrate a goal to expand historical responsiveness. Specifically, there is an effort to recognize historical counter-narratives in several key places. For example, a quotation by Kiowa writer and scholar N. Scott Momaday opens the introductory text to the website (The West Film Project, 2001d). However, the *New Perspectives on the West* resources do not clearly privilege counter-narratives as a focus for the “new”

perspectives on the West. Instead, the emphasis is on comprehensiveness: The goal, as described by the producers of the film and creators of the supplemental resources, is to tell “the story of all of us, no matter where on the continent we happen to live, no matter how recently our ancestors arrived on its shores” (The West Film Project, 2001d).

Discourse Analysis

In addition to considering the broader goals of the resources within the context of critical Indigenous theory, the analytical framework provided a structure to guide the line-by-line situated discourse analysis and the subsequent identification of themes (Fairclough, 1992; Gee, 2005). In many regards, the way the resources represented Hinmatóowyahtq'it's speech demonstrates awareness of the tenets identified by Indigenous scholars, as outlined in the following sections and in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

Respect for peoples, communities, and traditions. In terms of the three resources in this analysis, attention was given to authorship and cultural context as connected to the specific tribal traditions and leadership. All three sources attribute authorship to Joseph and recognize his Nez Perce tribal affiliation. Of particular interest is the introduction of Joseph as Hinmatóowyahtq'it provided by the *New Perspectives on the West* (The West Film Project, 2001b). Critical Indigenous scholars emphasize the importance of Native names, especially since using names assigned or preferred by dominant culture groups potentially undermines Indigenous culture and language.

Resources should also support and acknowledge tribal views of leadership to meet the respect guideline. *Voices of a People's History of the United States* does not identify Joseph's role

within the tribe. The other two resources endeavor to more clearly distinguish between the myth of Joseph as a military leader and the reality of Nez Perce leadership. For example, the *New Perspectives on the West* resources emphasize that Joseph was not considered a “war chief” by the Nez Perce, and that, instead, his role was more civilian:

By the time he formally surrendered on October 5, 1877, Joseph was widely referred to in the American press as "the Red Napoleon." It is unlikely, however, that he played as critical a role in the Nez Percé's military feat as his legend suggests. He was never considered a war chief by his people, and even within the Wallowa band, it was Joseph's younger brother, Olikut, who led the warriors, while Joseph was responsible for guarding the camp. It appears, in fact, that Joseph opposed the decision to flee into Montana and seek aid from the Crows and that other chiefs—Looking Glass and some who had been killed before the surrender—were the true strategists of the campaign. (The West Film Project, 2001b)

The distinction between “war chief” and “village chief” is important in terms of not only understanding the leadership system of the Nez Perce, but also because it highlights the role of the media and the military in defining and positioning Native heroes. As the *New Perspectives on the West* overview demonstrates, the “legend” of the Nez Perce surrender does not necessarily align with lived experience (The West Film Project, 2001b). Furthermore, the resource acknowledges the dynamism of history, using the term “appears” to signal the potential for historical understanding to change as new information surfaces.

The digital materials that accompany the *New Perspectives on the West* resource further encourage responsive historical thinking by readers, since they provide some basic guidance for teachers and general audience members in terms of understanding the influence of dominant

culture on the shaping of sources and creating Native heroes. For example, in the “Archives of the West” section of the site, readers can access Lieutenant Wood’s recollection of the Nez Perce surrender. In the version provided there, Wood explained:

I had written in lead pencil Joseph's speech as he gave it through Chapman [the interpreter], but eventually I gave the original to the adjutant general of the army, at his request, because he said he had in his archives the speeches of Chiefs Logan, Red Jacket and one other of the great Indian chiefs—I forget the name—and he would like to add this speech of Joseph's to the collection. I gave it to him, and as it was not long I made a copy immediately. Later, after I had resigned from the army, and was on one of my visits to Washington to appear before the Supreme Court, I went into the War Department and as a matter of curiosity asked to see this lead-pencil memorandum which I had made, as I had lost my own copy. The clerks made diligent search for it, but the then adjutant general told me it had disappeared. I have done my best now to reconstruct it from memory, but it will be found correctly given in the account of the surrender which I wrote for a Chicago newspaper and in the article I later wrote for the Century Magazine. (The West Film Project, 2001a)

If teachers and/or students read Wood’s account in addition to the speech credited to Joseph, they may begin to ask questions about the nature and purpose of authorship and audience. While the *Voices of a People’s History of the United States* and the NPS Nez Perce National Historical Park resources provide minimal historical context for the speech in general, the *New Perspectives on the West* online materials offer insight to the influence of dominant culture, the media, and specific individuals on the development of myth. Teachers who use these materials may, as a result,

recognize that the popular understanding of Joseph's speech does not necessarily align with Hinmatóowyalahtq'it's lived experience or with the broader Nez Perce views of the event.

Recognition of discursive positioning. Many critical Indigenous scholars emphasize the importance of Native language as connected to understanding culture and power. Although the lesson plan accompanying the *New Perspectives on the West* episode positions Joseph's "powerful and poetic use of language" (Schur, 2001) in a positive light, none of the materials available through the PBS website recognize his use of a language other than English, with the exception of Lieutenant Wood's mention of an interpreter. Similarly, the *Voices of a People's History of the United States* text provides no information recognizing Joseph's use of an Indigenous language to present the speech. The website of the Nez Perce National Historical Park, however, shares general information regarding the Nez Perce language (NPS, 2011e), and the "educator's guide" (see NPS, 2011b) also includes information about the language Joseph spoke during the surrender, stating that Joseph used a blend of "Indian languages," French, and English in his surrender speech (p. 54).

In terms of audience awareness and analysis, the *Voices of a People's History of the United States* text is the only resource that directly references the original 1877 publication source. In this case, the source was *Harper's Weekly*, which had previously developed the reputation of depicting the Nez Perce in a negative light (Swagerty, 2005). The *New Perspectives on the West* resources provide Lieutenant Wood's account of the surrender, which makes vague and indirect references to forms of the speech printed in several publications. Additionally, the lesson plan that supplements the *New Perspectives on the West* resource encourages teachers and students to consider the influence of Joseph's discourse on the broader American audience. Specifically, the plan asks

students to think about the effect of one of Joseph's later speeches on "America's conscience" (Schur, 2001, Activity 1, Step 13).

The representation of Joseph as a hero is a final consideration related to discursive positioning. Two of the resources use language to directly position Hinmatóowyahtq'it as a leader worthy of remembrance within the broader U.S. historical narrative: The Nez Perce National Historical Park website describes the speech as "immortal" (NPS, 2011a), and the *New Perspectives on the West* resource suggests that the speech "immortalized [Joseph] as a military leader in American popular culture" (The West Film Project, 2001b). The lesson plan that accompanies the *New Perspectives on the West* resource also includes an objective that emphasizes the iconic status of Joseph: "Students will assess the effect of Chief Joseph's legacy on our identity as Americans" (Schur, 2001).

To provide an authentic representation of Joseph's position as one of activism, instead of assimilation and defeat, it is also important to consider the events that followed the surrender speech. Two of the resources referenced Hinmatóowyahtq'it's other speeches, including those more clearly focused on resistance, sovereignty, and cultural sustainability, as opposed to assimilation and surrender. Many experts suggest that the discourse used within these other speeches is more representative of Joseph's intent, and inclusion of these speeches bolsters responsive contextual representation for the surrender speech. For example, *Voices of a People's History of the United States* (Zinn & Arnove, 2004) notes that Joseph "continued to speak out against the crimes of the U.S. government" after the surrender (p. 146). The *New Perspectives on the West* resource on Joseph concludes with:

In his last years, Joseph spoke eloquently against the injustice of United States policy toward his people and held out the hope that America's promise of freedom and equality

might one day be fulfilled for Native Americans as well. An indomitable voice of conscience for the West, he died in 1904, still in exile from his homeland, according to his doctor "of a broken heart." (The West Film Project, 2001b)

Although a focus on “eloquence” and death “of a broken heart” reinforce the romanticized and defeatist stereotypes often associated with the Nez Perce orator, this reference to Joseph’s “indomitable voice” suggests the potential for conflicting versions of history (i.e., Joseph surrendered, but did not surrender).

Honoring of complexity of Indigenous knowledge systems. The three resources address Indigenous knowledge systems in very different ways. The *Voices of a People’s History of the United States* text does not provide any contextualizing information regarding translation or the importance and legitimacy of oral history sharing. Throughout the NPS Nez Perce National Historical Park website, there is evidence of culturally responsive discourse and support for Native ways of knowing. For example, the History and Culture page includes a quotation from the Tribal Executive Committee, which emphasizes that “We did not travel here; we are of this land” (NPS, 2011d). Furthermore, the Nez Perce Language page emphasizes the complexity and dynamic nature of Native language as it is connected to oral history and culture (e.g., “When songs and stories are translated into English, the subtlety of the stories is lost”) (NPS, 2011e).

The *New Perspectives on the West* resource encourages teachers and students to consider the motivations of both the Wallowa band and the U.S. Army within the context of the surrender. For example, the lesson plan resource (Schur, 2001) includes a role-play discussion activity focusing on groups of “panelists” with different perspectives (see Activity 2). While the motivations of Nez Perce leaders are often positioned only in relationship to those of the U.S. military within curriculum resources, this activity includes a “surviving member of Chief Joseph's

band of Nez Perce” who “can be based on the biography of Looking Glass, who in some ways differed from Chief Joseph in his approach to the crisis faced by the Nez Perce” (Schur, 2001).

To explore the historical and continued influence of inter- and intra-tribal diversity, the *New Perspectives on the West* lesson plan (Schur, 2001) encourages students to consider the differences between the Nez Perce and other tribal nations, as well as between the bands of the Nimi'ipuu (see Activity 2 and Extension/Adaptation Ideas). In addition to considering diversity across and within Native groups during the time of the surrender, critical Indigenous theorists advocate for an awareness of diversity across time and space. The *Voices of a People's History of the United States* text provides no explanation of Nez Perce cultural traditions impacting Joseph's speech or continuing to influence the lives of people today. In contrast, the website of the Nez Perce National Historical Park provides links to lesson plans and resources specific to Nez Perce culture, tradition, and spirituality. As one of the extension activities to the *New Perspectives on the West* lesson (Schur, 2001), students are encouraged to learn about Nez Perce life today using Internet resources. Although such an activity would best support the third guideline if embedded within the actual lesson, the plan's author made efforts to recognize the dynamic and continued influence of Nez Perce culture.

Discussion: *Hearing the Histories*

The three resources reviewed for this project demonstrate efforts to support culturally responsive pedagogy. For example, each attributes authorship to Joseph, demonstrates a respect of Joseph's leadership talents, and acknowledges Joseph's specific tribal affiliation. Both the Website of the Nez Perce National Historical Park and the materials that support *The New Perspectives on the West* documentary clarify Joseph's leadership role within the tribe. The NPS website provides a more comprehensive picture of the linguistic and cultural complexity surrounding the Nez Perce

surrender than the other resources. The PBS resource asks readers to consider multiple historical perspectives and acknowledges the involvement of others in the crafting of the speech as it is known today. Although the three resources promote cultural responsiveness and critical inquiry in several ways, it is important to note the potential for the resources—and others like them—to reinforce the dominant culture narrative.

Recognizing that the primary purpose of this article is to introduce readers to the potential application of critical Indigenous theory within curricular decision-making, the review of resources related to Chief Joseph's surrender speech holds several implications for classroom teachers, teacher educators, and social science scholars. First, teachers, and others, cannot assume representations of Native primary source accounts are accurate or culturally responsive. Instead, they should recognize the continued influence of the "hidden curriculum" (Freire, 1972/2000)—the underlying dominant culture norms that shape learning experiences for students both in and beyond schools—on their own work and in resources that claim to represent Native accounts accurately. Second, curriculum developers, scholars, and teachers need to carefully consider the role of "discursive positioning" (Bishop, 2005) in social studies curriculum. Finally, teachers and students need to confront the myth of objectivity in social studies education, and in historical inquiry at large.

The Hidden Curriculum: The Prominence of Eloquent Speakers and Noble Savages

Without careful teacher reflection throughout the process of document selection, analysis, and presentation, the popularity of primary document use may actually limit historical accuracy and critical thinking (Barton, 2005). In this study, review of the resources suggests a lingering assumption that teachers (and students) already possess the necessary background information when they first encounter the content. For example, while each of the resources alludes to the

importance of including primary accounts provided by Native peoples in classroom settings, only one (the *New Perspectives on the West* resource) provides direct access to tools needed to support a broader understanding of the context surrounding the surrender.

Although none of the resources provide direct access to such tools, educators who build lesson plans using the resources may conduct additional research on their own. However, lesson plans shared in popular online depositories demonstrate the potential for teachers to perpetuate widely disseminated untruths about Joseph's speech, especially in online forums. For example, the belief that Joseph was "articulate in English" is pervasive across lesson plans. In reality, ethnohistorians and tribal members emphasize that Hinmatóowyalahq't spoke little to no English (Guthrie, 2007; West, 2010), especially at the time of the surrender.

If teachers do not actively seek accurate contextualizing material, another concern arises, since the "great documents" that are sprinkled throughout social studies curriculum in public schools in the United States represent a distorted sense of the Native experience. Often, the accounts included in the curriculum are from leaders who, like Joseph, are praised by members of the dominant culture for their role in promoting peace, assimilation, or accommodation, whether such recognition is accurate or not. These "heroes" are most often those who acted as intercultural intermediaries (e.g., members of the Mandan, Sacajawea, etc.), encouraged assimilation in order to save their people (e.g., Joseph, Little Turtle, etc.), or filled a token role (e.g., Jim Thorpe) (Stanton, in press).

In addition to reinforcing the dominant culture narrative, focusing only on the story-experiences of a chosen few raises another concern: Students and teachers may interpret individual experiential narratives as collective reality or viewpoint (Beverley, 2005). Not only is the resulting view inaccurate ("All Nez Perce were ready to surrender" or "He was the Chief, so he knew best"),

but it is also disrespectful of epistemological differences. For many Native communities, collective understanding is not something that can be transmitted by any single person (Battiste, 2007; Smith, 2005). Stories compound and add to the collective narrative, and members of the community (and their ancestors and descendants) actively contribute to, interact with, and *experience* the events shared in those accounts (Raffan, 1992). As a result, decontextualized primary documents, such as Joseph's surrender speech, that are shaped and represented by cultural outsiders, potentially lose authenticity and respect among Native groups.

When curriculum authors and editors choose to ignore context, they contribute to the hidden curriculum. For example, omitted information about the role of translation in the Nez Perce surrender may lead teachers and students to assume—incorrectly—that Joseph spoke English. Even more worrisome are the descriptions that emphasize Joseph's eloquence without honoring the role of his Indigenous language: Is it possible that young learners may develop the belief that powerful ideas and effective communication are English-bound? Unless teachers and students are able to also understand what is *not* written, they may misinterpret what *is* written.

Silence of the Written Word: Context, Representation, and Discourse

Another key finding based on the review of the example resources is that Native primary accounts are automatically positioned within dominant culture constructions of discourse (i.e., understandings of authorship, language, and structure align with dominant culture values) and document (i.e., written formats are privileged over oral retellings). Such historical “skirmishes around the power of the word” demonstrate the influence of discourse on authenticity, representation, positionality, and colonization, especially as connected to Nez Perce accounts like that of Joseph (McCoy, 2004, p. 4). For instance, two of the resources use the English name “Joseph,” and one refers to Joseph as a chief without further explanation. While two discuss the

Nez Perce language or mention a translator, only one of the resources emphasizes the potential for meaning to shift as a result of translation from an oral account to a written document.

Such “discursive positionality” affects both the reading and interpretation of primary source accounts. Translation, in particular, affects discursive positioning of the Native counter-narrative within the dominant culture historical narrative. As Bassnett and Trivedi (1999) note, the act of translation in a post-colonial context can center upon a display of power and dominance. For many Native peoples, who traditionally shared experience orally and through an Indigenous language, the “flattening” and “freezing” of events through writing and English represents a dual translation (McCoy, 2004, p. 4). Furthermore, the writers, who were rarely the speakers themselves, were able to select or de-select information they deemed important or unimportant, further shaping and affecting the primary source account. Joseph’s surrender speech was, for example, translated by one non-Native person and written by various others.

Historical Distance: The Myth of Objectivity in Social Studies Education

Eamon (2006) argues that genuine and accurate interpretation of primary source documents requires an ability to determine the “authenticity, voice, and bias” of the source (p. 304), suggesting that objectivity—as defined by dominant culture social science—is achievable, desirable, and superior to the experience of the primary source, since that experience may be somehow untruthful or exaggerated. As critical Indigenous scholars note, this perspective directly conflicts with Native epistemologies, especially given the influence of the hidden curriculum and discursive positionality within the shaping of Native accounts as represented in contemporary history curriculum.

Within the example resources, an emphasis is placed on the Native speaker (Joseph), which, on the surface, seems to advance responsive historical inquiry. While that emphasis is

essential in order to adhere to the *respect* and *recognition* tenets of critical Indigenous theory, it is only part of the picture in the case of many written Native accounts from this time period. Failing to define the identities and motivations of the various interpreters, writers, publishers, and audiences potentially sends a message that such individuals are unimportant when considering the meaning of the account. In reality, these people had enormous influence over what was said/written and how it was shared with both Native and non-Native peoples. To suggest they are not important privileges the dominant culture position as related to objectivity: The White translator, writer, or reader does not need to think about his/her position in relation to the Native speaker, since his/her interpretation is inherently uncomplicated and unflawed.

Without calling attention to contextualizing information and authenticity of representation, readers are also not required to question their own understanding or the understanding of others and their experiences. In short, they are not expected to interact with the text. For many critical Indigenous scholars, this false sense of objective distance from the storyteller conflicts with traditional values of interaction and dynamic telling (Archibald, 2008; Jahner, 1983). The perspective that a non-Native reader does not need to form a broader understanding of the context surrounding the Native source suggests that a relationship between teller and hearer is unnecessary, even counterproductive.

Since writers often make decisions regarding what and how oral story is shared, and since many writers are not Native themselves, both content and form are potentially affected by the myth of objectivity. In many cases, the content of the account is itself modified. For example, in the case of Joseph's surrender speech, the writer, most likely Lieutenant Wood, altered the written version multiple times, adding and subtracting information—and potentially fabricating part of the story—

in order to cast himself and Joseph in “more dramatic roles” (Hampton, 1994, p. 370). In sum, the objectivity many teachers and scholars claim actually rests upon countless subjective influences.

Implications for Practice: The Potential for Responsive Representation

Given the influence of the hidden curriculum, discursive positionality, and the myth of objectivity, critical and transformative pedagogy requires guided inquiry for teachers and scholars, as well as for students, as a means to better *hear* the stories shared by historically marginalized peoples. Cleary and Neumann (2009) emphasize that asking the “right question” about primary source documents is as important as choosing the “right documents” (p. 77). In other words, the process is as important—if not more important—than the specific substantive concepts (Lee, 1983). Specifically, engaging in critical curriculum inquiry—for teachers and students—is important for responsive curriculum implementation and expanded historical thinking.

To guide responsive curriculum inquiry and implementation, Native community members, including Indigenous scholars, must be involved in the process of curricular resource selection (Rogers & Jaime, 2010). Cultural mentors can guide teachers and students through inquiry that considers tribal context, collective memory, and the nature of oral history. For example, given the many misconceptions illustrated within this study of the resources analyzed here, it is vital that educators strive to build a broader sense of Nez Perce history in order to gain even a basic understanding of the dimensions of Nez Perce leadership and the influence of language on the tribal memory. That history began well before contact with Europeans and Euro-Americans (McCoy, 2004).

Teacher training, in general, holds promise for increasing responsive teaching with primary accounts. The project conducted by Waring and Torrez (2010) demonstrates the effectiveness of guided teacher training in the use of primary sources. Specifically, the preservice teacher

participants gained confidence in terms of “getting away from the textbook as the main source of information” (p. 303). With relatively minimal technical preparation, teachers demonstrated their interest in promoting genuine inquiry through the inclusion of primary accounts.

The digital age also presents new possibilities, and challenges, for teachers who strive to responsively integrate Native primary accounts into their social studies classrooms. Eamon (2006) suggests that access to extensive digital archives using the Internet avoids some of the problems associated with pre-selected sets of materials, such as those defined in teacher kits. However, without a dialogic interaction, the resulting use of a Native story-experience can represent a form of colonization, or “commodification” of Native languages, traditions, stories, or experiences for the benefit of a non-Native entity (Smith, 2005, p. 95), because increased global access to Indigenous resources inflates the potential for inappropriate interpretation or application of the materials.

Wineburg’s (2001) research suggests that when learners encounter contextual information, they can “better understand” the texts they read (p. 47) as a means to “decode authors” as well as texts (p. 74). In addition to encountering background information, “contextualized thinking” (p. 90) also depends upon the ability of readers to make connections between texts, particularly when assumptions regarding culture form the subtext and metadiscourse of a curricular resource. For example, accounts from other Nez Perce leaders, such as Yellow Wolf, can expand understanding of Nez Perce history, culture, and experience, while simultaneously raising questions about the use of Joseph’s speech to provide voice for the tribe as a whole (McCoy, 2004). Successful confrontation of cultural assumptions also depends upon the redefinition of history for students. If notions of authenticity or perspective conflict with prior understandings, students can continue to struggle in terms of thinking historically.

Therefore, students need guidance in terms of interpretation of primary accounts and the materials contextualizing them. While frameworks for interpretation, such as the College Board's AP PARTS (author, place/time, prior knowledge, audience, reason, the main idea, and significance) model (Greer, 2006) or the Six C's (content, citation, context, connections, communication, and conclusions) guide (The History Project, n.d.), exist and are gaining popularity in social studies classrooms, these frameworks do not explicitly consider cultural epistemologies. Potentially, an adaptation of the analytical framework used in this project, or—better yet—a framework collaboratively developed with Indigenous peoples in the school's specific community, could guide student reading while simultaneously advancing responsive inquiry. Asking students questions like “Who is telling this story, and what is his/her cultural context?” and “How can we be sure?” can be effective in igniting the critical inquiry process. To follow the initial conversation, students could collaborate with Native community members to analyze primary source documents in terms of cultural interpretation, conduct additional research to seek diverse perspectives of the event, and discuss potential points of conflict within and between texts. In addition, pairing textbooks and supplemental resources with materials prepared by Native historians and leaders, such as *Custer Died for Your Sins* (Deloria, 1988), offers a way to engage students in the critical historical dialogue.⁵

However, as Wineburg (2001) argues, “it is not enough to expose students to alternative visions of the past, already digested and interpreted by others” (p. 131). Teachers must guide students through the process of historical inquiry and contextualized thinking, especially in terms of Native primary accounts that are embedded within larger curricular resources. Teachers can encourage such thinking by providing access to expanded background information, by structuring activities to incorporate the sourcing heuristic and critical inquiry of the subtext and

metadiscourse, and by engaging students in the telling/writing of historical events (Wineburg, 2001). For example, students who work to transform an elder's oral account into a written text learn firsthand about the challenges associated with authentic representation of lived experience (Stanton & Sutton, in press).

It is attention to this process of curriculum development that holds the greatest potential to advance social justice. Bhabha (1994) argues that the act of translation, if critiqued and considered part of a dialogue, allows for both the original storyteller and the participant to “rehistoricize” events (p. 55). As Kincheloe (2006) emphasizes, critical social studies educators “must search in as many locations as possible for alternate discourses,” but their job does not end there—they also need to consider diverse “ways of thinking and being that expand the envelopes of possibility,” particularly in terms of Indigenous experience (p. 15).

Conclusion: Looking Ahead and Behind

Primary accounts can promote culturally responsive inquiry and social justice social education (Merriam, 2002; Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005), if they allow members of the audience to deconstruct their own understanding while interacting with diverse experiences. When combined with self-reflection, critical “storywork”—the centering of Indigenous story-experiences within educational contexts—offers a way to challenge colonization (Archibald, 2008). Smith (1999) emphasizes that responsive attention to the primary source demands more than mere inclusion of primary source story-experiences; deconstruction of dominant culture historical narratives and curricula must occur as well. Grande (2008) calls for a “revolutionary critical pedagogy” that demands a critical view of the broader context of both counter-narratives and dominant culture narratives (p. 237). For example, McCoy (2004) encourages critical analysis of

the “cult and myth of Chief Joseph and the reasons for Anglo Americans using his images, actions, and words” (p. 10).

Such critical pedagogy demands an attention to both the process and product of historical inquiry, and it does not rest on the basic curricular resources alone, given the challenges identified in this article. As illustrated by the Chief Joseph surrender speech example, curricular resources that include Native primary sources do not necessarily provide adequate contextual information to accurately and responsively represent those accounts. Little attention is given to the broader historical or contemporary political context, the challenges associated with translation and writing, or to epistemological differences, such as dominant culture insistence on objectivity in historical inquiry. It is important to note that supplemental curriculum resources have already undergone multiple forms of interpretation when they reach the teacher, because someone has selected, or de-selected, potential documents for inclusion and defined ways to represent the accounts. As a result, the story-experiences of the elite and of the Native heroes who were shaped by the dominant culture continue to dominate the educational landscape.

Given the persistence of the dominant culture narrative, adhering to critical Indigenous theory can prove challenging. Scholars and teachers may lack familiarity with many of the stories and perspectives offered through counter-narratives: It can be difficult to write or teach about something that directly conflicts with what you learned as a reader or student. Scholars or educators may exclude Native counter-narratives if they feel bound by a majority rule mindset. Standardized curriculum materials often reflect this mindset—they include histories of majority-minorities (i.e. women, Blacks, and Latinos), but they neglect the Native perspective given the small population and limited visibility.

In addition, even culturally responsive scholars and educators may exclude some counter-narratives, since it is not appropriate to share certain cultural content with non-Natives. Many tribes have stories that can only be told by specific individuals, to specific audiences, and in specific contexts. Furthermore, responsive scholars and educators may hesitate to include Native counter-narratives if they are concerned that readers and students will fixate on the authenticity or truth of those histories, which can lead to added criticism of—as opposed to enhanced respect for—Native perspectives. As a result, an epistemological tension remains between validation of the Native perspective and the dynamic nature of historical inquiry, which hinges upon the understanding that all accounts are influenced by subjective bias. While this project offers an example of ways counter-narratives can influence our understandings of historical events, it does not, and cannot, answer this broader epistemological question.

Despite the challenges, sharing story-experiences can be an effective and responsive means to teach about history, anthropology, geography, and other social studies fields, especially for Native communities (Archibald, 2008; Hermes, 2005; Peacock & Cleary, 1997). Smith (1999) explains that stories can sustain Indigenous culture and resist dominant culture colonization: “The story and the story teller both serve to connect the past with the future, one generation with the other, the land with the people and the people with the story” (p. 145). Storytelling, as a form of “qualitative oral record,” is viewed by many tribal groups as the most appropriate way to share history and experience (Indigenous Knowledge Systems Research Colloquium, 2005, p. 9). In many Native communities, storytelling is more than just a means to preserve memory of events. Archibald (2008) and Iseke-Barnes (2009) argue that Indigenous stories can heal communities and advance achievement for Native students. In terms of traditional Native ways of sharing

knowledge, honoring story as experience can extend learning, build relationships, and legitimize the experiences of Indigenous peoples (Battiste, 2007; Dunbar, 2008; Smith, 2005).

Given the importance of the Native counter-narrative in the efforts to advance critical Indigenous theory and social justice social education, teachers should continue to integrate Native primary accounts into their social studies teaching. However, the way these accounts are represented should be carefully considered. Teachers, teacher educators, and scholars must look beyond the literal in curriculum resources. In addition, tribal members and schools can cultivate cultural mentorships and critical dialogue in order to expand responsive teaching and increase pressure on curriculum publishers. Teachers can utilize analytical frameworks to guide their own understanding and to support student learning through responsive, critical examination of curriculum resources. Critical Indigenous theory can guide the analysis of these resources, especially if approaches such as “storywork” (Archibald, 2008) and “red pedagogy” (Grande, 2008) inform the process. As social studies educators and scholars, we cannot view primary source analysis as an objective science, as stand-alone story reading, or as something we, or our students, can do effectively without guidance from tribal members and ethnohistorians. In order to *hear* the stories fully, we need to look beyond the source, the existing curricular resources, and ourselves.

NOTES

This project would not have been possible without the guidance of several individuals and communities. In particular, I thank Dr. Francisco Rios, Dr. Angela Jaime, Dr. James Loewen, Marty Conrad, Lisa Moss, Burnett Whiteplume, Donovan Archambault, Aldora White, and members of the Northern Arapaho, Eastern Shoshone, Crow, and Blackfoot nations for their contributions to my ongoing education as related to critical curriculum inquiry and Indigenous perspectives of history. In addition, I am grateful to Dr. Robert Petrone and Dr. Sarah Schmidt-Wilson from Montana State University for their assistance in the preparation of this article.

¹ Although it is preferable to utilize specific tribal names when discussing Indigenous groups, it is not always appropriate or feasible to do so. Throughout this article, specific tribal names (i.e., Nez Perce) are used when possible, while the terms “Native” and “Indigenous” are used when specific tribal affiliation is not. Many critical Indigenous scholars are utilizing “Native” or “Indigenous” to demonstrate solidarity in terms of critical work and to emphasize the traditional view of many Native peoples regarding their origins. Along these lines, "critical Indigenous theory" refers to a synthesis of the work of several leading Indigenous scholars from around the world, particularly in Australia and New Zealand. In this article, I chose not to capitalize "critical" or "theory" in order to avoid misleading readers (the framework that guided discourse analysis did not stem from the work of one specific theorist), to encourage readers to resist application of a general theory to all situations and tribal communities without first recognizing the uniqueness of those situations and communities, and to reinforce the intellectual sovereignty of Indigenous

scholars and communities in the Americas in terms of shaping a Critical Indigenous Theory that reflects the unique history and beliefs of Native Americans.

² While Joseph was given a Christian name by his father at his baptism, tribal members called him by his Nez Perce name, Hinmatóowyahtq'it, and it was the U.S. military and media who popularized the name “Chief Joseph” (West, 2010). Throughout this article, “Joseph” and “Hinmatóowyahtq'it” are used interchangeably to draw attention to the politicization of discourse and to connect with the broadest possible audience. The spelling of the tribal name varies; the spelling used in this article comes from Aoki’s 1994 work on Nez Perce language.

³ The Nimi’ipuu were named the Nez Perce, or “pierced nose,” by members of the Lewis and Clark expedition, despite the reality that few Nimi’ipuu practiced nose piercing (NezPerce.org). Like the Chief Joseph/Hinmatóowyahtq'it duality, Nimi’ipuu and Nez Perce are used interchangeably in this article to emphasize the use of language as tool to reinforce mistrusts within politicized dominant culture curriculum.

⁴ The term “minority” is inappropriate in many contexts due to shifting demographics in the United States, but it is also suggestive of a power hierarchy. While Critical Race Theory emphasizes the endemic nature of racism, the theory also emphasizes the potential for educators, scholars, and community members to address and deconstruct racism and the associated power hierarchies. Instead of using the word “minority”—especially without the use of quotation marks to draw attention to its inappropriateness—it is preferable to use more specific terms (i.e., “Indigenous,” or better still, “Nez Perce”) or acceptable terms identified by persons within the “minority” culture (i.e., “people of color” or “historically marginalized peoples”).

⁵ For additional teaching ideas and resources geared toward critical theory and social studies education, see Daniels, 2011.

REFERENCES

- Aoki, H. (1994). *Nez Perce dictionary*. University of California publications in linguistics (Vol. 112). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Archibald, J. (2008). *Indigenous storywork: Educating the heart, mind, body, and spirit*. Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press.
- Barton, K. C. (2005). Primary sources in history: Breaking through the myths. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(10), 745-753. doi:10.2307/20441899
- Bassnett, S., & Trivedi, H. (1999). Introduction: Of colonies, cannibals and vernaculars. In S. Bassnett & H. Trivedi (Eds.) *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice* (pp. 1-18). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Battiste, M. (2007). Research ethics for protecting Indigenous knowledge and heritage: Institutional and researcher responsibilities. In N. K. Denzin & M. D. Giardina (Eds.), *Ethical futures in qualitative research* (pp. 111-132). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Beverly, J. (2005). *Testimonio*, subalternity, and narrative authority. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 547-557). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bishop, R. (2008). Te Kotahitanga: Kaupapa Maori in mainstream classrooms. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies* (pp. 439-458). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

- Bishop, R. (2005). Freeing ourselves from neocolonial domination in research: A Kaupapa Maori approach to creating knowledge. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 109-138). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Brayboy, B. (2005). Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. *The Urban Review*, 37(5), 425-446. doi: 10.1007/s11256-005-0018-y
- Cleary, P., & Neumann, D. (2009). The challenges of primary sources, collaboration, and the K-16 Elizabeth Murray Project. *The History Teacher*, 43(1), 67-86. Retrieved from <http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/ht/43.1/cleary.html>
- Daniels, E. A. (2011). Racial silences: Exploring and incorporating critical frameworks in the social studies. *The Social Studies*, 102(5), 211-220. Doi: 10.1080/00377996.2011.558938
- Deloria, V., Jr. (1988). *Custer died for your sins: An Indian manifesto*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York, NY: New Press.
- Deur, D. (2009). *Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve: An ethnohistory of traditionally associated contemporary populations*. (U.S. Department of the Interior, NPS, Pacific West Region Series in Social Science, Publication No. 2009-02). Retrieved from http://www.cfr.washington.edu/research.cesu/reports/J9W88040021_final_report.pdf
- Dunbar, C., Jr. (2008). Critical Race Theory and Indigenous methodologies. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies* (pp. 85-99). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

- Eamon, M. (2006). A “genuine relationship with the actual”: New perspectives on primary sources, history and the internet in the classroom. *The History Teacher*, 29(3), 297-314. Retrieved from <http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/ht/39.3/eamon.html>
- Erdoes, R., & Ortiz, A. (1984). Introduction. In R. Erdoes & A. Ortiz (Eds.) *American Indian myths and legends* (pp.xi-xv). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Malden, MA: Polity.
- Fixico, D. L. (1997). Methodologies in reconstructing Native American history. In D. L. Fixico (Ed.), *Rethinking American Indian history* (pp. 117-130). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation*. Boston, MA: Bergin & Garvey.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum. (Original work published 1972)
- Fresch, E. (2004). Preparing preservice elementary teachers to use primary sources in teaching history. *International Journal of Social Education*, 19(1), 83-103.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, & practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Gay, G. (2004). The importance of multicultural education. In D. J. Flinders & S. J. Thornton (Eds.), *The curriculum studies reader* (2nd ed., pp. 315-320). New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Grande, S. (2008). Red pedagogy: The un-methodology. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies* (pp. 233-254). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Greer, C. (2006). Primary source strategies. New York, NY: College Board. Retrieved from apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/members/repository/ap05_ushist_greer_2_p_50286.pdf
- Guthrie, T. H. (2007). Good words: Chief Joseph and the production of Indian speech(es), texts, and subjects. *Ethnohistory*, 54(3), 509-546. doi:10.1215/00141801-2007-005
- Hampton, B. (1994). *Children of grace: The Nez Perce War of 1877*. New York, NY: Holt.
- Hermes, M. (2005). White teachers, Native students: Rethinking culture-based education. In J. Phillion, M. F. He, & F. M. Connelly (Eds.), *Narrative experience in multicultural education* (pp. 95-115). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hirsch, E. D. (1988). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know*. New York, NY: Vintage.
- The History Project. (n.d.) The 6 C's of Primary Source Analysis. University of California, Irvine. Retrieved from http://www.humanities.uci.edu/history/ucihp/tah/6cs_Primary_Source.pdf
- Indigenous Knowledge Systems Research Colloquium (2005). Colloquium Overview Powerpoint. Retrieved from www.nativescience.org/pubs/WIPCE%202005%20IKS%20Colloquium.pdf
- Iseke-Barnes, J. (2009). Grandmothers of the Metis Nation: A living history with Dorothy Chartrand. *Native Studies Review*, 18(2), 69-104.
- Jahner, E. (1983). Intermediate forms between oral and written literature. In P. G. Allen (Ed.) *Studies in American Indian literature* (pp. 66-74). New York, NY: Modern Language Association.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2001). *Getting beyond the facts: Teaching social studies/social sciences in the Twenty-First Century* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2006). Critical ontology and Indigenous ways of being: Forging a postcolonial curriculum. *Curriculum as cultural practice: Postcolonial imaginations*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press. Retrieved from <http://www.freireproject.org/critical-pedagogy-and-philosophy>

King, J. E. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *Journal of Negro Education*, 60(2), 133-146.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. E., IV. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47-68.

Lee, P. (1983). History teaching and the philosophy of history. *History and Theory*, 22, 19-49.

Levstik, L. S., & Barton, K. C. (2010). *Doing history: Investigating with children in elementary and middle schools* (4th ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Loewen, J. W. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

McCoy, R. R. (2004). *Chief Joseph, Yellow Wolf, and the creation of Nez Perce history in the Pacific Northwest*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Milner, H. R., IV (2007). Race, culture, and researcher positionality: Working through dangers seen, unseen, and unforeseen. *Educational Researcher*, 36(7), 388-400. doi:

10.3102/0013189X07309471

- Mule, L. (1999). Indigenous languages in the school curriculum: What happened to Kiswahili in Kenya? In L. M. Semali & J. L. Kincheloe (Eds.), *What is Indigenous knowledge: Voices from the academy* (pp. 227-242). New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.
- National Council for the Social Studies (2010). *National curriculum standards for social studies: A framework for teaching, learning, and assessment*. Silver Spring, MD: NCSS.
- National Park Service Nez Perce National Historical Park (2011a). Bear Paw Battlefield. Retrieved from <http://www.nps.gov/nepe/planyourvisit/bear-paw-battlefield.htm>
- National Park Service Nez Perce National Historical Park (2011b). And it is still that way: An educator's guide. Retrieved from <http://www.nps.gov/nepe/forteachers/curriculummaterials.htm>
- National Park Service Nez Perce National Historical Park (2011c). Frequently Asked Questions. Retrieved from <http://www.nps.gov/nepe/faqs.htm>
- National Park Service Nez Perce National Historical Park (2011d). History and Culture. Retrieved from <http://www.nps.gov/nepe/historyculture/index.htm>
- National Park Service Nez Perce National Historical Park (2011e). Nez Perce Language. Retrieved from <http://www.cr.nps.gov/museum/exhibits/nepe/language.html>
- National Park Service Museum Management Program (n.d.). Nez Perce National Historical Park Museum Collections: Overview. Retrieved from <http://www.cr.nps.gov/museum/exhibits/nepe/index.html#>
- Nerburn, K. (2005). *Chief Joseph and the flight of the Nez Perce*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Nez Perce Tribe Information Systems Department (2009). History Frequently Asked Questions. Retrieved from <http://www.nezperce.org/Official/FrequentlyAskedQ.htm>

- Nieto, S. (2004). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Olson-Raymer, G. (2006). *Teaching with Voices of a People's History of the United States*. New York, NY: Seven Stories Press. Retrieved from <http://www.sevenstories.com/book/?GCOI=58322100707730>
- Peacock, T., & Cleary, L. M. (1997). Disseminating American Indian educational research through stories: A case against academic discourse. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 37(1), 7-15. Retrieved from <http://jaie.asu.edu/v37/V37S1dis.htm>
- Raffan, J. (1992). *Frontier, homeland, and sacred space: A collaborative investigation into cross-cultural perceptions of place in the Thelon Game Sanctuary, Northwest Territories*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Education Resources Information Center [ERIC]. (ED356927)
- Richardson, L. & St. Pierre, E. A. (2005). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 959-978). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rios, F. A. & Stanton, C. R. (2011). *Understanding multicultural education: Equity for all students*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Rogers, C. A. & Jaime, A. M. (2010). Listening to the community: Guidance from Native community members for emerging culturally responsive educators. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 43(2), 188-201. doi:10.1080/10665681003719657
- Sanchez, T. R. (2007). The depiction of Native Americans in recent (1991–2004) secondary American history textbooks: How far have we come? *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 40(4), 311-320. doi:10.1080/10665680701493565

- Schur, J. B. (2001). The Nez Perce and the Dawes Act. In *New Perspectives on the West*. Retrieved from http://www.pbs.org/weta/thewest/lesson_plans/lesson03.htm
- Scott, D. (2008). *Critical essays on major curriculum theorists*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sewall, G. T. (2000). *History textbooks at the new century: A report of the American Textbook Council*. New York, NY: American Textbook Council. Retrieved from www.historytextbooks.org/2000report.pdf
- Short, E. C. (1991). Introduction: Understanding curriculum inquiry. In E. C. Short (Ed.) *Forms of curriculum inquiry* (pp. 1-25). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. New York: Zed Books.
- Smith, L. T. (2005). On tricky ground: Researching the Native in the age of uncertainty. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 85-107). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stanton, C. R. (in press). Context and community: Resisting curricular colonization in American History courses. In H. Hickman & B. J. Porfilio (Eds.), *The new politics of the textbook* (pp. 173-194). Boston, MA: Sense.
- Stanton, C. R. & Sutton, K. (in press). "I guess I *do* know a good story": Re-envisioning the writing process with Native American students and communities. *English Journal*.
- Swagerty, W. R. (2005). Chief Joseph and the Nez Perce Indians. Retrieved from <http://www.windriverhistory.org/exhibits/chiefjoseph/chiefjoseph01.htm>
- Teaching for Change and Rethinking Schools. (2012). *Teaching A People's History: The Zinn Education Project*. Retrieved from <http://zinnedproject.org/>

- Ulrich, L. T. (2007). How Betsy Ross became famous: Oral tradition, nationalism, and the invention of history. *Common-Place*, 8(1). Retrieved from <http://www.common-place.org/vol-08/no-01/ulrich/>
- VanSledright, B. (2002). Confronting history's interpretive paradox while teaching fifth graders to investigate the past. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(4), 1089- 1115. doi: 10.3102/000283120390041089
- Vizenor, G. (1995). Introduction. In G. Vizenor (Ed.), *Native American literature: A brief introduction and anthology* (pp. 1-15). New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Waring, S. M., & Torrez, C. (2010). Using digital primary sources to teach historical perspective to preservice teachers. *Contemporary issues in technology and teacher education*, 10(3), 294-308. Retrieved from <http://www.citejournal.org/vol10/iss3/socialstudies/article1.cfm>
- The West Film Project and WETA (2001a). Archives of the West. Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/weta/thewest/resources/archives/six/joseph.htm>
- The West Film Project and WETA (2001b). Chief Joseph. Retrieved from http://www.pbs.org/weta/thewest/people/a_c/chiefjoseph.htm
- The West Film Project and WETA (2001c). Commentators and Consultants. Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/weta/thewest/program/producers/commentators.htm>
- The West Film Project and WETA (2001d). New Perspectives on the West. Retrieved from http://www.pbs.org/weta/thewest/index_cont.htm
- West, E. (2010). Dream weaver. *American History*, 45(5), 56-63.
- White, R. (1991). *The Middle ground: Indians, empires, and republics in the Great Lakes region, 1650-1815*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Wilson, A. C. (1997). Power of the spoken word: Native oral traditions in American Indian history. In D. L. Fixico (Ed.), *Rethinking American Indian history* (pp. 101-116). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts: Charting the future of teaching the past*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Yeager, E. A., & Foster, S. J. (2001). The role of empathy in the development of historical understanding. In O. L. Davis, E. A. Yeager, & S. J. Foster (Eds.), *Historical empathy and perspective taking in the social studies* (pp. 13-20). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Zinn, H. (1980). *A People's history of the United States*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Zinn, H. (2009). *A young people's history of the United States: Columbus to the War on Terror* [Contribution by Rebecca Stefoff]. New York, NY: Seven Stories Press.
- Zinn, H., & Arnove, A. (2004). *Voices of a people's history of the United States*. New York, NY: Seven Stories Press.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

CHRISTINE ROGERS STANTON is Assistant Professor of Social Studies Education in the Department of Education at *Montana State University*, Bozeman, MT 59717. She can be contacted at christine.rogers1@montana.edu.

Table 1

Critical Indigenous Framework to Evaluate Curricular Resources

Representations should demonstrate respect for peoples, communities, and traditions by:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognizing the author (i.e. include tribal affiliation, Indigenous name, community role, etc.) • providing contextual information regarding the cultural significance of event, artifact, etc.
Representations should recognize the influence of discursive positioning by:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • positioning the writer/documenter/witness (i.e. role, perspective, mode of documentation, etc.) • identifying the audience (both for original source material and for written reproduction) • acknowledging other influential cultural factors (i.e. translation challenges, age norms, etc.)
Representations should honor Native knowledge systems, collective memory, and oral history by:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing information regarding the limitations of written English to encompass meaning • recognizing the diversity within and between Native communities

Table 2

Analysis of Resources and Contextual Information

Resource	Contextual Information
<i>Voices of a People's History of the United States</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endnote identifies publication source (<i>Harper's Weekly</i>, 1877) • Authorship attributed to Joseph • Tribal affiliation is clear
Website of the Nez Perce National Historical Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorship attributed to Joseph • Tribal affiliation is clear • Clarifies the misconception that Joseph was a "war chief" • Provides brief historical context • Acknowledges challenges associated with translation of the Nez Perce language into English • Provides links to lessons emphasizing unique culture, tradition, and spirituality of the Nez Perce peoples • Explains that English was not spoken during the surrender
Digital resources to supplement <i>New Perspectives on the West</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorship attributed to Joseph • Tribal affiliation included • Joseph's Nez Perce name included • Explanations regarding the influence of "myth" on Chief Joseph's image provided (including role as "village chief") • Includes Yellow Wolf, Gen. Howard, and Lt. Wood accounts • Lesson encourages students to consider motivations for the speech, audience influence, and the diversity of tribal groups