Colonialism, Sovereignty, and Native American Higher Education: On Carney's Division of Three Eras of the Development of Native American Higher Education

Xiaochen Sun
American Indian Studies, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, USA

[Abstract] The early trials of Native American higher education at Harvard University, the College of William and Mary, and Dartmouth College are analyzed to answer the question as to why the attempt to establish Native American colleges utterly failed. Additionally, the article compares these early efforts in the colonial era, when more Native American students during the federal era were able to graduate from colleges, but the curriculum mainly focused on vocational training and assimilation of Native American students according to the needs of the Anglo-Americans. The real progress in the field of Native American higher education is made during the self-determination era, the name of which makes it self-explicit how the rise of Native American autonomy ultimately witnesses the blossoming of Native American higher education.

[Keywords] Native American higher education, self-determination, Native American autonomy

Introduction

Prior to the 1960s, very few Native Americans attended colleges, and even those who had college degrees received only vocational training, which was of little use to the building of their own nations. Native American higher education stepped into self-determination and prosperity mainly after the 1960s (Carney, 1999). In this article, the question of which factors decide the fate of Native American higher education is explored by posing it within the historical, political, and social context of three eras of Native American higher education. The three eras were determined as the colonial era, the federal era, and the self-determination era, as proposed by Cary Michael Carney in 1999.

Carney's Influence in the Field of Native American Higher Education

Debates have been going on among scholars in the field of Native American studies about how to divide different periods of Native American higher education. Some scholars simply do not divide Native American higher education history into different periods, while others divide it into three or more periods. Beck (1995), for example, did not divide Native American higher education history at all when writing the article titled "American Indian Higher Education before 1974: From Colonization to Self-Determination." As we know, the 1960s and the 1970s is a clear dividing line between Native American higher education; only after the 1970s did the Native American people finally retake control over their sovereignty, as well as higher education. However, without any divisions, readers cannot see clearly whether Native American higher education experienced any preparational or transitional stages prior to its success in the 1970s. The subject of Native American higher education did not cause much attention among educators and historians until the ground-breaking publication of Carney's historiography, *Native American*

Higher Education in the United States, in which he explicitly proposed that Native American higher education could be divided into three eras: the colonial era (from 1492 to the 1780s); the federal era (from the 1780s to the1960s); and the self-determination era (from the 1960s to the present, meaning 1999, when Carney's book was published) (Carney, 1999, p.13-121; Trennert, 2000). It is no exaggeration to say that this historiography ushered the study of Native American higher education into a new era, for most scholars thereafter either directly employed Carney's temporal framework of Native American higher education in their research or subdivided his three eras into smaller time units. As long as they wrote about Native American higher education history prior to 1999—the year when Carney's historiography was published—they adopted Carney's temporal framework.

Carney's way of division, for example, was directly adopted by well-known Native American educators, Professor George S. McClellan, Professor Mary Jo Tippeconnic Fox, and Shelly C. Lowe (2005). Additionally, Stan Juneau (2001) generally agreed with Carney, while modifying and complementing Carney's framework with more details about the development of Native American higher education during what Carney called the federal era, as can be seen in the names of the seven chapters of his book: Traditional Indian Education and European Intrusion (1942-1787), Federalism and the Indian Treaty Period (1787-1871), the Indian Boarding School (1617-Present, meaning 2001, when Juneau's book was published), The Allotment Period (1887-1934), Tribal Reorganization Period (1934-1953), Termination of Indian Tribes (1953-1975), Indian Self-Determination and Beyond (1975-Present, meaning 2001).

Similarly, Professor Jon Reyhner and Professor Jeanne Eder (2017) developed their co-authored educational historiography *American Indian Education: A History* based on Carney's classical division Native American higher education. On the one hand, they kept Carney's colonial era and self-determination era, re-naming them as "Colonial Missionaries and Their Schools" and "Self-Determination, 1969-1990," while, on the other hand, they replaced the nearly 180-year period from 1780s to 1960s, namely Carney's federal era (1780s – 1960s), with a series of important events shaping the future development of Native American higher education: "Treaties and Western Removal, 1776-1876," "Reservations, 1876-1887," "Allotment and Dependency, 1887-1923," "Mission Schools," "Government Boarding Schools," "Students and Families," "A New Deal, 1923-1945," and "Termination and Relocation, 1945-1969" (p. 5). In other words, although Reyhner and Eder did not use the name "the federal era" directly, the events that they chose to outline the middle phase of Native American higher education history, from 1776 to 1969, generally overlapped with Carney's federal era. Their division of Native American higher education not only analyzed the 200-year development of Native American higher education in depth, but also made it evident with multitudes of facts how the changes in American political climate closely impacted the development of Native American higher education. It is noteworthy that they added another chapter, "Language and Cultural Revitalization, 1990-2017," to emphasize the prominent changes taking place in Native American higher education during the period (p.5). Native American language and culture was requested by laws and policies by President George W. Bush to play a central role in tribal colleges (p.326). This article, however, employs Carney's classical division of three periods to provide a brief overview of Native American higher education. In brief, almost no scholars prior to Carney had systematically studied Native American higher education based on the needs of Native American people; Carney's division of three periods of Native American higher education, covering over five hundred years of Native American higher

education history, is seen to have a profound impact on successors in this field up to the present today.

Employing Carney's Framework of Three Eras as a Central Reference

Presently, Carney's division of three eras has become a classical study pattern for scholars in the field of Native American higher education and, thus, will be adopted as the framework of this article to study the historical development of Native American higher education in relation to federal Indian policies. Carney's framework of the three eras makes it self-evident that the first two eras, the colonial era and the federal era, served as preparational and transitional stages to the great success of the third era, the self-dependence era, although, most of the time, the attempt to establish Native American higher education institutions failed. Those political and historical events that heavily influenced the development of Native American higher education will not be simply listed, but a developmental trend of Native American higher education within each era will be analyzed in relation to those historical and political events to explore the main political logic underlying each era: the invisible hand behind life and death of Native American higher education. Finally, using the framework of the three eras proposed by Carney as a central reference, this article demonstrates, through an overview of the history of Native American higher education, that the idea of sovereignty and self-dependence is key to the success of Native American higher education.

The Colonial Era: Distorting and Erasing Native American Culture

According to Carney, the colonial era of Native American higher education began with the first contact between Europeans and Native American people and extended to the Revolutionary War (McClellan, Tippeconnic-Fox, & Lowe, 2005, p. 7-15). After Europeans' "discovery" of America, Native Americans' resistance against the European expansion into their territory turned out to be fruitless. Epidemic diseases brought by colonizers from European countries, such as smallpox, plague, pneumonia, etc., claimed countless Native American people's lives. English settlers, after winning the land from French and Spanish, spent consistent effort on conquering the land from Native American tribes. The less powerful striking weapons of those Native American survivors, such as clubs, hatchets, arrows, and spears, were nothing compared with guns and firearms, and thus their diminishing sovereignty power was accompanied by their loss of land. To further solidify the colonial power after the Indian wars, the English were enthusiastic about molding Native Americans according to the social, political and economic needs of the colony, and the theory that justified this was usually Christianizing the Native American "pagans" (Erdrich, 2017, p.143).

The colonial era was a witness to the total failure of Native American higher education as a result of Native Americans' lack of control over their own education. During this era, only a few Native American students were able to attend colonial colleges. "Harvard University, the College of William and Mary, and Dartmouth College enrolled only forty-seven Native American students, only four of whom graduated" (McClellan, Tippeconnic-Fox, & Lowe, 2005, p. 7-15). As the name of this era suggests, people actively engaged in Native American higher education intended not so much to improve the life of Native Americans as to conspire with the colonizers in order to demean them: on the ideological level, Native American people were alienated and were only taught the English ways, while on the practical level, the funds actually allocated to

Native American students decided that the educational efforts during this era were doomed to fail.

Ideologically, the stereotypes of Native American people were abundant during this era. The early settlers felt justified to impose ethnocentric perspectives upon Native American people and appropriated higher education according to the need of the English, which also helped to alienate Native Americans and justify colonization, "The focus of Native American education in the colonial period was on cultural change […] the new settlers attempted to train the Indians to acquire European knowledge and "change their ways accordingly" in hopes that the trained Indians would then educate future generations" (Stewart, 2011-12, p.348). Native American students during the colonial era were educated in order to fit into the colonial system in terms of higher education. For example, funds were donated to John Eliot to build the Indian College building at Harvard College probably because he was deemed as the "Apostle to the Indians" (Normandie, 1912, p.370). One of William and Mary's charters when founding Brafferton School for Indian students was "that the Christian faith may be propagated amongst the Western Indians" (Adams, 1888, p.17).

As a practical matter, Native American students during the colonial era were never adequately funded, as those donors who eagerly see their metamorphosis expected, and the education offered was not oriented at Native American students. Bobby Wright (1995) studied three early colleges that allegedly recruited Native American students. At Harvard University, "charitable funds dispensed by the New England Company were spent on an Indian College building at a cost of £400. During nearly four decades, the college housed no more than two Indians at a time and admitted only four for the bachelor's degree" (p.26). Similarly, at William and Mary College, they spent money from "the substantial Boyle endowment on the Brafferton School building and the college library, [but] for at least two decades there is no evidence of any Indians attending the college" (p.26). The third early college, Dartmouth College, also diverted funds that were initially intended for Native Americans to serve the needs of English students (p.26). With the support of the emerging revisionist view of ethnohistorians concerning Native American higher education during the colonial era, Wright pinpoints that Native American higher education consistently failed not because the early missions did not possess the necessary ingredients for success – "money, land, innumerable 'lost souls' and certainly an abundance of pious rhetoric," but because "[these colonial experiments in Native American higher education] reflect [. . .] the discordant threads of piety, politics, and profit, woven into a fabric of failure" (p.26). A very small amount of money actually went to the Native American students in those early colleges.

Native American higher education during the colonial era almost had nothing to do with Native American people. It was simply an excuse for those private English settlers to exploit Native American people in the name of higher education to ultimately profit themselves and the English society economically and politically (p.26). To interpret this phenomenon in a larger historical context, Native Americans' loss of land, dependence upon the Europeans for funds to build their colleges and lack of autonomy over their educational rights, as well as a proper representation of their people in public media, contributed to utter failure of Native American higher education during the colonial era.

The Federal Era: Internalizing the Value of the Anglo-Americans

By the 1880s, the wars against Native American people were almost over, so this era was characterized by a transition from colonization through coercion and military force to persuasion and federal policies. The federal era of Native American higher education began with the development of treaty relationships between the United States government and Native American nations following the American Revolution and extended through the advent of the movement toward Native American self-determination (McClellan, Tippeconnic-fox, & Lowe, 2005, p. 7-15). As Tsianina Lomawaima and Tsianina Lomawaima (1996) put it, "[. . .] national Indian policy turned from conquest and relocation to bureaucratic control" (p.6).

Secretary of War John C. Calhoun's report to congress in 1818 paved way for the following federal Indian policies and the federal Indian policies concerning Native American higher education. In this report, he started by denying the sovereignty granted to Native American tribes in the treaties signed by the U.S. government and Native American tribes, "They neither are, in fact, nor ought to be, considered as independent nations [, and] [o]ur views of their interest, and not their own, ought to govern them" (Calhoun, 1855, p.18). He continued to suggest that Native American people should be further colonized with "a proper combination of force and persuasion" (Calhoun, 1855, p.18).

The manipulation of the U.S. government over the Native American people was justified by defining the relationship between the two as a ward-to-guardian relationship. Similar ideas can be found in The Marshall Trilogy (1823-1832), which shaped principles of federal Indian law in the following decades, limited Native American people's sovereign rights to land, redefined Native American people's sovereignty as "inherent" and "limited," and defined the relationship between the U.S. government and Native American tribes as "federal trust responsibility," like that between a parent and a child (Den Ouden, 2013, p.124). Another major influence that Calhoun's report on the following federal Indian policy is his proposition about contracting and dividing Native Americans' land in the name of a parental government.

He advocated that Native Americans "[could] be civilized and saved from extinction" as long as they "contract[ed] their settlements within reasonable bounds, with a distinct understanding that the United States intend[ed] to make no further acquisition of land from them, and that the settlements reserved [were] intended for their permanent home" (Calhoun, 1855, p.18-19). Thus, the Indian Removal Act was signed into law in 1830, authorizing President Andrew Jackson to grant unsettled lands west of the Mississippi River in exchange for Native American lands within existing state borders, and Native Americans were made to remove to smaller settlements. In addition, the Dawes Allotment Act in 1887 also received influences from Calhoun in this report, in which he advocated that the Native American people's land should be "divided among families and charged property tax" (Calhoun, 1855, p.18). The Dawes Allotment Act caused Native American tribes to lose most of their land and broke up their communal social system (Reyhner & Eder, 2017, p.82).

Calhoun's ideas could be traced through many other writings of the Native American commissioners and secretaries of state, as well as secretaries of war during that time. These ideas about how to educate Native American students were a springboard for the birth of later mission schools and boarding schools. The primary intent of the Indian Civilization Fund Act of 1819 was to "create a fund to reform and 'civilize' Indian peoples in accordance with alien cultural norms imposed on them by a conquering majority" (Lee, 1997, p.36). According to the U.S. House of Representatives, the Indian Civilization Fund was used to "put into the hands of their children the

primer and hoe, and they [would] naturally, in time, take hold of the plow, and [. . .] their minds [became] enlightened and expand" (Fletcher, 1888). The attempt to transform Native American people's way of living was just a beginning, while the real purpose was to assimilate them ideologically. The records of the U.S. House of representatives continued to show that "the Bible [would] be their book, and they [would] grow in habits of morality and industry, leave the chase to those of minds less cultured, and become useful members of society" (Fletcher, 1888). The federal Indian policy during this era was also about assimilation, acculturation, and colonization, but unlike the colonial era, Native Americans were more often described as children of the U.S. government who needed to be educated according to the principles of colonial culture and to be taught a new way of life other than "blood-thirsty" enemies. In other words, tribes' lack of sovereignty during the federal era was still a major reason that hindered the progress of education.

Many scholars attribute the undesired performance of Native American students in mission schools or boarding schools to the tribes' lack of autonomy over their education. Tsianina Lomawaima and Tsianina Lomawaima (1996) claim that "the education of Native American people by others – by missionaries, federal employees or public-school teachers – has been shaped by policies and curricula largely uninfluenced by Indian people themselves" (p.5).. Benda J. Child (2018) also comments that "boarding schools did, after all, align federal authority with the zealotry of religious missions, and suppress Indian cultures in an English-only way while opening the door to alienation from land and the extension of everyday Anglo-American culture into the lives and souls of Indian people" (p.38). John R. Gram (2016) also expresses similar opinions concerning boarding school, "The boarding schools were intended not only to educate but to assimilate. Everything about the boarding school experience was designed to transform Indian children into mirrors and messengers of Anglo-American civilization" (p.256).

As a Taos Pueblo Indian student commented on his feelings about studying experiences in Carlisle Indian School (1879), an off-reservation boarding school, "they told us that Indian ways were bad. They said we must get civilized [. . .] It means "be like the white man." [. . .] And so, after a while we also began to say Indians were bad. We laughed at our own people [. . .]" (Grinde, 2004, p.28). Native American students' tribal cultures were under eradication and distortion, and the historical knowledge in textbooks concerning the Indian Wars seemed to be contradictory to the historical realities. Finally, the Native American students at Carlisle were transformed into mimic men/women who disregarded the value of authentic Native American culture, knew nothing about Native American history_and despised their own tribesmen from an Anglo-American, or to be more exact, an outsider's perspective.

Native American higher education was overlooked until the beginning of the twentieth century, when some colleges started to focus on Native American higher education. "Indian university (now Bacone College), chartered by Muscogee-Creek Nation in 1881, was founded by Baptist missionary teacher Almon C. Bacone to 'prepare native teachers and preachers for a more effective Christian work among the Indian tribes'" (Williams & Meredith, 1980, p.15). Another Native American college was Croaton Normal School (1887) for Lumbee Indians, which was "the only state-supported four-year institution for Native American until the mid-twentieth century" (McClellan, Tippeconnic-Fox, & Lowe, 2005, p.10). Founded in 1878 to educate Alaskan Natives, Sheldon Jackson College, a third Native American higher education institution during the federal era, was initially a mission school, paying Presbyterian missionaries "to educate Alaska Native students into the mid-1890s," which "in 1966 became Sheldon Jackson College (History, 2003)" (Reyhner & Eder, 2017, p.35).

Therefore, the idea of sovereignty was surfacing in some of Native American higher education institutions. For example, Indian University (Bacone College) was chartered by Muscogee-Creek Nation, which demonstrated sovereignty to a certain extent. Croaton Normal School was also requested by Indian parents in 1887 and the building was constructed by local people, which started to reflect the needs of Native American people rather than the needs of Anglo-Americans in higher education (Reyhner & Elder, 2004, p. 291-292). The Meriam Report in 1928, being "critical of BIA school system and altered approach to Indian education," could be seen as an important transition in Native American higher education (Juneau, 2001, p.53). It was named after University of Chicago professor Lewis Meriam and investigated economical, medical, social, familial, and educational aspects of Native American issues (McClellan, Tippeconnic-Fox, & Lowe, 2005, p. 7-15).

Overall, although some forms of Native American higher education institutions were emerging, yet since Native American people were still short of sovereign power during the federal era, the curricula mainly focused on vocational training, and the main purpose of their colleges was still serving the cultural, political, and economic needs of Anglo-American people by assimilating, acculturating, and Christianizing Native American students. A major difference between Native American higher education during the colonial era and the federal era is that the former is characterized by settler's private efforts, while the latter is made up of public efforts on the governmental level. Native American people found little use of what they learned for the building of their own nations. However, both the colonial era and the federal era can be seen as the preparational and transitional stages during which Native American higher education gradually moved toward autonomy and self-determination in the following stage.

The Self-Determination Era: Validating Native American Culture

Although scholars differ about when the self-determination era began, there is little doubt that the Progressive movement in education and the passage of the Indian Reorganization Act in 1934 are pivotal events in the movement toward Native American self-determination in education (McClellan, Tippeconnic-Fox, & Lowe, 2005, p. 7-15). Several historical events during the federal era that were connected to the issue of independence and sovereignty paved the way for the progression into the independence era, especially the Meriam Report, a watershed moment for Native American higher education. As Vučković (2008) notes,

> The report strongly criticized the philosophy underlying the boarding school system. The group visited sixty-four of the existing seventy-eight government boarding schools and concluded that most boarding schools did not even provide minimum standards of care for their students – a fact that Indian parents and students had known for decades. [. . .] The report argued that through their discipline and routine, boarding schools actually destroyed the students' independence and initiative instead of promoting it. (p.16-17)

The Meriam Report had a major influence on policymakers in the following years and led to the reforms during the Indian Reorganization Act (1934) under Commissioner of Indian Affairs John Collier from 1933 to 1945. The report bridged the progression of Native American higher education from the federal era into the independence era, "The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 affirmed Native American sovereignty and self-determination with regard to education and

included the first federally designated scholarship funds for Native American higher education" (McClellan, Tippeconnic-Fox, & Lowe, 2005, p. 7-15).

However, the following termination policy (from the mid-1940s to the mid-1950s) retrieved supportive federal policies concerning the Native American higher education again, creating adverse political environment for the development of Native American higher education and forcing Native Americans to see the importance of strengthening sovereign power. Dr. Willard Bill (1987), Education Consultant and Indian Education Leader in the state of Washington, enrolled member of the Mukelshoot Tribe, notes that

> At the close of World War II there was a movement to revert Bureau policies to a prior era. [. . .] The termination goal was to have tribes rid themselves of Indian trust land and to terminate federal recognition and services. Indians would leave the reservation and relocate in cities. (p.21-22)

Termination policy not only ended the trust relationship between the federal government and Native Americans, but also "shifted responsibility for Native American services to the states," the result of which is devastating for Native Americans (McClellan, Tippeconnic-Fox, & Lowe, 2005, p.10).

Meanwhile, the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, along with other policies in the 1960s, were seen to counteract the negative influence of the termination policy and finally welcome the spring for Native American higher education. The Indian Reorganization Act affirmed Native American sovereignty and self-determination with regard to education and included the first federally designated scholarship funds for Native American higher education (McClellan, Tippeconnic-Fox, & Lowe, 2005, p.10). John Collier had worked on Indian issues for ten years prior to his appointment. He intended to reverse the worst government policy and provided ways for Native American self-government and self-sufficiency.

The movement during the 1960s brought a larger wave of reform of tribal colleges. Linda Sue Warner and Katryn Harris Tijerina posit that the era of Native American self-determination began in the 1960s. The 1960s saw the founding of National Indian Youth Council (1961), the American Indian Movement (1968) and the passages of the 1968 Indian Civil Rights Act (Warner & Tijerina, 2009). Kiowa writer N. Scott Momaday's novel, *House Made of Dawn,* being laureated the Pulitzer Prize in 1969 and marked the American society's increasing recognition of the value of Native American art, literature and culture.

Since the social environment became increasingly friendly for Native American education, Native American tribes set to establish Native American higher education institutions to train the students they needed to further nation building and assert sovereignty. As Navajos began to assert their rights more aggressively, there was frustration that few tribal members had the skills needed to effectively lead a nation with a population reaching two hundred thousand. Leaders, including Guy Gorman, Dean C. Jackson and others, recognized that higher education was a key to self-determination (Boyer 1991, p.2). In 1968, the changes in the social and political climate, and the needs for well-trained tribal leaders to practice sovereignty gave birth to the Navajo Community College (Diné College), the first tribally controlled college and a potential source of tribal esteem in the field of Native American higher education. It was chartered by the Navajo tribe and had an all-Navajo board that was independent of the tribal government to insulate the institution from tribal politics (McClellan, Tippeconnic-Fox, & Lowe, 2005, p.11).

After the civil rights movement and the American Indian movement, the passage of many other acts also helped foster the growth of tribal colleges by seeking federal support while maintaining their autonomy over tribal colleges. The Navajo Community College Act of 1971 provided federal support for the college on the Congressional level (Reyhner & Eder, 2017, p.298). In 1973, Native American Higher Education Consortium was established by the first six Native American tribally controlled colleges "to provide a support network as they worked to influence federal policies on American Indian higher education" (AIHEC). The Indian Education Act of 1972 established the Office of Indian Education and the National Advisory Council of Indian Education, empowering Native Americans by including parents in advisory boards and providing federal funds for students. The Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 asserted tribal sovereignty while giving Native American nations greater control over welfare and grants (Reyhner & Eder, 2017, p.298).

It is perhaps self-explanatory to trace the transformation of a tribal college during the self-determination era to examine how increasing sovereign power significantly influenced the performance of tribal colleges. Haskell Indian Nations University (Haskell), now a member of the Consortium of American Indian Higher education, also a federally supported institution, had served the Native American community for over 130 years by 2015. It began as a United States Indian Industrial Training School, aiming at assimilation, and transformed into an intertribal university in 1927, serving the needs of Native American people as well as their community. Haskell, during the federal era, functioned as an institutional power either ideologically rendering Native Americans as inferior or making them invisible and unheard in mainstream society.

The changes in the overall political climate and increased autonomy of tribes over their own higher education institutions led to Haskell's dramatic transformation from an industrial training school to an intertribal Native American tribal college accredited by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association. In *Tribal College Journal of American Indian Higher Education*, an article titled "125 Years: Haskell Roots Tie Families Together" documents Haskell's big change in role, "a name changes in 1993 from Haskell Indian Junior College to Haskell Indian Nations University symbolizes the school's evolution into a four-year institution, a center for Indian education, research, and cultural programming" (125 Years, 2009).

A brief review of Haskell history records of pivotal moments when Haskell progressed into an increasingly self-independent tribal college. In 1884, Haskell began as an educational program that focused on agricultural education in grades one through five. Assimilation was its core value during that time. In 1927, Haskell became an accredited high school. In 1935, it evolved into a postsecondary, vocational-technical institution. In 1993, Haskell created its first baccalaureate degree program. In 1993, Haskell transformed into a tribal college, Haskell Indian Nations University. Simply put, this university was built for the purpose of assimilating Native Americans for the benefit of Anglo-Americans, but with the change of the U.S. political climate, it transformed into one that served Native American people and community.

Today, Haskell students represent federally recognized tribes from across the United States and are as culturally diverse as imaginable. The review of Haskell's history also provides a miniature of the progression of Native American higher education. The rationale of Haskell today is to teach Indian philosophical values as well as to promote Indian nations' sovereignty. Haskell has met both practical and philosophical educational needs of students individually as well as the needs of the community. To enhance students' sense of community, on the one hand, Haskell provides courses that both enable community members to find jobs and address practical needs

of the community, such as business and administration, environmental science, and computer science, geography, etc.; on the other hand, Haskell incorporates a sense of community into its curriculum. Students are also able to have access to the vitality of exchange of faculty through a joint program run by Haskell and the University of Kansas. The mission of the Haskell Student Success Center is to provide accessible and enriched academic services and programs to support and enhance the academic, cultural and career success of Haskell students.

Conclusion

To sum up, an overview of Native American higher education history in the above three eras illustrates the role sovereignty plays in the success of Native American higher education institutions. During the colonial era, there were absolutely no colleges controlled or chartered by Native American tribes, while Native American people of different tribes were treated unfairly and represented with "negative" stereotypical images in the Anglo-American society (Tan, Fujioka, & Lucht, 1997, p.267). Native American higher education during this era "failed utterly" due to their lack of control over their own education (McClellan, Tippeconnic-Fox, & Lowe, 2005, p.8). When it comes to the federal era, the federal policy shifted from conquest and relocation to assimilation, acculturation and bureaucratic control. There were only a very limited number of Native American higher education institutions in the federal era and their curricula were mainly about teaching Christianity, western culture, and vocational training. Only until the Native American higher education entered the self-determination era did the social and political climate become tolerant enough for the generation of tribal colleges. The self-determination era witnessed the blooming of Native American higher education:

> There are over 200 languages and vast cultural differences between and within the 565 federally recognized tribes in Indian Country. Adding to the complexity are the various types of schools, colleges, and universities that are educating Native students. Many educational institutions are identifying tribal values as a way to provide an overall framework or as "guiding principles" to teaching, learning, research, and governance. (Tippeconnic III & Tippeconnic Fox, 2012, p. 841-853)

The above data shows the wild blooming of Native American higher education during the self-determination era: an increasing number of Native Americans earned their two-year or four-year undergraduate and graduate degrees in tribally-controlled colleges. Native American Studies program housed in mainstream colleges and universities also helped to serve significant Native American student populations. Native American students were able to seek federal funding and support as students while contributing to Nation Building after graduation to further maintain autonomy of their tribes. Hopefully this study of Native American higher education in Carney's three eras will inspire future researchers in the field of Native American higher education the key role sovereignty and autonomy play in Native American higher education. It is to remind people that the educational experiment conducted on Native American students during the colonial era and the federal era inevitably fail. Only in the self-determination era and hereafter, when Native American higher education is planted in the soil of Native American culture and people, will it bloom and prosper.

References

Adams, H. B. (1888). *Thomas Jefferson and the University of Virginia*. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Bill, W. E. (1987). *From Boarding Schools to Self Determination*. Washington Office of the State Superintendent of Public Education.

Fletcher, A. C. (1888). *Indian education and civilization a report prepared in answer to Senate resolution of February 23, 1885*. Kessinger Legacy Reprints.

Boyer, E. (1991). *Tribal colleges: Shaping the future of Native America.* Princeton University Press.

Calhoun, J. C. (1855). The works of John C. Calhoun, Vol. V: Reports and Public Letters of John C. Calhoun. (R. K. Crallé, Ed.). D. Appleton and Company.

Carney, C. M. (1999). *Native American higher education in the United States.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers,

Child, J. Brenda (2018). The boarding school of metaphor. *Journal of American Indian Education. 57*(1), 37-57.

Den Ouden, A. E. (2013). *Recognition, sovereignty struggles, and indigenous rights in the United States: A Sourcebook*. University of North Carolina Press.

Erdrich, L. (2017). *Tracks: A novel*. Harper Perennial.

Gram J. R. (2016). Acting out Assimilation: Playing Indian and Becoming American in the Federal Indian Boarding Schools. *American Indian Quarterly. 40*(3), 251-273.

Grinde, Jr., D. A. (2004). Taking the Indian out of the Indian: U.S. policies of ethnocide through education. *Wíčazo Ša Review.19*(2), 25-32.

Horse, P.G. (2001). Reflections on American Indian Identity. In C. L. Wijeyesinghe and B. W. Jackson III (eds.), New Perspectives on Racial Identity Development: A Theoretical and Practical Anthology (p.91-107). New York University Press.

Juneau, S. (2013). *History and foundation of American Indian Education*. Montana Office of Public Instruction.

Lee. I. (Winter 1997). Freedom, law and prophecy: A brief history of Native American Religious Resistance. *American Indian Quarterly, 21*(1), 35-55.

Lomawaima, K. T., & Lomawaima, T. T. (1996). Estelle Reel, Superintendent of Indian Schools, 1898-1910: Politics, Curriculum and Land. *Journal of American Indian Education*, *35*(3), 5-31.

McClellan, G. S., Tippeconnic Fox, M.J., & Lowe, S.C. (2005). Where We Have Been: A History of Native American Higher Education. *New Directions for Student Services*, 7-15.

Normandie, J. D. (1912). John Eliot, the Apostle to the Indians. *The Harvard Theological Review*, *5*(3), 349–370.

Paine, G. L. (1926). The Indians of the Leather-Stocking Tales. *Studies in Philology 23*(1), 16-39.

Reviewer, Trennert, R. A. (2020, December). Review of *Native American Higher Education in the United States* by Cary Michael Carney. *The Journal of American History*, 87(3), 1057.

Reyhner, J., & Eder, J. (2017). *American Indian education: A history*. University of Oklahoma Press.

Stewart, A. J. (2011-12). Acting for the Left Behand: How the Native Class Act Could Close the Gaps in American Indian Education. *American Indian Law Review*. *36*(2), 347-384.

Tan, A., Fujioka, Y., & Lucht, N. (1997). Native American Stereotypes, TV Portrayals, and Personal Contact. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, *74*(2), 265.

Tippeconnic III, J. W., & Tippeconnic Fox, M. J. (2012). American Indian tribal values: a critical consideration in the education of American Indians/Alaska Natives today. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *25*(7), 841-853.

125 Years: Haskell Roots Tie Families Together (2009). *Tribal College Journal*, *21*(1).

Vučković, M. (2008). *Voices from Haskell: Indian Students between Two Worlds, 1884-1928*. University Press of Kansas.

Williams, J., & Meredith, H.L. (1980). *Bacone Indian University: A History*. Western Heritage Books.

Warner, L. S., & Tijerina, K.H. (2009). Indigenous Governance. In L. S. Warner and G. E. Gipp, (Eds). *Tradition and culture in the millennium: Tribal colleges and universities*. Information Age Publications

Wright, B. (1995). The broken covenant: American Indian missions in the colonial colleges. *Tribal College: Journal of American Indian Higher Education, 7*(1), 26.