

Conversations on Indigenous Education, Progress, and Social Justice in Peru

Conversaciones sobre Educación Indígena, Progreso, y Justicia Social en el Perú

Elizabeth Alva Sumida Huaman
Arizona State University
U. S. A.

This article attempts to contribute to our expanding definitions of Indigenous education within a globalized world. Additionally, the article critiques notions of progress modeled by powerful nation-states due to their histories based on the intended consequences of marginalizing Indigenous populations for the purposes of material gain. Last, global discourses on meaningful Indigenous participation in educational design are discussed as they illuminate culturally and politically based movements that defy singular narratives of Indigenous peoples and education. (This article is provided in English only)

Este artículo intenta expandir nuestras definiciones de educación en el contexto de un mundo globalizado. De esta manera, el artículo presenta una crítica a las ideas de progreso que han sido impuestas por estados-naciones que concentran el poder. Se argumenta que esta imposición es el resultado de procesos históricos basados en la marginalización de poblaciones Indígenas con el propósito de enriquecer materialmente a las sociedades occidentales. La discusión finalmente se enfoca en los discursos globales que enfatizan la relevancia de la participación Indígena en el diseño de la educación, y que destacan la contribución de los movimientos políticos y culturales al desafío de los discursos esencializados sobre los pueblos Indígenas y sus relaciones con el desarrollo de educación. (Este artículo se ofrece solamente en inglés.)

[Researcher Reflexivity](#)
[Education Revisited](#)
[Models of Progress?](#)
[Seeking Solutions from Within](#)
[Notes](#)
[Acknowledgements](#)
[References](#)

Alberto and Reyna are Indigenous teachers in Peru. Alberto is of Wanka descent and was raised between his parents' village of Hatun Shunqo and the nearby city of Huancayo, the capital of the region of Junín. Reyna is of Chanka descent and was raised in her parents' village outside of Churcampa, a province in the region of Huancavelica, which like Junín is located in the Central Peruvian Andes. Both are speakers of different varieties of Quechua, the most widely spoken Indigenous language in the country, although Reyna was raised with Quechua as her first language, and Alberto was raised as a bilingual speaker,

learning both Quechua Wanka and Spanish. After several years of teaching, Alberto was promoted to the position of school principal where Reyna also served as a math teacher. During school breaks, they would make the long journey by foot, bus, and car with their infant son back to Huancayo where they would stay with Alberto's family while taking classes towards their *título*, teaching degrees, at the *Universidad Nacional del Centro del Perú* [National University of Central Peru].

In 2008, while carrying out research on “traditional education” (Cajete, 1994) in community and family spaces in Hatun Shunqo and on the intersections of this type of education with national language and education policies, I conducted my first interview with Alberto and Reyna who were visiting relatives in the village. I explained that I was examining farming and agricultural traditions as educational processes for Wanka community members and specifically Wanka youth. They listened and nodded but, instead of commenting on the study, redirected the conversation by asking if I had read about any of the authors they needed know about in order to finish their coursework for their teaching degrees. They were looking for resources to help them work through the theories of Piaget, Vygotsky, Skinner, and other Western scholars. Alberto and Reyna explained that Western psychology dominated how education was constructed and implemented in Peru. They wanted to see a video of a typical U.S. classroom that depicted these theories in practice, including the pedagogy, the school environment, classroom environment, and a teacher's typical day. They wondered if education was different in the United States. Was it more effective? What were the challenges? I responded that educational researchers have critiqued the U.S. school system, particularly due to the achievement gap for underserved populations like minorities and socioeconomically disadvantaged students. I mentioned that there were other schools, private and public, that utilized creative methods of pedagogy. These included Indigenous-serving schools that used Indigenous community and culturally-based approaches. However, these programs required financial support from parents or outside funding sources, as innovative projects cost money. Reyna remarked that class differences would significantly impact the access and quality of education a particular child might receive. I also explained that Indigenous scholars in the United States were becoming more prominent in educational theory and practice. Were they exposed to any such research or literature—reading any Indigenous theories from the United States, Latin America, or elsewhere? Of the different methods of pedagogy and the theorists that dominated, Reyna responded that in Peru educators were forced to follow dominant Western theorists and, thus far, there had been no Indigenous scholars in their coursework to counter dominant assumptions of education or to assist teachers to consider education relevant to what she referred to as “the reality of Indigenous students.” She said, “In the U.S. you have the ability to be independent. Here in Peru, we are forced to follow only one type of thinking about education and teaching” (2007 Fieldnotes). As a result, dominant voices and modes of thought and operation in the world were privileged, ultimately wielding the power to silence anything different.

In Peru, current Indigenous educational policy has been narrowly constructed and narrated largely by non-Indigenous peoples motivated by mainstream notions of progress. Education for both students and teachers is synonymous with schooling for the purpose of upward social and economic mobility. However, recent findings have demonstrated that schooling can contribute to the marginalization of Indigenous children—from lack of acknowledgement of their prior knowledge and lack of valuing of their identities vis-à-vis Indigenous languages, to the subtle and overt messages that their rural home life holds no opportunity for advancement (Ames, 2012; Crivello, 2011). Indigenous teachers also struggle to support cultural and linguistic maintenance in contexts where Indigenous lifeways and epistemologies are unrecognized for their existing and potential worth to educational processes and to larger society (Hornberger & Swinehart, 2012; Valdiviezo, 2010).

Drawing from almost two decades of ethnographic research in Wanka communities in the highlands of Peru and over a decade of qualitative research with Indigenous communities in the United States, this article includes data collected from 2007 to 2009 in order to provide a reflection on multiple definitions and approaches to Indigenous education within a globalized world. It critiques notions of progress modeled by the United States as fallacies that have been historically constructed. The examination of such national history can reveal the intended consequences of marginalizing Indigenous populations for the purposes of material gain derived from control of resources that benefit non-Indigenous populations. Arguably, the lack of diverse Indigenous narratives and approaches in educational discourse makes evident that the “problem” of Indigenous populations as a social justice issue is alive and well. In order to illuminate movements that defy singular narratives of Indigenous peoples and education, this article concludes with a discussion on global discourses about meaningful Indigenous participation in educational design.

Researcher Reflexivity

As an Indigenous researcher doing work in Indigenous communities, my position is constantly interrogated by the communities I work with and through my own reflection. This interrogation is embraced in my reflexivity as researcher. Since 1995, I have been conducting ethnographic research in my home community of Hatun Shunqo, a Wanka village in the Andean highlands of Peru. Since 1993, I have also worked with American Indian¹ populations in the United States in roles ranging from youth coordinator to program evaluator and, in the last decade, researcher. The data collected from fieldwork included in this article were part of a comparative study conducted in both Peru and in New Mexico starting in 2007. In particular, Smith’s work (1999) and Pueblo Indian protocols have served as models for respectful ways of working with Indigenous populations, which include approval of the study and all subsequent publications by the Tribal Council, the body of authority on matters that impact the tribe,

including research. While this experience does not confer me the right to speak on behalf of Indigenous peoples—my own communities or others—my time in the field has taught me that there are valuable lessons in both the shared struggles and different strategies that Indigenous peoples employ to resist the impositions and dominant policies that have characterized contentious relationships, from national governments to corporate interests. For example, the Wanka people maintain *Quechua Wanka* language and cultural practices that are inextricable from our relationship with the natural environment and a lifestyle of farming. However, we are not the only ones to maintain land-based cultural practices, nor are we the only communities to use our Indigenous language to do so. Indigenous communities worldwide maintain links with their ancestral homelands, with vital places and spaces, while negotiating usage of their own heritage languages within the context of dominant national and world languages and rapidly expanding globalization (McCarty, Nicholas, & Wyman, 2012).

As a researcher, my interest in comparative and international Indigenous education (Sumida Huaman, forthcoming) was catalyzed by theories of Indigenous community-based education (May, 1999) and the development of local Indigenous research methodologies. Trained by New Mexico Pueblo Indian researchers, including Anya Dozier Enos, a qualitative researcher, my early work as a member of an all-Indigenous research team focused on a Pueblo Indian-directed study that examined community-based education. As part of the research team, my fieldwork was conducted in Pueblo Day Schools, institutions under the U.S. government's Bureau of Indian Education (BIE). The findings of this study extrapolated the ways in which Pueblo educators use cultural practices, languages, and spiritual beliefs in the schooling of their children. The willingness of some schools to begin fostering relationships with community partners by bringing community priorities to life within the school space, during and after school hours, was a key aspect in shaping Pueblo children's educational experiences in historically restrictive spaces. This work was shared with other Indigenous sites funded to do similar work, and one of our most inspirational connections came from partnership with Angayuqaq Oscar Kawagley of the Alaska Native Knowledge Network (ANKN) who consistently challenged us to "teach through the culture" and to consider the significance of this process against what he referred to as the "psychosocial maladies" (1995) brought on by colonization. Kawagley argued that the richest and most relevant lessons for Indigenous children came from valuing local knowledge and Indigenous languages as the basis of educational practice. He also extended this argument to include non-Indigenous populations as well. Our Indigenous inquiry strands highlighted at multiple national educational conference gatherings demonstrated a clear trend drawing attention to Indigenous knowledge systems (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2005) and educational design, showing that these sites shared something unique—the ability to identify and use Indigenous cultures and languages in the construction of educational approaches for our own and other children. This became the standard for how I defined educational practice—as taking place in many settings, including so called informal spaces, and using Indigenous ways of knowing that honor the vital intellectual contributions of

Indigenous peoples to educational development. As a result, this article reflects my formation as an Indigenous researcher and educator over the past two decades as much as the research itself, which has been influenced by the *Kaupapa Māori Research Framework* (Smith, 1999). This framework offers critical ideas for research design that Indigenous researchers can apply to their own communities. In this spirit, and borrowing from Smith (1999), a *Quechua Research Framework* “takes for granted the validity and legitimacy of Quechua, the importance of Quechua language and cultural practices, and is concerned with the “struggle for autonomy over our own cultural well-being” (p. 185).

Education Revisited

The term *education* implies a range of conceptualizations, including formal schooling tied to national political agendas (Fagerlind & Saha, 1989). As a construction of the state, formal education is perhaps the most important method of cultivating a cohesive national identity rooted in notions of citizenship, democracy, modernity, and progress (Fuller, 1991; Luykx, 1999). While formal education in the global South is believed to provide increased social and economic opportunities for students, schooling can also replicate social inequalities in many ways justified by measures of achievement rooted in Western standards of success. Today in Peru and the United States, education is still conceptualized as formal schooling structured as “banking,” where educators make unquestioned knowledge deposits in empty students (Freire, 2006), and success is defined as excelling in school in order to enable employability and overall economic mobility.

For Indigenous peoples, mainstream schooling and ideals of success have historically signified extermination and assimilation policies—extermination of Indigenous identities, languages, and cultural practices, and assimilation into Western and mainstream societies. There are numerous examples of the impact of this process worldwide on Indigenous cultures, languages, psyches, ecologies, and sovereignty (Alfred & Corntassel, 2005; Deloria & Wildcat, 2001; Kawagley, 1995; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006; Trask, 1999; Wilkins, 2007). In the case of Peru, scholars have further argued that the colonial method of educating local masses was never intended to provide equal footing to Indigenous populations, but rather to give them “just enough education” (Carnoy, 1974, p. 134) to train them as good workers and to keep them from rebelling against those in power. As a result, the Indigenous family and community as vital contributors to the development of their own children have been downplayed or excluded from sustainable educational design. At best, Indigenous cultures and languages are viewed as tools to accomplish dominant goals for education, such as achieving literacy and eradicating poverty. Because cultural relevancy has often been used in schools only as a tool to impart dominant ideologies about what it means to be a successful member of society, schooling has become a panacea for economic stability, environmental sustainability, development, and national security. Thus

schooling remains largely unchallenged due to the argument that education is a universal right and that everyone, especially the poor, desires schooling as a way to transcend oppressive social, economic, and political conditions. Although these are important goals, Indigenous languages and cultural practices as intellectual contributions to child development, education, and society are more than just mechanisms for introducing dominant concepts. Worldwide, schooling largely remains the responsibility of the state. Under its design and control, demands by the international community to provide basic education as outlined in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Education For All (EFA) serve to further promote state responsibility bolstered by foreign aid and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). In its conception, the extent of local participation in educational development is debatable, and those with resources are often favored through access and better quality educational opportunities. Further, the universalizing goals of providing basic education have yet to address the problem of how to effectively incorporate local knowledge for the sake of serving Indigenous community priorities.

The rise of Indigenous voices in educational development and theory addresses those gaps. For generations, communities have demonstrated educational practices that are not limited to school space or bound by government-mandated curricula and standards. Rather, Indigenous community education, known as “Indian self-education” (Lomawaima, 1999), is the enactment of environmental, cultural, and linguistic relationships founded in Indigenous epistemologies and Indigenous knowledge systems (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2005; Kawagley, 1995; Simpson, 2004). For example, in the United States, fishing camps in Alaska Native communities, the harvesting of wild rice in Ojibwe northwoods communities, and the farming of corn in New Mexico Pueblo villages exercise skills and lessons that are culturally, linguistically, and ecologically-based and that promote scientific, spiritual, intellectual, and cognitive development (Bang et al., 2007). These are intergenerational, structured, and meaningful programs of education that pre-date colonial and industrial notions of schooling. While Indigenous knowledge is relevant to schooling, issues of environmental sustainability, and the preservation and growth of human diversity, these knowledge systems are not always viewed as on par with efforts to modernize, which are put forth as for the greater good. What is learned in Indigenous communities is viewed as informal education or nonformal education if organized by a particular body or institutions. These labels de-legitimize the position of Indigenous knowledge and related pedagogies as their own structured systems of teaching and learning that transcend notions of formal, informal, or nonformal.

Another challenge for Indigenous/local knowledge in education has been the question of whether there is a right way to do this—are we trying to fit the proverbial square peg into the round hole? Efforts to include *some* language and curriculum may provide students with important messages that Indigenous identities have a rightful place in dominant spaces. However, although Indigenous community education activities have been integrated in small ways into schools in Peru, they are nonetheless considered supplementary or informal

(Valdiviezo, 2006). Indigenous cultural knowledge in U.S. schools is too easily dismissed or eliminated, especially as international emphasis on STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) achievement and standardized testing grows. STEM training is critical for Indigenous peoples in building capacity to address complex issues in their own communities, so growing STEM opportunities in education should not be contested. The issue is that Indigenous peoples, cultures, and languages are easily characterized as primitive or backwards and deemed irrelevant to modern society, ultimately representing inability to assimilate (McCarty, Romero & Zepeda, 2006). At the same time, Indigenous peoples are demonstrating resistance to these damaging characterizations and voicing the need for “globalization from the bottom up,” which highlights Indigenous knowledge as an opportunity rather than an obstacle to progress (Hornberger & McCarty, 2012).

Models of Progress?

When exploring insights on transnational policy borrowing and lending, Steiner-Khamsi was concerned with growing fears regarding an “international model of education” and the Americanization of education accelerated by globalization (2004, p. 3-4). This present article assumes that an international model of education has been a reality for Indigenous peoples for centuries vis-à-vis imperialistic ideologies and colonialism. However, such a model is increasingly complicated by the questions that Steiner-Khamsi examines in terms of why certain policies, even if unpopular, are transferred, and how those policies are adapted locally. Furthermore, as Steiner-Khamsi urged, explorations of these lessons from elsewhere could stimulate critical challenges to policy development at home. As a world power, the U.S. offers an example of development to the rest of the world, which is perpetuated through its educational policies, for example. For Indigenous populations, these policies present ideologies of educational construction that Peruvian teachers like Alberto and Reyna must consider. In these instances, critical reflection of what those policies represent is necessary at all levels—from policymakers to educational stakeholders receiving those policies on the ground. Over 100 years of federal Indian policy enacted on American Indians in the United States has much to teach the world’s Indigenous populations. For example, Deloria (1991) offers a persuasive depiction of the adamant legitimization of Western knowledge:

For many centuries, whites scorned the knowledge of American Indians, regarding whatever people said as gross savage superstition and insisting that their own view of the world, a complex mixture of folklore, religious doctrine, and Green natural sciences was the highest intellectual achievement of our species. This posture of arrogance produced some classic chapters in the history of the Western hemisphere: Ponce de Leon wandering around the southeastern United States vainly searching for the Fountain of Youth, Swedish immigrants on the Delaware River importing

food for thirty years because they could not grow anything in this country, and the Donner party resorting to cannibalism because of their fear of local Indians. (Deloria, 1991, p. 9)

Deloria argued that the divisions between dominant discourses of knowledge and local American Indian knowledge were quite clear. Thus, it is possible to identify two major trends in the construction of education for Indigenous people: first, the assumption of the unquestionable superiority of the colonial project over Indigenous peoples and second, the negation of Indigenous knowledge as premise to the myth of that superiority. Formal education reflects the mission of the colonial project towards complete dominance and trusteeship over Indigenous peoples who are believed to require paternalism and protection. In the cases of Peru and the United States, each nation has aimed to “civilize the Indian” through a characteristically religious and vocational education. American Indian formal schooling in the United States is but one realm of numerous interactions (land, economic development, governance, etc.) between tribes and state and federal politics. The historical and contemporary interaction between these entities is translated into a daily reality experienced by students, their families, and educators. For example, the religious civilization of American Indians and the ever-expanding Western usurpation of their lands reflected the national plan for dealing with the “Indian problem.” This problem, outlined in federal language, was also viewed as resolvable through education, which ultimately meant the assimilation of Indians into U.S. society.

The entrance to nearly every Indian boarding school is marked by an arch, a symbol of the transition from “uncivilized” space to “civilized” space. As new students arrived at school and passed through the arch, they essentially passed from one life to another, entering a difficult and traumatizing time that, for many, marked numerous difficult and traumatizing years. Former students vividly recall their first hours and days after passing through that arch, when they were often assaulted by practices consciously designed to strip them of their identities. This is how the schools began their task of creating a new kind of individual. (Archuleta, Child & Lomawaima, 2000, p. 24)

From the 1800s to the mid-1900s, American Indian communities were heavily impacted by the boarding school era. Federal funding was appropriated for these schooling projects, some of which are still in existence today. This boarding school era is often viewed by scholars as one of the most tragic periods in U.S. education history. Operated by Christian missionaries, these schools left lasting impacts of sexual, physical, emotional, and/or psychological abuse. American Indian languages were impacted as children who attended these schools were forced to relinquish their languages or suffer physical punishment (Archuleta, Child, & Lomawaima, 2000). Furthermore, the focus of these schools was not the cultivation of the mind; rather, education was religious and vocational/technical because Indian mental capabilities were believed to be limited. These spaces created a legacy of systematic abuse that denied the intellectualism of Indigenous knowledges, cultures, and languages and the

nurturing settings from which these children had come (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006).

There are some exceptions to the antagonistic relationship between the federal government and American Indians: the Meriam Report of the 1920s examined the conditions of institutions serving Indian peoples, including a major critique of the boarding schools and their deplorable conditions (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). In the 1960s and 1970s, the Civil Rights era helped to birth Indian Self-Determination, which allowed tribes to take control over their own schools if the capacity to do so was demonstrated by the tribe, and the Office of Indian Education was created bringing attention to American Indian rights to education and self-government. In 1968, Congress passed Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Bilingual Education Act, which focused on using English languages to teach. Until 1978, this Act excluded American Indians, even though American Indian children had the same educational needs as Latinos and new immigrants. With the Title VII expansion to Indian reservations and Indian children, a marked shift became evident. Suddenly, within communities where generations of community members had been sent to government-run Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding schools or missionary-run schools and punished for speaking their Native languages, speaking one's native language became acceptable and even promoted (Crawford, 2004). Furthermore, government funding became available for language revitalization efforts: the Native American Languages Act of 1990 and the Esther Martinez Act of 2006 outlined the federal government's responsibility to work with tribes to ensure survival of their languages and cultures.

Despite these favorable turns towards American Indians in the United States, reminders of the power of the colonial process remained evident in the conception and enactment of educational policy. As Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) argued, "Even in the severely assimilationist setting of the Indian schools, then, it made sense to preserve some 'safe' markers of Indian Identity that marked or defined racial difference. The challenge was how to find adequately safe differences" (p. 53). Additionally, in a nation that has engaged in serious debate and court battles over the medium of instruction in schools despite scientific research that indicates cognitive development is bolstered by acquisition of additional languages, English remains the dominant language. American Indian children attend compulsory schooling in English, and for Native people whose cultural practices and languages are linked, conventional schooling can serve to widen the gaps between generations of language speakers: While there are 175 Native languages still spoken in the United States, less than one quarter are being learned by children (Romero & McCarty, 2006). Moreover, around the world, the steady decline of Indigenous languages lost among individuals and shifting to dominant languages is fast becoming the norm (Romaine, 2006). Understanding global trends of waxing and waning support for Indigenous cultures and languages and being critical of the existence of "safe" markers of Indian identity are important issues for Indigenous educators to understand as they explore awareness of their involvement in educational design and why certain limitations may present themselves.

Seeking Solutions from Within: Indigenizing Globalization

Teófila Salazar Sora and Julio Orellana Mirán are a married Hatun Shunqo couple in their 30s. As is customary in Hatun Shunqo, entire families work together in their farm fields, *chakra*, throughout the village. Like other Wanka, Teófila began farming as a child, by the age of 10, she was already harvesting crops with her parents. Julio also farmed as a child, which was “like playing” for him. Though he was from a neighboring village, he did not come from a farming family and as an adult began to work in his wife’s family fields. Although his wife was a Quechua Wanka speaker and he was not, they both shared admiration for the language that Julio linked to cultural identity and Teófila linked to the quality of social interaction that the language ensures.

Julio: Some of the younger ones know how to speak. They understand too. But when they leave, they are embarrassed to speak, because you are viewed as a *serrano*, highlander, a *Wanka*. To represent themselves as modern, they do not speak Quechua. But it is beautiful to speak Quechua.

Teófila: [What is beautiful is] How you pronounce, how you speak, when you talk, it makes you laugh. In Quechua, it has a different meaning, in Spanish [it’s like] “what’s that?” (2007 Fieldnotes)

In order to alleviate language loss, Julio believed language should be taught in school, perceiving the school as a space with power not only to validate language, but to restore its status in order to maintain Wanka identity. However, he and Teófila explained that younger people migrating to urban centers for jobs would appear embarrassed to interact in Quechua. In their defense, Julio explained that those community members experienced discrimination in the cities. The identifiers of *serrano* and *Wanka* are not inherently derogatory. They are proudly declared within villages, expressing nostalgia of homeland and countrymen through the use of *huaynos*, Peruvian folk songs, and at social dances and *huaylarsh* competitions. However, used by non-Indigenous/non-rural Peruvians, they had become racial and class slurs degrading Hatun Shonko community members with lowly service sector jobs. As a result, *serrano* and *Wanka* represented provincial, rural, backwards identities that were brought home.

On the one hand, being “modern” entailed rejecting elements that make up Wanka place-based relationships, including language, farming, and certain cultural practices, and severing ties with community as a strategy for navigating racism and transcending social and class hierarchies. On the other hand, Teofila and Julio hoped that Hatun Shunqo would become more modernized, which to them meant infrastructure like paved roads. I asked if that meant people would then compromise cultural practices, traditions, and language in order to become modern. Julio shook his head, “No, that’s not what it means at all. To get better

doesn't mean we will forget...but we don't have to suffer." He and Teófila agreed, "The traditions of before should continue so that our children, our grandchildren can see them" (2007 Fieldnotes). Julio and Teófila's reflections can resonate with views of others in the Latin American region that point at the need to repair the injustices imposed on Indigenous people.

But if we do not resolve the problem of Indigenous people who make up the majority of the population, it is impossible to think that there will be social justice in our country. Each and every one of us should seek to repair the damage done over so many years. (Bolivian President Evo Morales Ayma, Al Jazeera, March 28, 2008)

In Peru, the dominant social, economic, and political construction of Indigenous peoples has led to the wielding of education and language policies as weapons against Indigenous identities. Formal compulsory education for Indigenous children excludes Indigenous minds (recognition of Indigenous people as intellectual) and Indigenous voices (recognition of Indigenous articulation of their own intellectualism and capacity to act). Comparative analysis of policies presents examples of lessons learned in the experience of other Indigenous peoples, in this case in the United States. They have been subjected to assimilationist tendencies and now favorable policy talk, both of which reflect the power of others over Indigenous peoples, as well as formulaic strategies for dealing with Indigenous populations. The formula entails colonial and industrial approaches to development and continuous and often simultaneous attacks on Indigenous governance, lands, languages, and knowledges. There are, however, important Indigenous responses like the one expressed by President Morales' own reframing of Bolivia's "Indigenous problem" that demonstrates how Indigenous perspectives, meaning worldviews that merge Indigenous epistemologies with critical commentary on the current status of Indigenous peoples, can turn the "Indigenous problem" into a question of social justice and the responsibility of all citizens.

One of the main questions challenging Indigenous communities today in relation to Indigenous education is how Indigenous knowledge contributes to national and international interests, particularly within a globalized economy. Over a decade ago, Carnoy (1999) made an important distinction regarding our current global economy as an economy whose activities function on a planetary scale in real-time, made possible through technology. He argued that the two main foundations of globalization are information and innovation, both of which are dependent upon knowledge, which is highly portable. As such, knowledge is vital to globalization, an assertion that led to his call to learn how globalization and its ideological packaging, such as private sector bias, affect the delivery of schooling. He discussed the impact of globalization on schooling in key ways: (a) financially through public spending; (b) through the labor market by creating the need for more skilled workers; and (c) in educational terms whereby systems of education are increasingly compared internationally and the emphasis is on universal standards for the purposes of measuring achievement and ranking nations. So what can Indigenous communities contribute to this conversation?

Particularly as regional and national spaces are interconnected globally, can Indigenous communities contribute a perspective more widely accepted due to environmental destruction, such as climate change? How can Indigenous culturally and community-based approaches inform the design of effective educational ecological practices that also meet family and cultural priorities when the dominant discourse on education and national participation and development appears to be the only recognized discourse? These could be important research questions for Indigenous educational research today.

Godenzzi (1997) remarked that ancient cultural practices in the Andes, which can be seen as examples of peoples' "real sociocultural identities" (Corson, 1999), had resulted in successful management of the environment. While these practices still exist and could be widely applied, they are endangered, and those who practice them or are aware of them may question their potential contribution to the labor market. So while school is not the only way to be a productive human being, formal education offers crucial growth and exposure to ideas and skills that Indigenous children can use for their own and family and community benefit, especially as Indigenous communities consider their participation in globalization, which may or may not include ways to address the loss of cultural practices and language. Because the history of education of Indigenous peoples is riddled with traumas and violations, considering multiple definitions and practices of education that reflect diverse experiences in a globalized world requires reflection on historical themes, exposure to new knowledge, and an ability to exercise creativity.

Over a decade ago, Stiglitz (2002) critiqued globalization by challenging why this force, neither good nor bad, had become so controversial and moreover why, in a globalized world, the number of those in poverty had increased by almost 100 million. As Indigenous and marginalized peoples reconsider definitions of education (May & Aikman, 2003)—when education happens, whose interests are reflected, who is served and to what end—communities must also consider how poverty is defined and how globalization impacts our definitions, constructions, and implementations of education as a "way out of poverty." If dominant educational policies have been a device of destruction of Indigenous lifeways and silencing of worldviews, and globalization has theoretically increased access to opportunities for the world's marginalized, the challenge now is to envision a "world of our own making" (Kawagley, 1995) and in this process to explore the meanings of bountiful and good lives. Will such a life include Indigenous cultural practices, languages, and protection of Indigenous lands? These questions can also be referred to as the "question of the goal which, even in the thick of battle, entails the analysis of choices. Are we fighting just to rid ourselves of colonialism, a necessary goal, or are we thinking about what we will do when the last white policeman leaves" (Said, 1994, p. 41)? In Peru, our challenge will be to envision schools that do not replicate colonial injustices under oppressive conditions or globalization and that do not define Indigeneity as synonymous with poverty and ignorance. Research that explores these topics and the interplay among Indigenous education broadly defined, transnational

policies, and globalization may help educators, policymakers, and Indigenous community members alike not to “forget” even as we “get better.”

Notes

1. The terms *American Indian* and *Native American* are used interchangeably in this article when referencing U.S. Indigenous populations. Both terms are used in U.S. policy language and by tribal communities themselves. However, the preferred approach by U.S. Indigenous scholars and tribal communities has been increasingly to use the local Indigenous/Native language when referring to specific populations—meaning, a respectful approach is referring to Indigenous peoples in the way and using the language that they use to refer to themselves.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Serafín Coronel Molina for his guidance on Wanka language orthography, and to Teresa McCarty and Tsianina Lomawaima for their important and inspirational work on colonial education and Indigenous resistance, to the Wanka peoples of Hatun Shunqo, the Pueblos of New Mexico, the Leadership Institute at the Santa Fe Indian School, Anya Dozier Enos, Patricia Sandoval, and mentors, friends, and colleagues in the United States, Canada, and elsewhere whose work inspires Indigenous researchers.

References

- Alfred, T., & Corntassel, J. (2005). Being Indigenous: Resurgences against contemporary colonialism. In Bellamy, R. (Ed.) *The Politics of Identity-IX* (pp. 597-614). Oxford, UK: Government and Opposition.
- Ames, P. (2012). Language, culture and identity in the transition to primary school: Challenges to indigenous children's rights to education in Peru. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 32, 454-462.
- Archuleta, M., Child, B., & Lomawaima, T. (2000). *Away from home: American Indian boarding school experiences*. Phoenix, AZ: Heard Museum.
- Bang, M., Medin, D., & Atran, S. (2007). Cultural mosaics and mental models of nature. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(35), 13868-13874.
- Barnhardt, R., & Kawagley, O. (2005). Indigenous knowledge systems and Alaskan ways of knowing. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 36(1), 8-23.

- Cajete, G. (1994). *Look to the mountain: An ecology of indigenous education*. Durango, CO: Kivaki Press.
- Carnoy, M. (1974). *Education as cultural imperialism*. London, UK: Harlow, Longman Group.
- Carnoy, M. (1999). *Globalization and educational reform: What planners need to know*. Paris, France: UNESCO.
- Corson, D. (1999). Community-based education for Indigenous cultures. In S. May (Ed.), *Indigenous community-based education* (pp. 8-19). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English learners: Language diversity in the classroom* (5th ed.) Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Educational Services.
- Crivello, G. (2011). "Becoming somebody": Youth transitions through education and migration in Peru. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 14(4), 395-411.
- Deloria Jr., V. (1991). *Indian education in America*. Denver, CO: AISES.
- Deloria Jr., V., & Wildcat, D. (2001). *Power and place: Indian education in America*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Resources.
- Fagerlind, I., & Saha, L. (1989). "Education, political mobilization and development." *Education and national development: A comparative perspective*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.
- Fuller, B. (1991). *Growing up modern: The Western state builds third-world schools*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (2006). *Pedagogy of the oppressed, 30th anniversary edition*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Godenzzi, J. C. (1997). Literacy and modernization among the Quechua speaking population of Peru. In N. Hornberger (Ed.), *Indigenous literacies in the Americas: Language planning from the bottom up* (pp. 237-250). New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hornberger, N. H., & McCarty, T.L. (2012). Globalization from the bottom up: Indigenous language planning and policy across time, space, and place. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 6, 1-7.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Swinehart, K.F. (2012). Not just situaciones de la vida: Professionalization and Indigenous language revitalization in the Andes. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 6(1), 35-49.
- Kawagley, O. (1995). *A Yupiaq worldview: A pathway to ecology and spirit*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Lomawaima, K. T. (1999). The unnatural history of American Indian education. In Gayton Swisher, K. & Tippeconnic, J. W. (Eds.). *Next steps: Research and practices to advance Indian education* (pp. 3-31). Charleston, NC: Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.

- Lomawaima, K. T., & McCarty, T.L. (2006). *To remain an Indian: Lessons in democracy from a century of Native American education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Luykx, A. (1999). *The Citizen factory: Schooling and cultural production in Bolivia*. New York, NY: SUNY Press.
- McCarty, T. L., Romero, M. E. & Zepeda, O. (2006). Reclaiming the gift: Indigenous youth counter-narratives on Native language loss and revitalization. *American Indian Quarterly*, 30(1 & 2), 8-48.
- McCarty, T. L., Nicholas, S., & Wyman, L. (2012). Re-emplacing place in the "global here and now": Critical ethnographic case studies of native american language planning and policy. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 6, 50-63.
- May, Stephen. (1999). Language and education rights for Indigenous peoples. In May, Stephen (Ed.), *Indigenous Community-Based Education* (pp. 42-66). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- May, S., & Aikman, S. (2003). Indigenous education: Addressing current issues and developments. *Comparative Education*, 39(2), 139-145.
- May, S. (1999). *Indigenous community-based education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Romaine, S. (2006). Planning for the survival of linguistic diversity. *Language Policy*, 5(2), 443-475.
- Romero, M. E. & McCarty, T. L. (2006). Language planning challenges and prospects in Native American communities and schools. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University Educational Policy Studies Laboratory.
- Said, E. (1994). *Representations of the intellectual*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Simpson, L. (2004). Anticolonial strategies for the recovery and maintenance of Indigenous knowledge. *American Indian Quarterly*, 28, 373-384.
- Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London, UK: Zed Books.
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Steiner-Khamsi, G., Ed. (2004). *The Global politics of educational borrowing and lending*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Sumida Huaman, E. (forthcoming). "You're trying hard, but it's still going to die:" Indigenous community education and youth language tensions in Peru and the U.S. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*.
- Trask, H. (1999). *From a native daughter: Colonialism and sovereignty in Hawaii*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

- Valdiviezo, L. (2006). *The construction of interculturality: An ethnography of teachers' beliefs and practices in Indigenous Quechua schools*. Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College Columbia University, New York.
- Valdiviezo, L. A. (2010). Indigenous worldviews in intercultural education: Teachers' construction of interculturalism in a bilingual Quechua-Spanish program. *Intercultural Education*, 21(1): 27-39.
- Wilkins, D. (2007). *American Indian politics and the American political system* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.