
The intention behind assigning this article is to have a condensed historical overview of the process by which American Indians came to occupy a reduced land base on often restrictive terms, and how this process might possibly be conceived as part of a larger phenomenon that one could call ethnocide.

1. Please explain how land allotment was tied into both evolutionary thinking and a policy for carrying out assimilation of American Indians into “white civilization.”
2. How were lands to be specifically administered under the Dawes Allotment Act of 1887? (Please explain lands held in trust, trust patents, fee patents, what types of lands were to be allotted and in what portion, and who was to receive the lands.)
3. In the end, how much land was allotted to how many American Indians, and how much surplus land was sold or ceded?
4. Please make a note in the text of the “Indian Rights Association” and the “Friends of the Indians”—who are they? What positions do they seem to be adopting?
5. In the final analysis, what does the author conclude about whether the Dawes Act was successful in achieving its objectives?


When reading this chapter, it is important to pause and take careful note of the following items:
(a) Bonita Lawrence’s theoretical framework for understanding the political and cultural significance of identity legislation such as the Indian Act;
(b) The provisions of the Indian Act and how they relate to attempted assimilation;
(c) The Gradual Civilization Act, the Gradual Enfranchisement Act, and attempted assimilation; and,
(d) The provisions, both the initial ones and those added in subsequent amendments, of the 1876 Indian Act.

1. Bonita Lawrence repeatedly explains that identity legislation in Canada and the U.S. has had the effect of instituting a regime of ongoing colonization and reduction of indigenous cultures and communities. Please explain how this argument works.
2. Why is knowledge of past identity legislation of any significance today? How does such knowledge impact on possible resurgence movements among indigenous communities?
3. Can there ever be such a thing as “defining an Indian” in a manner that is not invested with power and domination?


1. How does Sissons relate the concept of assimilation with genocide, and what do you think of his approach?
2. While the previous chapters we read for this section addressed identity legislation and the loss of lands, this chapter focuses on the loss of children. Conceptually, how would you link all three?
3. What elements are common to the experiences of “educating” indigenous children under (neo)colonial systems in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, the United States, and Mexico?
4. How does Sissons envision the repossesssion of indigenous children as a form of resurgence? Indeed, does he see new indigenous schools as capable of generating revived indigenous communities? What can, and cannot, be done in his view where indigenous education is concerned? [This question and the ones that follow will be particularly relevant to discussions following the mid-term exam.]

5. Sissons makes the argument that indigenous educational control can be defeated by indigenous economic marginality. What do you make of this argument? What are the assumptions on which this argument rests?

6. Make note of the connection between the Navajo Rough Rock School and the Strelley school in Western Australia.

7. What are the goals and challenges faced by urban indigenous re-education?

8. Is indigenous “cultural preservation” the most important goal for urban, indigenous-controlled schooling, in Sissons’ view? What do you think of his argument?