



Fall 2015

Indigenous Institutional Inclusion

Kristy L. Garcia
Gettysburg College

Follow this and additional works at: https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/student_scholarship

 Part of the [Australian Studies Commons](#), [International and Area Studies Commons](#), and the [International and Comparative Education Commons](#)

Share feedback about the accessibility of this item.

Garcia, Kristy L., "Indigenous Institutional Inclusion" (2015). *Student Publications*. 401.
https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/student_scholarship/401

This is the author's version of the work. This publication appears in Gettysburg College's institutional repository by permission of the copyright owner for personal use, not for redistribution. Cupola permanent link: https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/student_scholarship/401

This open access student research paper is brought to you by The Cupola: Scholarship at Gettysburg College. It has been accepted for inclusion by an authorized administrator of The Cupola. For more information, please contact cupola@gettysburg.edu.

Indigenous Institutional Inclusion

Abstract

While attending James Cook University (JCU) in Cairns, Australia and researching Arizona University (UA) in Tucson, Arizona, I noticed differences concerning the inclusion of Indigenous representation within their educational institutions. While UA focuses on academic education and community outreach through external concentration, JCU focuses on positive cultural awareness and acts of reconciliation through internal concentration. The influence of colonization in both the United States and Australia contributed to the presence, or lack, of tribal sovereignty in Indigenous communities therefore effecting federal recognition, reconciliation, and government funding which ultimately impacted the school systems.

Keywords

Indigenous, Native American Tribal Government, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander, Australia, United States, James Cook University, University of Arizona, Colonization

Disciplines

Australian Studies | Education | International and Area Studies | International and Comparative Education

Comments

This paper was written for the International Bridge Course, Fall 2015, and was funded by the Mellon International Bridge Course Grant.

The International Bridge Course is a unique opportunity for Gettysburg students to engage in a faculty-mentored research project of their own design over a three-semester period. IBC scholars began their research in semester one, carry out continuing or comparative research while studying abroad in semester two, and complete their research and submit their final project in semester three. Credit is awarded in semester three via an independent study. In this way, students, under the continued mentorship of a faculty member, may truly integrate their study abroad experience with the coursework they have taken on campus.

Indigenous Institutional Inclusion

Kristy Lyn Garcia

Gettysburg College

December 2015

Introduction

While attending James Cook University (JCU) in Cairns, Australia and researching Arizona University (UA) in Tucson, Arizona, I noticed differences concerning the inclusion of Indigenous representation within their educational institutions. As I noticed these differences, I decided to research reasons behind their presence and ultimately found correlations between these universities and their associated political and social institutions.

Initial Findings: Educational Institutions (UA & JCU)

While focusing on the representation and inclusion of Indigenous people within the educational institutions of UA and JCU, I found that while UA mostly emphasizes academic representation and community outreach, JCU mostly emphasizes positive cultural awareness in addition to reconciliation. After researching the forms of Indigenous inclusion within both UA and JCU, I decided to place the examples of representation into distinct categories consisting of: Forms of Teacher Education, Indigenous Staff Employment, Academics, Research and Study Towards an Indigenous Studies Career (based on the university's degree program), Assistance and Help for Students Getting an Indigenous Studies Degree, Assistance and Help for Indigenous People/ Communities (outreach), Assistance and Help for Indigenous Students Attending the University, and Awareness of Indigenous Culture and Presence. After placing all examples, elements, and forms of Indigenous inclusion and representation into these categories separately for both universities, I found that the majority of examples of Indigenous inclusion at UA landed within the categories of Academics, Research and Study Towards an Indigenous Studies Career, and Assistance and Help for Indigenous People/ Communities (outreach); while at JCU, the majority of examples were under the category of Awareness of Indigenous Culture and Presence. Although UA and JCU demonstrate different categories of their highest forms of Indigenous representation, they had about an equal amount of examples under the category of Assistance and Help for Indigenous Students Attending the University. Although the number of examples for both universities in this category (about ten) was still less than that of their most represented categories, they both clearly demonstrated their commitment to support Indigenous students within their institutions. After studying the examples of Indigenous inclusion within this category of Assistance for Indigenous Students at both universities, I noticed that while UA's examples of

assistance and help for Indigenous students focused on pre-determined concentrated organizations such as the O’Odham Ki Living Community, JCU’s examples focused on more of a broad range of support such as the availability of Indigenous student support officers, meeting spaces, and computer labs specifically designated for Indigenous Students. In this sense, JCU really demonstrates itself, as an educational institution, one which offers hands on examples of support for Indigenous students. Because of this clear difference in forms of Indigenous student assistance/ support, I found this category at JCU to truly illustrate examples of reconciliation rather than support due to the holistic nature of the examples. Therefore, in light of these examples, I deemed JCU’s to be more responsive to the categories of Cultural Awareness in addition to Demonstrations of Reconciliation, and UA relating more to academic education in addition to community outreach. I will below describe the portrayal of these predominant categories which will contribute to my ultimate findings within both universities separate of each other before describing the comparisons between the two educational institutions and their differences.

University of Arizona

When addressing Native inclusion throughout University of Arizona, the form of representation that is most noticeably present is associated with academics in terms of education in addition to external community outreach. The American Indian Studies program (AIS) focuses on educating students both through internal academics as well as external hands-on community engagement through courses, research, and internships. Although AIS may be assumed to be the only academic program that illustrates Native inclusion, there are a variety of other academic programs such as the departments of Law, Health Science, and Education that include programs of Native outreach and education as well. In addition to academic educational degree programs, UA also participates in and contains programs and organizations whose focus is purely on community outreach and assistance rather than on the education of UA students. While these outreach programs are based at an educational institution, their primary purpose of engagement is not for the education of UA students but rather on the progression of the task at hand. Through Native-based educational degree programs as seen through AIS, programs incorporating Native

elements, and non-degree-based Native programs, UA represents Native inclusion by means of both educational academic and community outreach programs.

American Indian Studies at UA, established in 1970, is one of the new programs in the country to not only offer Indigenous study-based degrees, but degrees at both the graduate and undergraduate level with additional support for research and internships as well. After researching its associated elements, the program itself seems to focus on Native American sovereignty, self-determination, and self-governance as described on their website's mission page:

"American Indian Studies seeks to develop a strong understanding of the languages, cultures, and sovereignty of American Indians/Alaska Natives, which honors our ancestors and their wisdom."

"American Indian Studies maintains productive scholarship, teaching, research, and community development; and provides unique opportunities for students and scholars to explore issues from American Indian perspectives which place the land, its history and the people at the center."

"American Indian Studies promotes Indian self-determination, self-governance, and strong leadership as defined by Indian nations, tribes, and communities, all of which originated from the enduring beliefs and philosophies of our ancestors." (Ais.arizona.edu).

With about ninety-five courses offered, "AIS is a Graduate InterDisciplinary Program at the University of Arizona offering a Ph.D., M.A., J.D./M.A., and Graduate Certificates in Higher Education, Natural Resources Administration & Management, and Native Nation Building. The Undergraduate Program is part of the College of Social & Behavioral Sciences and offers a Major (B.A.) and Minor in AIS" (Ais.arizona.edu). After studying AIS's mission statement, courses, degrees, and research and internship opportunities it has to offer, it is apparent that the programs inclusion of Native peoples focuses mostly on education in terms of both academics through research, coursework and community outreach. For example, "MA students have to take an internship course as well as pre-determined courses in research methodology, and a course

each from the concentrations of " Societies and Cultures, and American Indian Law and Policy" (Williams 9). Both of these concentrations in addition to internships and research exemplify UA's emphasis on tribal politics in addition to community outreach as seen by two of AIS's previous directors who envisioned the program to focus on Native issues and tribal policy. With these two themes of focus in mind put in place in the mid-1970s, one can better understand the emphasis put on the program today as seen through its approval of a Master's degree in 1982 and a Ph.D. in 1997. Both degrees focus on Native issues and tribal policy through coursework, internships, and research. For example, courses such as AIS 525: Native Economic Development and AIS 575: Contemporary Federal Indian Policy, internships such as with the American Indian Assistance Fund and the National Congress of American Indians, and lastly AIS's required research through the Human Subjects and Institutional Review Boards all represent the program's emphasis on Native issues and policy as seen in these elements of education and outreach. In addition, these examples illustrate the program's significant amount of attention put on tribal sovereignty by attempting to educate students on ways in which to address issues seen in Indian country as well as the associated political matters concerning tribal governance. As previous and present directors of AIS have stressed, Indian country cannot continue to develop and progress without the programs and education to initiate it. By focusing on both Native issues and policy, AIS is ultimately working for the progression and development of Indian country by addressing its current state of tribal sovereignty, self-determination, and tribal governance. With this focus on sovereignty, the only way in which to tackle its emphasized elements is through the education of this generation and those to come as demonstrated in AIS. Through academics and hands on work, UA shows Native inclusion through its incorporation of AIS and its academic emphasis on education for the future of tribal sovereignty.

In addition to the AIS program, UA also contains many examples of community outreach through programs such as Native Peoples Technical Assistance Program, the Partnership for Native American Cancer Prevention, the American Indian Science and Engineering Society, and the American Indian Language Development Institute, therefore representing Indigenous people in another manner other than academics and AIS. While AIS also emphasized community outreach through its internships and research programs, these individual programs show that

the university is interested in externally supporting Natives through programs other than those specifically based on AIS students. These programs are run through both non-AIS academic programs in addition to ones without an educational basis. This proves that the university is not only interested in supporting Indian Country through education, but through non-educational community outreach as well therefore showing its role as both an institution for higher learning in addition to an institution for community outreach. For example, the Partnership for Native American Cancer Prevention (NACP) externally participates in “training and outreach programs in collaboration with the communities” that they serve in order to “alleviate the unequal burden of cancer among Native Americans of the Southwest” (Uacc.arizona.edu). While NACP focuses on the support of Natives, it is not associated with AIS but rather the department of Health Sciences at UA therefore illustrating the commitment that this educational institution has towards Native community outreach. While there are many educational programs that include Native representational outreach including AIS, the Health Sciences, and Law programs, there are also non-educational program in which include Native community outreach such as the American Indian Language Development Institute (AILDI) whose mission is to “provide critical training to strengthen efforts to revitalize and promote the use of Indigenous languages across generations. This is accomplished by engaging educators, schools, Indigenous communities and policy makers nationally and internationally through outreach, transformative teaching, purposeful research and collaborative partnerships” (Aildi.arizona.edu). AILDI is one of multiple programs that is not academic based (meaning its focus is not on educating UA students but rather external education) therefore portraying UA’s intent on community outreach.

Whether the programs mentioned are through AIS, a degree program other than AIS, or non-degree based programs, they all include the representation of Native people through either academic education and/or external community outreach. This Native representation at AU evidently centers around the concept of tribal sovereignty through focusing on issues present in Indian Country in addition to the political elements associated with them. Therefore, it seems that the educational institution of AU is concentrating primarily on ways in which to contribute and assist Native Communities. While the university’s Native representation does include elements of positive cultural awareness such as Native American Heritage month and through a

variety of cultural-based AIS courses, examples of cultural awareness such as these are minimal therefore portraying their concentration on tribal sovereignty through academics and outreach as the most prominent form of Native inclusion.

James Cook University

After having attended and researched James Cook University (JCU), I found that the representation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people (whom I will call Indigenous) predominantly focuses on demonstrating elements of cultural positive awareness in addition to acts of reconciliation. Although JCU does include elements of academic educational Native inclusion, such as illustrated through their School of Indigenous Australian Studies (SIAS) and its associated research, in addition to examples of community outreach, such as through the Indigenous Health Unit, the form of Indigenous inclusion which is most prominent within JCU consists of elements demonstrating positive cultural awareness and acts of reconciliation.

Cultural awareness at JCU is demonstrated through acts of positive cultural recognition in addition to the presence of designated days of Indigenous celebration. For example, the days of celebration recognized by the university include SIAS Wantok Day, National Reconciliation Week, National Close the Gap Day, Harmony Day, Mabo Day, National NAIDOC Week, and International Day of the World's Indigenous People (Jcu.edu.au). The recognition and inclusion of these days not only promote Indigenous cultural awareness, but involve demonstrations of Indigenous culture as well. For example, I was lucky enough to attend JCU during their National Reconciliation Week this past year in May of 2015, and was able to witness and participate in its festivities which included Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander traditional dance performances, an art show, the production of traditional foods, and crafting activities. These festivities took place for an entire week throughout JCU at my location in Cairns where every single student was exposed to the culture through these *positive* demonstrations of awareness. Both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander dance and music performances took place right outside the campus library on its front lawn; the presentation of Indigenous art works were displayed along the main sidewalk/ walkway on campus; food was being sold directly outside the library; and a crafting table for making/ designing reconciliation posters to put up around campus was located on the

main campus lawn. The Cairns campus at JCU is very small with only a few main sidewalks therefore forcing every student to be exposed to the week's exciting festivities. Reconciliation week is not only celebrated at JCU, but is celebrated across Australia each year between May 27th and June 3rd. These dates commemorate two significant milestones in the reconciliation journey as they are the anniversaries of the successful 1967 referendum and the High Court Mabo decision. "The week is a time for all Australians to learn about our shared histories, cultures and achievements and to explore how each of us can join the national reconciliation effort" (Jcu.edu.au).

In addition to positive awareness as seen through the Indigenous celebrated days, acts of reconciliation are illustrated through the JCU website, their inclusion of a reconciliation statement, and their inclusion of support services for Indigenous students. For example, at the bottom of each page of the JCU website, there is a statement that reads, "Traditional Owners: We acknowledge Australian Aboriginal People and Torres Strait Islander People as the first inhabitants of the nation and acknowledge Traditional Owners of the lands where our staff and students live, learn and work" (Jcu.edu.au). If one clicks on that statement, they are brought immediately to a page titled "Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Information" which consists of a variety of information including links and videos concerning all Indigenous related topics. One of the dozens of links on the page is titled "Reconciliation" which, once clicked on, leads to another page which clearly outlines JCU's Reconciliation Statement:

"Reconciliation is:

1. An honest and critical understanding of Australia's shared history, and how it has informed the lives of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and other Australians today.
1. Other Australians and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples building and preserving mutual, positive, and respectful relationships.

1. Optimising on these relationships to work together on closing the gap and to achieve a shared sense of fairness and justice as a foundation for success and to enhance our national wellbeing.” (Jcu.edu.au)

After these three points are given, they explain the importance of Indigenous culture by stating, “*Acknowledging the First Nation peoples of the world, their rich cultures and their knowledge of the natural environment, we pay particular respect to Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, the traditional custodians of the lands and waters of Australia. We are pledged to achieve genuine and sustainable reconciliation between the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and the wider community*” (Jcu.edu.au). By portraying a statement recognizing Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders at the bottom of every page on their website and including it as a direct link to their Reconciliation Statement, JCU ultimately demonstrates Indigenous positive awareness through acts of reconciliation. As reconciliation refers to the reformation of a positive relationship between two bodies, the recognition of Indigenous peoples on the JCU website as well as easy access to their Reconciliation statement shows JCU’s commitment to forming a positive relationship and inclusion of Indigenous peoples following Australia’s acts of oppression during colonization and its discriminatory outcomes.

In addition to Indigenous representations on JCU’s website, the university also demonstrates acts of reconciliation through holistic support for Indigenous students. This support is shown through the presence of Indigenous Support Officers as well as computer labs and meeting spaces specifically designated for Indigenous students “in order to commune and provide and receive peer support on both the Cairns and Townsville Campuses. Open 7am – 7pm, Monday to Friday” (Jcu.edu.au). These examples of support for Indigenous students at JCU ultimately *demonstrate* reconciliation because they are being performed *within* the university as opposed to through community outreach. While there are programs focusing on external reconciliation through community outreach as previously mentioned, the majority of reconciliation examples are shown through *internal* forms of reconciliation. The use of the terms internal, refers to the university working to assist and help Indigenous communities *by* offering these examples of support for them *within* the campus itself. By attending JCU and having the

availability of Student Support Officers and Indigenous specified spaces to do work in order to “provide and receive peer support”, shows that JCU understands the detrimental effects of colonization and recognizes the steps that need to be taken in order to “close the gap” and give Indigenous people the acts of reconciliation they deserve. As these hands on examples of reconciliation focus on basic forms of support such as a solely designated space *in addition* to more concentrated forms, such as the ATSI Student Association, it shows that JCU is aware that reconciliation needs to begin at even the most basic levels of support rather than solely through concentrated programs. As all these forms of positive awareness are seen in a *holistic* manner through Indigenous days of celebration, website representation, the inclusion of a Reconciliation statement, in addition to Indigenous support facilities, true reconciliation is being demonstrated. If JCU was attempting to demonstrate reconciliation through just one of these forms, it would not be a true form of reconciliation as it needs to be accomplished in a holistic sense through every element of awareness available; and this is exactly what JCU is demonstrating.

While forms of Indigenous *positive awareness* are illustrated through recognized days of Indigenous celebration, acts of *reconciliation* are demonstrated through the recognition of Indigenous land seen on their website, the presence and inclusion of a Reconciliation Statement, and the availability of Indigenous student support. As forms of Indigenous positive awareness and acts of reconciliation go hand in hand, the both portray the most prominent forms of Indigenous representation at JCU. Reconciliation cannot be enacted without awareness and awareness cannot be followed through without reconciliation. Through all examples of positive awareness and reconciliation, JCU ultimately stresses the need for all students, Indigenous and non-Indigenous, to be aware of the beauty of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Culture and land, as it is their land that non-Indigenous people are borrowing. As stated on each page of JCU’s website, the campus acknowledges Indigenous peoples “as the first inhabitants of the nation and acknowledge the Traditional Owners of the lands where [the] staff and students live, learn and work”. Through this statement in addition to the ones stated within the Reconciliation Statement, JCU is not only accurately recognizing Indigenous people for their true nature as the original owners of the land, but is recognizing the horrible effects of colonization and the oppression that it has caused. If the land was not originally stolen by European settlers to begin

with, there would be no need to recognize the original “owners” as their “ownership” would already be implied. This represents just a small portion of the extent to which colonization dismantled Indigenous culture. By recognizing the effects of colonization through demonstrating acts of cultural awareness, JCU is also recognizing that hands on support needs to be enacted in order to fully work towards bringing reconciliation. This holistic framework for positive Indigenous awareness and reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples is a form of Indigenous inclusion and representation at JCU.

Indigenous Political Institutional Inclusion

United States

I believe that it is essential to understand the severe reality of what occurred during colonization and its resulting detrimental effects on Indian Country. One *must* be aware that the issues seen in Indian Country are a *direct* result of the dominating suppressive nature of colonization and its portrayed outcomes such as forced relocation, involuntary participation in Christian boarding schools, and mass genocide. The effects seen today of these horrific acts include the belief of Natives as solely living in the past, the notion of the “uncivilized savage Indian”, and the stereotype of Native inferiority/ western superiority. While the focus of this paper concerns Indigenous institutional inclusion rather than the oppression and discrimination demonstrated as the result of colonization, it is *critical* to keep these social and political effects of colonization in mind as its influence is present in all aspects of this paper. This is a request that I greatly stress.

Federal Recognition

In the United States, Indigenous political inclusion was seen from the beginning of the country’s founding in 1776 through federal recognition. Even before the official formation of the U.S. in 1776, “the Continental Congress governed Indian affairs during the first years of the United States... and in 1775 it established a Committee on Indian Affairs headed by Benjamin Franklin” (NCAI 7). Although this is not a formal statement, it shows that the U.S. has had an interest in Native federal recognition since its creation. The first formal federal recognition of

Natives includes the first signing of treaties in addition to the formal inclusion of Natives within the U.S. Constitution. From 1778-1871, the federal government established more than 370 treaties through the approval of the U.S. Senate in collaboration with Native nations therefore implementing the blueprints for future Native American political institutions to come in the 20th century (NCAI). In addition, the U.S. immediately recognized Natives in its Constitution when it was first put into action in 1789 along with all other elements included within its pages; Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution states, "The Congress shall have the power to... regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states and with the Indian tribes." Through these initial forms of federal recognition, forms of self-administration and self-governance were able to be established in the future. Although this first century of American power resulted in the forced removal of Natives from their land, family and culture, they have within the last half century found ways to rise again and fight for their Native sovereignty.

Although the establishment of treaties and reservations exemplify Native political inclusion and one of the first informal forms of federal recognition as they allow, in a political sense (most treaties were violated and the reservations held Natives as prisoners on their own land), Native ownership of their land, they do not demonstrate true Native political inclusion through the sense of self-determination and tribal governance. As there was no tribal governance until the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) of 1934, Natives could not express sovereignty or legally and rightfully communicate with this dominating presence as their very existence was controlled by the U.S. government. Although the IRA worked to create tribal governance in order to give Natives a voice in political matters, their foundations were drawn from non-Indigenous models and "introduced governing structures that were in direct conflict with the political traditions" of the Native nations (Cornell 354). Therefore, true Native self-administration was created in 1944 with the founding of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) and most prominently self-governance in the 1960's and 1970s with the formation of non IRA-based tribal governments; "the shift from self-administration to self-government is a fundamental aspect of nation building" (Cornell 360). These Native structured governments are still being formed by multiple Native nations today.

The majority of tribal governance and institution was established during the Self-Determination period (1960s-2000) during a time of Native political activism and increasing organizational growth. Under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 passed by Congress, came programs such as the Community Action Program (CAP) which endorsed the shift of federal money onto reservations therefore allowing for the development of Native opportunity, employment and control. Due to the development of the CAP agencies and their subsequent demonstration of Native self-administration, the strive for Native empowerment continued resulting in the 1975 Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (Cornell 354). Leading up to this policy were other examples of Native political inclusion such as the creation of the National Indian Youth Council in 1961, the Alaska Federation of Natives in 1966, the American Indian Movement in 1968, the Indian Education Act in 1972, and the International Indian Treaty Council in 1974. These examples of Native political institutional inclusion contributed both politically and socially to other elements of Native inclusion including educational institutions and Native communities. Although there was/ is still an undeniable lack of Native representation and inclusion within the U.S. political system, these policies illustrated the beginning of Native self-determination and therefore the increased development of Native inclusion within an array of elements, such as educational institutions and Native communities.

As outlined in the U.S. Constitution, “as sovereign nations, federally recognized American Indian and Alaska Native tribes have a government-to-government relationship with the two other sovereign governing bodies of the United States: the federal and state governments... Together, they form an American family of governments—interrelated yet uniquely distinct from each other” (NCAI 20). Although Natives technically gained federal recognition during the initial treaties beginning in 1778, they did not individually have truly tribal federal recognition in collaboration with this three-bodied system until the 1960s and 1970s.

Reconciliation

In terms of the United States, there has not been many forms of reconciliation seen within its political institutions besides examples such as the few reaffirming statements of tribal sovereignty, the establishment of the White House Tribal Nations Conferences and Youth

Gatherings, and the reauthorization of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act under the Affordable Care Act (Obamacare). While the American three-bodied family of governments began to develop during the 1960's it did not become prominent until the twenty-first century when "in 2000, President Clinton issued Executive Order 13175 for Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments to strengthen the US government-to-government relationships. By 2011, the number of self-governance tribes has steadily increased to 260 with the Department of Interior and 332 with the Department of Health and Human Services" (NCAI 13). In addition to this initiative taken by Clinton, President Obama committed to having the annual White House Tribal Nations Conference in 2009 which was hosted by Obama himself and included tribes from over five-hundred tribal nations represented. Similar to the Conference, this past year during the summer of 2015 I was lucky enough to work for the NCAI and therefore attended the first annual White House Tribal Youth Gathering. This gathering focused on inspiring the Native youth through workshops, career panels, music, and talks given by both tribal leaders and U.S. political leaders such as Michelle Obama. Although these are great initiatives for reconciliation, they are in reality only a fraction of the steps and initiatives that need to be taken in order for the U.S. to truly see itself as demonstrating acts of reconciliation. In addition, these statements, conferences, and gatherings are unfortunately just that; the majority of discussed plans for reconciliation are rarely followed through. While the Indian Health Care Improvement Act was incorporated in 2010, the House of Representatives has already in 2015 passed H.R.3762 which would terminate the Act therefore preventing Natives from receiving the healthcare they deserve (Trahant). This example of health care is just one in a very long list consisting of all the injustices occurring in Indian Country as a result of colonization and present day governmental discrimination.

Government Funding

In addition to healthcare as seen with the possible termination of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, Natives do not receive adequate funding from the government for programs relating to education, human services, law enforcement, transportation, and housing; "the funding for tribal programs" in 2013 "only represents 0.19% of the entire federal budget" (NCAI 28). By law, it is the duty of the federal government to provide adequate funding to Indian

Country. As a result of their present discriminatory and oppressive nature of underfunding, 39% of Natives are in poverty; joblessness is 49%; the unemployment rate is 19%; only 54% of Natives own their own homes (compared to 65% for non-Natives); the median income is \$35,062 (compared to \$50,046 for non-Natives); 32% of Natives have no telephone (compared to 2.4%); 25.8% of Natives' homes are overcrowded (compared to 5.7%); Natives have some of the highest rates of cancer, diabetes, mortality, homicide, suicide, abuse against women, and other health conditions. Only 10% of the total Native land that was taken under the General Allotment Act of 1887 has been returned (NCAI 27); and companies are constantly trespassing onto Native land through illegal acts such as drilling and mining.

In terms of academic institutions, "funding for Indian education and schools is the responsibility of the federal government, while both state and federal resources provide public education funding" (NCAI 30). As the federal government also funds tribal and BIE (Bureau of Indian Education) schools, the funding is drawn from the small 0.19% of total tribal funding therefore resulting in "60 of the 183 BIE schools facilities categorized as in 'poor' conditioning 2009" (NCAI 30). Obviously, as seen in this case, lack of funding and ultimate lack of attention from the federal government is clearly having huge implications on Indian Country in terms of their overall wellbeing and health. Elements of colonization are very clearly still being seen today in this era of post-colonization. While there has been progression in terms of Native advocacy, cultural continuation, and elements of community stability, there is still a lot of work that needs to be done and the lack of federal funding is not helping. NCAI states, "The Snyder Act of 1921 also acknowledged the trust responsibility, requiring that the Bureau of Indian Affairs, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, 'direct, supervise, and expend such moneys as Congress may, from time to time, appropriate for the benefit, care, and assistance of Indians throughout the United States' for several purposes, including education; health; economic development and profitability of Indian property..." (NCAI 21).

Australia

With the Indigenous people of the U.S., I would also like to stress the importance of understanding the history of Australian colonization and its devastating effects which have

influenced all aspects of society leading up to today. In similarity with the U.S., the Europeans who colonized Australia saw the land's Aboriginal peoples as termites in need of extinction. This notion of Terra Nullius, legally deeming Aboriginals as flora and fauna, justified the Australian government's participation in the forced removal, involuntary relocation to Christian missions and reserves, and mass genocide of Aboriginal peoples. In saying forced removal, I mean both from their land and their family. From 1788-1997, over 50,000 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander (ATSI) children had been removed from their families in order to "breed out" their non-European blood. All issues seen in Indigenous communities are again a *direct* result of colonization and its resulted discriminatory policies. The Eurocentric demeaning nature of colonization and its policies have imprinted inaccurate stereotypes of Indigenous peoples onto the mind of society and the government illustrating them as unintelligent and unsanitary savages. The understanding and awareness of Australia's violent history is *crucial* in order to diverge from these ethnocentric conceptions of Indigenous peoples unconsciously possessed by most non-Indigenous people.

Federal Recognition

When Europeans first arrived in Australia, they did not give Indigenous peoples the opportunity to negotiate treaties with a federal government or establish a form of tribal government. As a result, all Indigenous people were forcibly removed from their land and put on missions or reserves controlled by either Christian bodies or governmental powers. Due to this lack of Indigenous sovereignty, administration, and governance, it was very difficult for Indigenous people to gain any type of formal or informal type of federal recognition. While Indigenous self-administration began to appear in the mid-20th century, legal and formal federal recognition of land did not become present until the *Mabo v Queensland* decision of 1992, in 1993 with the Native Title Act, and in 1995 with the Aboriginal Tent Embassy. Although the Tent Embassy was recognized through its listing on the National Estate, it is seen as more of a symbol of Indigenous advocacy and Indigenous rights while the Native Title Act formalized the decision that the Meriam People of Murray Island hold title over their land while allowing a process for Native title to be present. Because Indigenous peoples were not given any sovereignty or

recognition from the beginning of colonial rule and Australian establishment, they, to this day, have no form of self-governance or formal federal constitutional recognition.

In terms of federal recognition within the Australian Constitution, Indigenous people were actually specifically excluded from federal inclusion under discriminatory basis. For example, “federal Parliament was denied power to make laws with respect to people of ‘the aboriginal race in any State’: section 51 (xxvi))¹⁷; and section 127 provided: ‘In reckoning the numbers of the people of the Commonwealth, or the State or other part of the Commonwealth, aboriginal natives shall not be counted.’¹⁸” (“Constitutional Recognition Of Indigenous Australians”). In the case of the original Australian Constitution of 1901, Indigenous people not only lacked federal recognition, but were mentioned by way of exclusion rather as opposed to inclusion. The first attempt at constitutional recognition occurred during the 1967 Referendum when the discriminatory statements were removed from the Constitution. Although there was no longer any evidence of exclusion, there was now no mention of Indigenous peoples at all throughout the Constitution therefore resulting in the continuing lack of recognition. Finally, in 2004, eventually followed by Queensland and New South Wales, the state of Victoria became the first governmental body in Australia to change its constitution to include and recognize Indigenous people as the original owners of the land in addition to their rights as individuals. Although the federal government has yet to include the recognition of Indigenous people within their constitution, in 2010, the Prime Minister and rest of the federal body stated his commitment and plan for Constitutional revision. In addition to creating an Expert Panel, the engagement of the Australian Human Rights Commission, the National Congress of Australia’s First Peoples, and Reconciliation Australia were deemed as mandatory in creating this constitutional development. As this process obviously addresses Indigenous constitutional recognition, it still has yet to be carried through. Although this inclusion has not been made within the Federal Constitution, it has been made within the 2013 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Recognition Act which does demonstrate the federal government’s recognition of Indigenous peoples although it is not in the constitution.

In this case, as there is no self-governed Indigenous body that is federally recognized within Australia I will further elaborate on the history of Indigenous inclusion in terms of

Indigenous self-administration within the Australian Political Institutions. The first real portrayal of Indigenous political inclusion was demonstrated through the 1962 amendment to the Commonwealth Electoral Act which extended the right to vote to all Indigenous peoples with Queensland being the last state to adopt the addition in 1965. Shortly after gaining the right to vote, Indigenous peoples gained the right to become full Australian citizens in the 1967 referendum in which they were recognized and included in the Australian census (Bennett). Although these policies are the first form Indigenous inclusion within politics in terms of the influence it had on the ATSI community, they still were not included physically within political institutions in terms of agency and communication. In other words, Indigenous peoples did not yet have a form of self-recognition in which they spoke for themselves in political matters. Finally in 1972, the federal government established the Department of Aboriginal Affairs (DAA) which took control from the non-Indigenous men working in the Council for Aboriginal Affairs, and placed it in the hands of ATSI representatives. The DAA, whose role was to advise and administer the government on ATSI affairs, was the first form of legitimate ATSI inclusion through self-administration in political matters (Korff).

After the introduction of the DAA, the period of Self-Management (1975-1996) came into place with the idea that Indigenous peoples should be held accountable for their own decisions and forms of management. The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) was formed in 1990 with the purpose of ensuring the involvement and participation of ATSI people within the process of government that so greatly affects their lives (Bennett). This period of Self-Management saw additional forms of Indigenous political representation such as the creation of the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation in 1992, the passing of the Native Title Act in 1993, and the recognition of the Aboriginal Tent Embassy in 1995; but although these representations positively influenced ATSI communities, they did not portray legitimate Indigenous inclusion and self-administration as seen by the DAA and ATSIC.

Reconciliation

The Reconciliation Period (1996-present) by far demonstrated the highest amount of Indigenous political inclusion through reconciliation including both Indigenous self-

administration and published reports compared to the previous political periods. In terms of published reports, I am referring to documents which were formulated with the intention of bringing awareness to the injustices that were put on Indigenous peoples from the time of colonial occupation up through the present. These reports included The Royal Commission into Aboriginal Death (1991), The Bringing them Home Report (1997), The Little Children are Scared Report (2007), The Northern Territory National Emergency Response (2007), National Apology to the Stolen Generations (2008), and The Steering Committee's companion report, Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage: Key Indicators 2014 (SCRGSP 2014b) (Commonwealth of Australia: Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision). Each and every one of these reports addresses issues within Indigenous communities that are a direct result of colonization and its discriminatory policies. For example, *The Bringing Them Home Report* illustrates the unimaginable horrors experienced by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders in which Indigenous children were forcibly taken from their families against their will starting around 1910 and continuing into the 1970s. These children were taken by both missions and the Australian government in order to "breed out" the "impure" and "uncivilized savage blood" that was too late to be removed from Indigenous adults. By forcing these children onto missions and reserves, the settlers were attempting to westernize them by therefore erasing all aspects of their Indigenous culture through abuse, discipline, and ultimately the separation from their land and family. As these children continued to be stolen, therefore adopting the term "Stolen Generation", into the 1970s, there is not one Indigenous family to this day that has not been impacted by this disgraceful policy. Every single Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander person on this earth either knows someone, has a family member, or was a child of the Stolen Generations therefore effecting all Indigenous peoples in every way possible. The separation from one's family, land, and culture has a ripple effect that leaves a lasting scar almost equivalent to that of Native Americans who experienced the same form of oppression. Due to the lasting effects of the Stolen Generations seen through a variety of issues in Indigenous communities today, *The Bringing Them Home Report* was published with the purpose of addressing and describing both the oppressive nature of this policy that was enacted in addition to examples of how it is effecting individual Indigenous peoples today. Through this report, people will become more aware both

socially and politically concerning colonization's effect on Indigenous communities and therefore work towards ways to decolonize them. All of the reports mentioned address issues brought about by the effects of colonization and therefore illustrate forms of reconciliation due to the effect that they have on Indigenous awareness and its resulted Indigenous inclusion in social and political institutions.

In addition to published reports and reconciliation, forms of Indigenous self-administration clearly represent Indigenous inclusion as the presence of an Indigenous-ran body represents their sovereignty and therefore agency in their own lives without the dominating presence of non-Native forces. While the DAA and ATSIC were just stepping stones for future policies and political developments the political organizations that portrayed Indigenous self-administration and consisted of Indigenous members were truly exemplified during Australia's Reconciliation Period beginning in the late 1990s and continuing to present day. These examples of Indigenous self-administration included the 2008 Australian Capital Territory (ACT), the 2008 Queensland Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Advisory Council, the 2009 National Congress of Australia's First Peoples (NCAFP), and Australia's First Nations Political Party (AFNPP) in 2011. With both the reports and bodies of self-administration becoming present during the Reconciliation period, it is only natural that these examples of Indigenous inclusion would demonstrate reconciliation as they both contribute to the further development of Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations. While the reports of abuse bring awareness of issues that need to be addressed in Indigenous communities and the colonial forces that initiated these issues, the examples of self-administration allow Indigenous people to have a voice in what occurs in their own communities through collaboration with non-Indigenous bodies therefore representing a form of reconciliation.

The Reconciliation Period beginning in the 1990s saw a variety of forms of reconciliation such as through the production of reports addressing historical and present injustices within Indigenous communities, and the establishment of Indigenous self-administration resulting in Indigenous sovereignty and agency through communication with the Australian government. While these forms of reconciliation are very important as they are the driving force behind future acts of reconciliation, the most noteworthy examples of Indigenous inclusion within the context

of political institutions is illustrated in 2008 through the National Apology to the Stolen Generations and the implementation of the 2007 Close the Gap Campaign. Through the National Apology the government is not only recognizing that the Stolen Generations did indeed occur, but that it was put in place by the government themselves therefore demonstrating the government's realization of their own acts of oppression and their role in its negative impacts on today's Indigenous peoples. By conducting this apology publically both through physical attendance and media, all people, Australian and foreign, were able to witness the formal apology given by the government itself therefore distributing social and political awareness of the severity of the Australian government's oppression of Indigenous people. As the National Apology included Indigenous presence through performed dance and song, people were able to recognize elements of positive Australian culture rather than the widespread conception and stereotype of Indigenous alcoholism and poverty. Through this public apology, historical truth was told, stereotypes were broken, and awareness was distributed therefore deeming it as one of the most, if not *the* most influential act of reconciliation and ultimately Indigenous inclusion to date.

As recognition of the health inequalities seen in Indigenous communities began to arise, the ATSI Social Justice Commissioner's 2005 report brought attention to the seventeen year life-expectancy gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples by urging Australian governments to commit to achieving equality for this gap within twenty-five years (Korff). This ultimately led to the creation of 2007 Close the Gap Campaign and the signing and implementation of the 2008 Close the Gap statement and intended targets. Because of its holistic inclusion of post-colonial issues, the present state of Indigenous health, and structured steps of enactment, the Close the Gap initiative is, in my opinion, the most influential establishment of reconciliation and Indigenous inclusion to date. Because of this wide range of considered methods in which to address the life expectancy gap, the initiative brought awareness to and reached a variety of fields therefore bringing the much needed attention to Indigenous inequality. Through the increased awareness of Indigenous culture and detrimental effects of colonization resulted from both the National Apology to the Stolen Generations and the Close the Gap initiative, political institutions were able to address the wide variety of issues seen in

Indigenous communities ultimately resulting in some of the most dominant establishments of reconciliation. If it was not for these two landmark examples of reconciliation, it can be argued that some of the most significant forms of political Indigenous inclusion such as the creation of the first Reconciliation Action Plan (RAP) in 2011, the passing of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples Recognition Bill in 2013, and the formation of the Indigenous Advancement Strategy in 2014 would not have been considered.

Government Funding

In contrast to the United States, Australia's funding for Indigenous programs comes from both federal and state budgets rather than just federal budgets, therefore adding up to 6.1% (\$30.3 billion) of the total governmental budget in 2013; 2.8% of the federal budget and 3.3% of state budgets (Commonwealth of Australia: Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision). These numbers obtained from the 2014 Indigenous Expenditure Report states that Indigenous people receive \$22,550 more per person compared to non-Indigenous Australians which is mostly due to the higher demands and costs for services as a result of: 1) "A lower median age which is likely to increase demand for school education", 2) The regional, remote, and very remote locations of Indigenous communities which increases cost of service delivery "due to reduced economies of scale, high transportation costs and higher wages or allowances to attract staff to remote locations", and 3) The significant disadvantage of Indigenous communities resulting in "poorer outcomes against a range of health, education, income" and indicators therefore increasing the demand for government program and services (Commonwealth of Australia: Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision 2-3). As the total Commonwealth, State, and Territory Government expenditure for Indigenous Australians spreads across 159 different expenditure categories including the previously mentioned reasons for demand, it is evident that the government has a purposeful commitment to reconciliation.

While here the government demonstrates their recognition of Indigenous inequality, they did not illustrate this recognition until the 2000s of the present Reconciliation period. They did not give significant funding for the deserved assistance to Indigenous people until 2009 when it

has been reported that the Australian government set aside \$4.8 billion for funding in the federal budget. It is important to remember the relationship between the Australian government and Indigenous peoples prior to the Reconciliation Era in which the policies behind the Stolen Generations were still very much alive. For example, the 1897 Queensland Aboriginal Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Act which both forcibly removed Indigenous peoples from their land and categorized them based on their amount of "Aboriginal blood", therefore initiating the Stolen Generations, was not legally terminated until 1965. As horrible acts of oppression and post-colonization continued only until the very recent past, as Aboriginal peoples were still being forcibly removed from their land into late, acts of reconciliation such as the previously mentioned reports were not able to begin formation until more recent years. These reports of the recent years of the Reconciliation Period not only bring awareness to colonial initiated acts of oppression, but result in increased governmental funding as a result of the published reports. With the majority of reports being published within the past decade or two, it is clear that the government's recognition of their contents led to the awareness of Indigenous inequality and therefore an increase in funding within the same time period.

Comparing the United States and Australia

In terms of Indigenous federal recognition within the political institutions of both the U.S. and Australia, it seems as if federal recognition was given to the Native Americans on a much more inclusive level than that of Indigenous Australians. The differences in federal recognition found between the two bodies seem to revolve around the countries' timeline of Indigenous constitutional recognition and Indigenous self-administration. Within the U.S. Native people were first federally recognized in 1778 within the constitution in addition to the first of 370 treaties approved by the U.S. Senate. Although these treaties were ultimately violated by the U.S. government, they were still treaties that were legally protected by the U.S. Constitution and therefore representative of federal recognition of Native nations. While the U.S. government legally recognized Indigenous nations as early as 1778, only two years after its formation, the Australian federal government did not legally and formally recognize any form of Indigenous body or land until 1992 with the *Mabo v Queensland* decision in which the recognition of Native

title was given to Indigenous people for the first time. In terms of Indigenous constitutional recognition, while Native Americans gained recognition within the initial production and enactment of the U.S. Constitution in 1789, Indigenous Australians have yet to be recognized within the Australian Constitution although they are recognized within three of their states' constitutions.

In addressing self-administration, while the U.S. had its first political body comprised of solely Natives (besides tribal government) in 1944 with the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), Australia did not have a similar form of Indigenous inclusion until 1972 with the Department of Aboriginal Affairs (DAA). As Native Americans went on to produce more self-governed forms of tribal-government starting with the IRA in 1934 into present day, Indigenous Australians went on to establish more bodies of self-administration despite never gaining a form of tribal governance or federal Constitutional Recognition. As Native Americans maintained a form of sovereignty and tribal-governance as a result of the initial treaties formed, they therefore continued to maintain federal recognition and political inclusion throughout colonization despite its destructive effects.

While reconciliation is a separate theme within the representation of Indigenous people within political institutions, it goes hand and hand with federal indigenous recognition due to the federal government's role in reconciliation. In considering the United States' role in reconciliation, it is important to remember that they have illustrated federal recognition in addition to tribal sovereignty and governance since the country's founding. As a result of this, there is both a social and political unconscious conception that Indian Country is entirely independent and does not need the help of the federal government. There is a resulting stereotype they do not need government funding due to their obvious capability of self-governance. While they are certainly experienced as Native people have been successfully running their own governments for centuries prior to colonization, people, both socially and politically, forget that the effects of colonization are still having very real detrimental impacts on Indian Country as seen through their significant inequalities of wellbeing compared to non-Natives. As the government continues to put Indian Country at the bottom of the list of people to assist, as seen through their lack of reconciliation examples and required funding for Native

people, they have this notion that Natives are not a priority even though it is their responsibility for the past and present oppression of Natives not to mention their legal responsibility as outlined in the Constitution.

This notion of Natives as independent due to the presence of federal recognition and tribal governance is important to remember in comparison to that of Australia. As Australia does not have prominent examples of federal recognition and therefore no form of tribal governance, there is a more conceptualized need for reconciliation and funding. Because of Native American's initial inclusion of federal recognition through treaties, reservations were put in place ultimately creating designated land for Natives leading to sovereignty. As Indigenous Australians were never given the opportunity to establish treaties or initiate recognition, they were therefore taken from their homes and not given any designated lands for reservations as seen concerning the Native Americans. As Indigenous Australians were never given reservations and the opportunity for tribal governance, they therefore are more prominently acknowledged by non-Indigenous people and the government as they are not "isolated" on reservations. Although over fifty percent of Native Americans live in urban areas, there is still a very common perception that all Natives live on reservations therefore contributing to their portrayal as "the separated other". Although Native Americans have tribal sovereignty through the three-part system of governance (federal, state, and tribal) while Indigenous Australians do not, they both are experiencing destructive identical effects of colonization as predominantly seen through health issues and quality of living. Due to Indigenous Australians' lack of sovereignty and federal recognition, people both socially and politically contribute more to forms of reconciliation. Having the realization that the Australian government has done nothing to assist Indigenous people in terms of sovereignty or federal recognition results in the desire to increase their support. This awareness began as the result of the reports mentioned addressing issues in Indigenous communities as a result of the lack of federal recognition and tribal governance. As an outcome, one can see the effect that the lack of tribal-governance and recognition have on both Indigenous peoples and the perceptions concerning them. Native Americans have reservations as a result of their early opportunity for sovereignty through treaties. As a result they are perceived by non-Natives as independent and not significantly in need of help therefore demonstrated in their lack

of funding and reconciliation. In addition, the perception of Natives as purely living on reservations illustrates a type of isolated portrayal of them as the “other” and leading non-Natives to distance themselves from Natives both socially and politically as seen through the lack of funding and acts of reconciliation. While Natives are isolated on their reservations while demonstrating their own forms of governance, non-Natives have to remember the oppressive historical political reasons behind the formation of the reservations. Just because they demonstrate sovereignty does not mean that the federal government can now ignore its “obligation... to protect tribal self-governance, tribal lands, assets, resources, and treaty rights” as they clearly *have* been as seen through lack of funding and reconciliation examples.

Ultimately, while the Native Americans have received federal recognition through tribal self-governance and sovereignty within the confines of their own land in addition to their membership in America’s three-part governmental family, Indigenous Australians have received more governmental funding in addition to public awareness in collaboration with a variety of methods of reconciliation. Through this, while Native Americans have benefited from federal recognition by legally having the ability to possess their own land sovereignty, they have also suffered from federal recognition as their resulted independence has contributed to the government’s lack of consideration for reconciliation and additional funding. In contrast, while Indigenous Australians have suffered from their *lack* of federal recognition through their inability to legally self-govern as sovereign nations within the boundaries of their own land, they have also benefited from their lack of federal recognition as it has given them more attention from the government by means of increased funding and acts of reconciliation.

Social Institutions – Population Statistics & Analysis

United States

Of the 308,758,105 total population of people living in the U.S., 5.2 million individuals (or 1.7% of the total U.S. population) identified as American Indian/ Alaska Native in 2010, while 4.8 % identified as Asian, 12.6% as African American, 16.3% as Latino/ Latina, and the remaining as of European descent (Promotions(C2PO). Within Arizona University’s city of Tucson, there are

about 520,116 total residents and about 14,154 (2.3%) of those individuals are Native therefore representing the smallest ethnic/racial population within the city as 2.5% identified as Asian, 4.3% as African American, and 36% as Latino/ Latina. Finally, out of the 42,236 students attending Arizona University, about 517 (1.2%) are Native.

In addition to the early federal recognition of Natives through treaties and tribal governance as previously mentioned, the above population statistics in terms of ethnic groups present within Tucson can be argued to have an effect on the lack of funding and recognition seen in Indian Country. As seen in both the city of Tucson and overall population of the U.S., Native people consist of the smallest population of ethnic minorities within their given area. In terms of the reasoning behind the lack of Native funding and acts of reconciliation seen within America's political institutions, the small percentage of Native people compared to other ethnic minorities may cause the political institutions to place their attention on those with a greater presence. For example, with the higher percentage of African Americans within the U.S. in addition to its history of slavery, the U.S. government has put much of its attention on African American reconciliation therefore raising the possibility of the shift in priority of those in which to support federally. The oppression of African Americans and Latinos/ Latinas is more clearly recognized due to their higher percentage in the overall population and the lack of conceptualized isolation as seen on the reservations. In addition, as these other minorities are not commonly associated with living on reservations as opposed to cities, they are therefore more significantly recognized both socially and politically within the U.S. as colonization has not labeled them as a population that is no longer existing. As a result, energy put into federal funding and reconciliation can therefore be argued as focusing on other, more populated ethnic minorities with a history of oppression.

Comparison to Australia

Out of Australia's 23.13 million people living in the country, about 713,589 (3%) identify as Aboriginal/ Torres Strait Islander (Healthinonet.ecu.edu.au) while about 12% are of Asian descent and the remaining of European descent (Asiancenturyinstitute.com). In JCU's city of Cairns, there are about 145,372 people living there total with about 14,420 (10%) individuals

identifying as Aboriginal/ Torres Strait Islander and about 10.3% of Asian descent. In addition, out of the 2,859 students attending JCU, 114 (4%) identify as Aboriginal/ Torres Strait Islander.

In contrast to the U.S., Australian Indigenous people make up one of the two significant ethnic minority groups in Australia (Indigenous and Asian) which individually have about the same percentage of population. Not only are Indigenous Australians one of only two minority groups, but make up the only minority group that have been immensely oppressed by the government as well. Due this high percentage of population, lack of other minority groups, presence as the only significantly oppressed peoples, and lack of federal recognition and self-governance, the Australian government has therefore most-likely given the majority of their attention including funds and forms of reconciliation to Indigenous peoples.

During my experience in Australia, I noticed the social emphasis on Indigenous people whenever race was brought into context. Having grown up in a very populated area similar to that of Tucson in terms of ethnic minority populations close city proximity, I noticed that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are the most referenced group when addressing issues of race both socially and politically within Australia just as Black and Hispanic people are the most referenced group when addressing issues of race in the United States. This can be seen in both countries during every day social interactions/ conversations as well as through the media in both the news and forms of entertainment. Because of the dominating population of Indigenous people as the only victims of oppression (in terms of political institutions) within Australia, they relate more to those identifying as African American due to their similarity as one of the majority minority populations. African Americans and Indigenous people from Australia both have a high minority population and both are recognized by the Federal government as an oppressed people resulting from government interference such as colonization or slavery. The difference in how Native Americans are portrayed in the U.S. is evident when comparing them to the majority minority. In the U.S., Natives are rarely recognized as an oppressed people because they are overshadowed by the larger minority groups of African Americans and Latin Americans. This difference in recognition results in lack of concern for Native reconciliation and ultimate funding due to both Native presence as the smallest minority population in addition to inaccurate notion of the majority of their population living isolated on reservations.

Relating Educational Institutions to Political and Social Institutions

In first addressing and recognizing the different forms of Indigenous representation both politically and socially within the United States and Australia, we are then able to reconsider the representation of Indigenous people within the educational institutions of both AU and JCU. By reentering the Indigenous representation at the universities into the conversation, we are able to analyze the ways in which the political and social institutions addressed have had an influence and are influencing the educational institutions.

Arizona University

In addressing the influence of America's political institutions on Arizona University, it is important to remember AU's emphasis on academic education and community outreach in addition to the American government's contribution to Indigenous federal recognition and tribal governance as well as their lack of reconciliation and federal funding. AU's emphasis on academic education and community outreach can first be related to the government's lack of federal funding and therefore reconciliation. As acts of reconciliation are in many cases, such as in Australia, a driving force behind governmental funding for Indigenous communities, those acts need to be initiated by political institutions in order for it to have an impact on communities, in this case the community of AU. As all major changes and improvements in local communities begin with political institutions and governmental authority, AU's focus on Native inclusion through education and outreach began with Native political inclusion, or lack thereof.. Due to the government's lack of funding for Indian Country resulting from their lack of reconciliation, there is a greater need for support within these communities.. As previously mentioned, these communities, have significant health, education, poverty, and unemployment issues as a result of the destructive impacts of colonization and ultimate lack of funding. They are greatly in need of additional assistance as the government's attention is not on Indian Country.

In contrast to Australia, the U.S. participated in the majority of Indigenous political inclusion during the 1960s and 1970s through its support for tribal governance and self-determination. In addition to tribal governance, during the same few decades the U.S. supported

and took part in examples of Indigenous political inclusion such as in the National Indian Youth Council (1961), the Alaska Federation of Natives (1966), the American Indian Movement (1968), the Indian Education Act (1972), the International Indian Treaty Council (1974), and the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (1975) (Glogower). As a result of this political era of Native self-determination and political elements of inclusion listed above, UA began to also see elements of Indigenous inclusion in a parallel manner to what was occurring politically. In 1968, Edward P. Dozier started the proposal for the development of a formal American Indian Studies (AIS) Program at UA which was the first of its kind in the U.S.; this was the same year that the self-determination period was set forth within the political world. In 1971, a proposal for the AIS program was administered from the Ford Foundation therefore showing the role that the government played in the establishment of the program, not to mention this occurred a year prior to the 1972 Indian Education Act which “required active participation of Native Americans in the management of their own education system” (Glogower). In 1978, Vine Deloria became the first Director of American Indian Studies at University of Arizona. He advocated and implemented his mission for the program to focus on Native federal law in which the aim was to gain federal assistance for Indian Country. . In this sense, the self-determination period was a time period in which the majority of transitions improved Indian Country and Indigenous inclusion not only in the government, but also in educational institutions such as AU and the AIS program. Deloria’s emphasis on tribal law demonstrates his obvious influence put in place by the governmental inclusion of Natives during the same time period due to their presence as the first decades of real Indigenous inclusion.

Having said this, just because the majority of federal inclusion and tribal governance was produced during the time period of Deloria, does not mean the U.S. government did not have a lack of reconciliation and federal funding. Although the Gerald R. Ford Foundation contributed to UA, the contribution was not only misappropriated, but was from his private foundation as well. While it is true that the contribution of the Ford Foundation gave funding for the AIS program, the grant was terminated in 1976 just five years after it was given; the reasoning was that the funding was being misused to hire *non-Native* faculty and benefit the anthropology department rather than for its true purpose which was to hire *Native* faculty and benefit the AIS

program. In addition to the AIS program, the majority of outreach programs within UA during that time period such as the American Indian Science and Engineering Society (AISES) in 1977 and the American Indian Language Development Institute (AILDI) in 1978 were truly initiated by the university itself and Native people *rather* than directly through a political means. If this does not represent a lack of reconciliation and federal funding, I do not know what does.

The lack of funding and reconciliation during the self-determination period (1960s-1970s) was not only seen in UA, but throughout all Native communities within the U.S. therefore resulting in UA creating programs in which to conduct community outreach. As mentioned, AISES and AILDI were formed at UA during this time period as both a result of increased federal recognition through the establishment of tribal governance and a lack of federal funding and reconciliation. Therefore the university was seen, for example through Deloria's concentration, to focus on both academics emphasizing tribal law and Native support through outreach. Although UA saw benefits during this time period, through federal recognition and tribal governance resulting in the academic educational creation of AIS and focus on tribal sovereignty, the university also saw an increase of outreach programs UA as a result of a lack of political reconciliation and federal funding causing a need of increased support in external Native communities. So ultimately, in terms of the effect of U.S. political Indigenous inclusion on UA, 1) the focus on academic education at UA resulted from the self-determination period's increase in federal recognition and tribal-sovereignty leading to the desire of the AIS program to educate students on how they can contribute to tribal law, and 2) the focus on community outreach at UA resulted from the self-determination period's lack of federal funding and acts of reconciliation leading to an increased need for support externally within communities rather than internally within the university. Benefits of federal recognition were seen during the 1960s-1970s through tribal governance and the creation of the AIS program, yet the recognition has begun to fade today as there are minimal forms of reconciliation and the government *continues* to hold back on their required funding to Indian Country. As a result of this continued lack of governmental attention, UA has increased attention on community outreach and academic education for tribal law in order to fill the gap between the lack of government funding and of Native attention.

James Cook University

In addressing the influence of Indigenous political inclusions on the Indigenous representation at JCU, it is important to remember the university's emphasis on positive cultural awareness and reconciliation in addition to Australia's political demonstration of reconciliation and government funding as well as their historical lack of federal recognition and tribal-governance. Australia's history has ultimately influenced JCU's emphasis on positive cultural awareness and acts of reconciliation. Because the government's inclusion and representation of Indigenous peoples is mostly seen during their Reconciliation period of the late 1990s into the 2000s (for example: the state of Victoria's 2004 Constitutional Recognition of Indigenous People, the 2008 National Apology to the Stolen Generations, and the implementation of the 2007 Close the Gap Campaign) the Indigenous representation at JCU is seen during the same time period. For example, in terms of positive cultural awareness JCU's celebration of days of Indigenous significance did not begin until the 2000s just as reconciliation did not begin until the 2000s. For example, as the National Reconciliation Week was initiated in 1996, so was Reconciliation Week at JCU. In 2008, the National Apology represented positive cultural awareness through the demonstration of Indigenous dancing and music; JCU's reconciliation week includes Indigenous dancing and music as well. Here we can clearly see how positive cultural awareness at the national level influences the local level as seen at JCU.

In addition in terms of reconciliation, it should be no surprise that governmental acts of reconciliation have influenced reconciliation at JCU. For example, just as the 2008 Close the Gap initiative was put into place, so was the Reconciliation Statement established at JCU in 2008. As the Close the Gap initiative emphasized the gap of health, income, and poverty inequality in Indigenous communities, the Reconciliation Statement at JCU led to their holistic support of Indigenous students seen through their establishment of support officers, laboratories, and meeting spaces specifically for Indigenous students. In being aware of the inequalities seen in Indigenous communities as a result of the national reports bringing awareness of the effects of colonization, JCU is therefore *demonstrating* the ways in which to reconcile with the oppression of colonization by internally assisting Indigenous people within JCU. As Australia does not have

their own reservations or federally recognized lands for the government to give support, the support goes directly to the country of Australia through holistic institutions such as schools and therefore JCU. Because of the historical lack of opportunity for Indigenous sovereignty and self-governance, Indigenous people were forced to integrate into the Australian society as best they could, given their oppressive circumstances (as seen through the Stolen Generations). Indigenous people of Australia do not have designated self-governed federally recognized nations, therefore, the government provides funding directly to programs and institutions that provide the support and assistance.

Holistic support of Indigenous people is seen at JCU through positive cultural awareness and reconciliation. The only way for the government's reconciliation policies to be carried out into Indigenous communities is through their focus on institutions such as universities like JCU. JCU's city of Cairns' high population of Indigenous people, will be supported through the awareness and assistance that is developed through the university. Through Indigenous celebration and the reconciliation statement, Australia is therefore carrying out their commitment to reconciliation and through the establishment of National cultural awareness.

Comparing UA and JCU

While UA focuses on supporting Indian Country through educating AIS students on tribal law and community outreach this hands-on approach, does not ultimately demonstrate internal support for the issues in Indian Country. External support puts the focus on Native communities as they are located on designated nations/ lands. In contrast, JCU focuses on support to Indigenous communities through *internally* demonstrating support for Indigenous people as their communities are not located on external nations/ lands but rather right there at the universities. As the U.S. has specific programs/ laws built to support Native nations as explicitly outlined in their constitution, all the funding and support that they are meant to give goes directly to those nations rather any communities outside those nations such as within UA. Because the U.S. government is not giving the obligated funding and support to the Native nations as is written in the U.S. Constitution, there is a vital need for public awareness through educational means such as programs and outreach efforts at UA. In contrast, as there is no explicit form of recognition of

Indigenous people through sovereign tribal nations within Australia, the governmental support is being given through other means such as institutions like JCU. In contrast to the U.S., Indigenous people is the only group of recognized oppressed people within the country. The majority of their support through funding and acts of reconciliation which are clearly seen throughout JCU.

While UA focuses on academic education and community outreach through external concentration, JCU focuses on positive cultural awareness and acts of reconciliation through internal concentration. These differences are due to both the historical and present differences demonstrated by America's and Australia's differences in Indigenous political and societal inclusion. While the majority of America's Indigenous inclusion began in the 1960s and 1970s, the majority of Australia's indigenous inclusion began in the 1990s'-today. Due to this difference in time period of Indigenous inclusion, the U.S. has politically seemed to have forgotten about their committed support for Natives as they clearly outlined in the U.S. Constitution and their formation of tribal-governance in the 1930s-1970s. In contrast, as Australia's commitment to Indigenous support was recognized much more recently than in the U.S., as seen through the 2008 National Apology and the 2007 Close the Gap Campaign, there is therefore much more current attention placed on Indigenous Australian reconciliation than on Native American reconciliation in both political and therefore educational institutions. As JCU really focuses on internally supporting Indigenous Australians as they have just recently become aware of the importance of it as demonstrated by their government and politics UA focuses more on externally supporting Natives because of the lack of recent governmental support in Native nations. Because Australian society was made aware of the issues seen in Indigenous communities as well as of the importance of Indigenous recognition, JCU has increasingly demonstrated their commitment to supporting Indigenous inclusion. Such commitment is seen on their websites statement of Indigenous recognition as well as a wide range of holistic representation of Indigenous culture and support through facilities and days of celebration.

Works Cited

- Bennett, Bindi. "The Importance of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander History For Social Work Students And Graduates". *Our Voices: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Work*. Bindi Bennett et al. 1st ed. South Yarra: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013. Print.
- Aildi.arizona.edu,. "Welcome To AILDI | AILDI - American Indian Language Development Institute". Web. 19 Jan. 2016.
- Ais.arizona.edu,. "American Indian Studies Mission | American Indian Studies". Web. 19 Jan. 2016.
- Asiancenturyinstitute.com,. "Asian Century Institute - Asian Migration to Australia". N.p., 2016. Web. 19 Jan. 2016.
- Commonwealth of Australia: Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision,. *2014 Indigenous Expenditure Report*. Canberra: N.p., 2014. Web. 19 Jan. 2016.
- "Constitutional Recognition of Indigenous Australians". Law Council of Australia, 2011. Print.
- Cornell, Stephen. "Remaking the Tools of Governance: Colonial Legacies, Indigenous Solutions". *Native American Voices*. Susan Lobo, Steve Talbot and Traci L. Morris. 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 2010. Print.
- Glogower, Ari. "The Indian Education Act of 1972". Mississippi Teacher Corps, 2005. Print.
- Healthinfonet.ecu.edu.au,. "What Details Do We Know About The Indigenous Population? Â« Health Faqs Â« Health Facts Â« Australian Indigenous Healthinfonet". Web. 19 Jan. 2016.
- Jcu.edu.au,. "Home - JCU Australia". Web. 19 Jan. 2016.
- Jcu.edu.au,. "National Reconciliation Week at JCU - JCU Australia". Web. 19 Jan. 2016.
- Jcu.edu.au,. "Reconciliation at JCU - JCU Australia". Web. 19 Jan. 2016.
- Korff, Jens. "Aboriginal History Timeline (2000 - Today)". *Creative Spirits*. Web. 19 Jan. 2016.

Korff, Jens. "Aboriginal Representative Bodies". *Creative Spirits*. N.p., 2015. Web. 19 Jan. 2016.

National Congress of American Indians (NCAI). *Tribal Nations and the United States*.
Washington D.C.: N.p., 2015. Print.

Promotions (C2PO), Center. "2010 Census Data - 2010 Census". *Census.gov*. Web. 19 Jan. 2016.

Trahant, Mark. "Congress Would Strip Millions of Dollars from the Indian Health System".
Indian Country Today Media Network.com. N.p., 2015. Web. 8. Dec. 2015.

Uacc.arizona.edu. "The Partnership for Native American Cancer Prevention (NACP) | The
University Of Arizona Cancer Center". Web. 19 Jan. 2016.

Williams, Caroline. "American Indian Studies at the University Of Arizona - An Extended
History". University of Arizona, 2009. Print.

