

# Lesson 7: Changes & Upheaval in Mni Sóta Maḵoḵe: Treaties, Loss, and Exile, Pt. 1

**Main Idea:** The Daḵota have a significant and sovereign connection to Mni Sóta Maḵoḵe that changed drastically because of United States governmental policies.

## **Essential Questions:**

- How did treaties between the United States and the Daḵota in Mni Sóta Maḵoḵe affect Daḵota relationships to the land?
- How did *Mni Sóta Maḵoḵe* become Minnesota?

## **Learning Goals (Students will know that):**

- Treaties are agreements made between sovereign nations.
- The terms of U.S. and Daḵota treaties were unfair to the Daḵota tribes and drastically diminished Daḵota access to the land of Mni Sóta Maḵoḵe.
- Treaties resulted in loss of land, and circumstances that led to eventual exile, for the Daḵota people.

## **Students Will Be Able To:**

- Describe how the Daḵota worldview influenced how they understood and participated in treaty-making.
- Identify how treaties interrupted Daḵota relationships with one another and with Mni Sóta Maḵoḵe.

## **Student Tasks:**

Review Treaty Timeline

Complete worksheet of 1851 treaty text analysis

## **Assessment Tools:**

1851 Treaty analysis

Treaty research (optional/additional)

## **Main Lesson Activities** (all times are suggested as a guide):

1. Review Daḵota place names and Daḵota sovereignty – 5 min
2. Introduction to Colonization & Treaties – 20 min
3. Analysis of 1851 Treaty Language – 20 min

## **Prior Knowledge Activated:**

Lessons 1-6

Possible familiarity with American Indian history in Minnesota, such as the treaty period, 1862, reservations, relocation, assimilation, boarding schools, etc.

## 7.1 In the Classroom

Learner Resources	Teacher Materials
<p><b>Media Resources:</b> Login by clicking Login button or going to: <a href="http://dakotawicohan.org/my-account/">http://dakotawicohan.org/my-account/</a> - <b>Username:</b> DW - <b>Password:</b> dakota123 Then go to: <a href="http://dakotawicohan.org/lessons/lesson-7-changes-upheaval-in-mni-sota-makoce-treaties-loss-and-exile-pt-1/">http://dakotawicohan.org/lessons/lesson-7-changes-upheaval-in-mni-sota-makoce-treaties-loss-and-exile-pt-1/</a></p> <p><b>Daḳota Community Interviews:</b> n/a</p> <p><b>Daḳota language in this lesson:</b> - <b>mitakuye owas’iṅ</b> – <i>all my relations; we are all relatives</i> - <b>Mni Sóta Maḳoce</b> - <i>land where the waters reflect the skies</i></p>	<p><b>Handouts:</b> - Treaty Timeline - 1851 Treaty Analysis worksheet</p> <p><b>Vocabulary:</b> (add to ongoing wall chart or student notebooks) - <b>colonialism:</b> <i>the system of a more powerful nation ruling other nations or countries from a distance and turning them into their colonies for economic benefit</i> - <b>colonization:</b> <i>the process by which a nation takes control of another nation’s land, resources, and people</i> - <b>treaty:</b> <i>a legal agreement made between two sovereign nations</i> - <b>cede:</b> <i>to give away or agree to hand over</i> - <b>reservation:</b> <i>an area of land defined by treaties where Indians can live and more or less control the land its laws</i> - <b>Ojibwe:</b> <i>American Indians who have lived in Mni Sóta Maḳoce a long time and who have several reservations in Minnesota; also known as Anishinaabe or Chippewa.</i></p> <p><b>MN 6<sup>th</sup> grade Social Studies Standards Alignment:</b> 6.4.4.18.2 Analyze how and why the United States and the Daḳota and Anishinaabe negotiated treaties; describe the consequences of treaties on the Anishinaabe, Daḳota and settlers in the upper Mississippi River region. (Expansion and Reform: 1792-1861).</p>

## Recommended Additional Reading for Instructors

- *Summary of an Era of Change & Loss*, Teresa Peterson
- *Documents of United States Indian Policy*, Prucha
- *Mni Sóta Maŋoŋe: The Land of the Dakota*, Chapter 4
- *Speaking of Indians*, Part 3, pp 75-135

## Other Instructional Materials

- map of indigenous peoples in North America pre-colonization (resource tbd).
- Minnesota interactive treaty map: <http://www.usDakotawar.org/history/treaties/minnesota-treaty-interactive>
- More on treaties: <http://treatiesmatter.org/treaties/land>
- Database of all Indian treaties: <http://digital.library.okstate.edu/kappler/vol2/toc.htm>
- Topics about Minnesota: <http://www.mnopedia.org/>
- *Between Fences, pt. 1*: <http://humanitieslearning.org/resource/resourceDetails.cfm?id=1315>

## Northern Lights Connections

- Chapter 6: The Land Changes Hands
- Maps: Major Land Cessions of American Indians (Map.03);
- Modern Ojibwe Reservations and Dakota Communities (Map.04) (pp. 502-03);
- Chapter 7: Minnesota's Newcomers (digital 7.11-7.12; print pp. 131-32)

## 7.2 Review Dakota Place Names and Dakota Sovereignty

Ask students to answer using classroom map and their notes/worksheet as a reference:

- What are some Dakota place names you learned about in the last lesson?
- How do we know that the Dakota are a sovereign people?

If students do not recall previous lessons, then you can prompt them or review using the following:

*Dakota people, having lived on this land for thousands of years, continue to operate their own governments as sovereign nations even while also being citizens of Minnesota and the United States. The Dakota have a historic and cultural connection to Mni Sóta Maŋoŋe—the Dakota homelands. They also have a spiritual connection to the land that we can see expressed in the worldview of Mitakuye Owasiŋ.*

Review the historical, cultural, and political significance of the Dakota in Minnesota: (refer students to the classroom poster of these terms, if posted)

- **Historical Significance:** The Dakota have lived in Minnesota longer than any other community in the state.
- **Cultural Significance:** The Dakota language is Minnesota's first language.
- **Political Significance:** Each Dakota tribe is a sovereign nation.

## 7.3 Introduction to Colonization & Treaties

Review main idea, essential questions, learning goals and any vocabulary for the day.

For Teacher	For Students	Additional/Optional
<p><i>The more recent story of Mni Sóta Maḵoce is tied up with the history of European and American settler colonialism in North America. Colonialism describes the system of a more powerful nation ruling other nations or countries from a distance and turning them into their colonies so that they can use the land and its resources for their own economic benefit. Settler colonization is when people (settlers) move onto land held by indigenous people with the intention to take control of the land and stay. This is what happened in Minnesota. The Dakota were removed from the land so that settlers could use it. Settler colonization is about owning the land, viewing the land as property—not relating to it as a relative.</i></p>	<p><b>What have you already learned about colonization?</b></p>	<p>Be prepared as necessary to review what students already know about how the United States was founded and westward expansion.</p> <p>Show them a map of indigenous peoples in North America pre-colonization (resource tbd).</p> <p>Ask students if they know why English is used in formal and legal documents of the United States.</p> <p>Ask students if they know of other examples of colonization such as the British in India or the French in Africa, or the Spanish in South and Central America.</p>

For Teacher	For Students	Additional/Optional
<p><i>Colonization is not just about taking control of land and resources. In order to justify taking control of a place and people, and committing violence against them, colonizers dehumanize the indigenous people to some degree. We talked about dehumanization in an earlier lesson and how it prevents people from seeing each other as fully human. In the case of the Dakota, their language, their spirituality, and their physical well being were all constantly under threat once settlers, missionaries, and government officials moved into Mni Sóta Makoce. Being a good relative to the land and to each other was increasingly difficult for the Dakota when they were less able to hunt and fish or gather food, when their language and lifeways were devalued by American missionaries and teachers, or when they were being killed or pushed off the land they knew.</i></p>	<p><b>What do you know about what happens when two very different cultures meet?</b></p> <p><b>What sort of interactions do people have? Peaceful? Violent? Both? Something else?</b></p>	<p>Note: This topic is very broad and has a lot of depth to it—more than this lesson truly allows. You know your students best in terms of what they need to know to fully grasp the rest of the lesson’s content.</p> <p>The main idea that students need in order to put the Dakota and U.S. relationship in context is that for awhile the two nations related largely as equals. And sometimes indigenous people were even relied on by the early colonizers. Then, when the U.S. needed and wanted more land and resources, the balance of power tipped and the U.S. began to construct the Dakota as less than human in order to justify taking away their land and their way of life.</p>

For Teacher	For Students	Additional/Optional
<p><i>Keep in mind that the Dakota way of life continued uninterrupted for a very long time here in Minnesota. When the Europeans arrived in this part of North America in the 1600s they were colonizers who introduced new goods and trade networks to many indigenous tribes and nations, including the Dakota, but lived and traded with the indigenous people more or less peacefully. However, beginning in 1805, the U.S. government's colonization efforts intensified and significantly changed the Dakota way of life. More settlers were coming to Mni Sóta Maḵoḱe to stay. 1805 marks the beginning of the treaty period in Minnesota.</i></p>	<p><b>What do you know already about the fur trade in Minnesota? Or early European explorers in North America?</b></p>	<p>Some students may have studied this history previously; many won't. But for some, recalling it may provide further historical context.</p>

## 7.4 Why Treaties Matter

For Teacher	For Students	Additional/Optional
<p><i>The website “Why Treaties Matter” gives us this definition of what a treaty is and why they matter even now to the Dakota and Ojibwe people who live in Minnesota: Treaties are nation-to-nation agreements among sovereign entities – political groups with the ability to set rules for their own communities, determine their own membership, care for their own territory, and enter agreements with other sovereign entities. The sovereignty of Dakota and Ojibwe people – recognized with that of other American Indian groups in the U.S Constitution – is not a product of the U.S. political system. It existed before the U.S. existed, it was retained in part through treaties, it exists today.</i></p> <p><a href="http://treatiesmatter.org/treaties">http://treatiesmatter.org/treaties</a></p>	<p><b>Does anyone know what a treaty is?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Add “treaty” to ongoing vocabulary notebook or wall chart.</li></ul>





For Teacher	For Students	Additional/Optional
<p><i>The treaties between the Dakota and the United States government were unfair to the Dakota and were written to give the European Americans who lived in Mni Sóta Maḵoḱe almost unlimited access to the land and its resources.</i></p> <p>Share with students this general timeline of the treaties that the U.S. government made with Dakota tribes in Mni Sóta Maḵoḱe. Please note: This timeline does not include the treaties with the Ojibwe. For more detailed information see this interactive map which also includes current Dakota and Ojibwe reservation locations and boundaries:</p> <p><a href="http://www.usDakotawar.org/history/treaties/minnesota-treaty-interactive">http://www.usDakotawar.org/history/treaties/minnesota-treaty-interactive</a>.</p>	<p><b>Compare the Ojibwe and Dakota reservations to each other.</b></p> <p><b>What do you notice about the size and location of the different reservations?</b></p>	<p>If they do not see it clearly, point out to students how visible the Ojibwe reservations are in comparison to Dakota ones, which are so small they show up as dots on the map. Also, the Dakota reservations are located in the southern part of the state.</p> <p>Take a minute to ponder how small an area legally “belongs” to the Dakota now as compared with the huge area that they consider their homelands.</p> <p>Another resource to consider: <a href="http://treatiesmatter.org/treaties/land">http://treatiesmatter.org/treaties/land</a></p>

For Teacher	For Students	Additional/Optional
	<p><b>What do you think about when you imagine the land on which you live now once was the home of the Dakota and/or the Ojibwe people? Does it change at all how you feel about it?</b></p>	<p>Additional treaty research: Have students in pairs or small groups identify a specific treaty that includes where they live in Minnesota now, or that includes the land of a place they like to visit or is special to them in Minnesota. This might include treaties that the U.S. made with the Ojibwe too.</p> <p>Ask them to read the actual text. Have them present the terms and conditions of the treaty to the rest of the class. Ask them to consider how this treaty affects where and how American Indians and whites lived and even live now in Minnesota.</p> <p>If desired, you can have them respond more personally about how having more knowledge about treaties in Minnesota affects (or doesn't) their relationship to this place we all call home.</p> <p><b>Research Sites:</b> - <a href="http://treatiesmatter.org/treaties">http://treatiesmatter.org/treaties</a> - <a href="http://www.usDakotawar.org/history/treaties/minnesota-treaty-interactive">http://www.usDakotawar.org/history/treaties/minnesota-treaty-interactive</a> <a href="http://www.mnopedia.org/">http://www.mnopedia.org/</a> (search under the topic of "American Indian") - <a href="http://digital.library.okstate.edu/kappler/vol2/toc.htm">http://digital.library.okstate.edu/kappler/vol2/toc.htm</a> (searchable online database of all Indian treaties that the U.S. made)</p>

## 7.5 Treaty Timeline with the Dakota in Mni Sóta Maŋoce

**1805** U.S. government made an agreement to buy land where the Mississippi and Minnesota Rivers meet to build a fort and trading post (what is now Fort Snelling). However, this treaty was never ratified, or made official, by the U.S. Senate.

**1825** This treaty made boundaries permanent that were previously more fluid when tribes interacted with each other around land and territory. The U. S. government signed this treaty with the Dakota, the Ojibwe, and other tribes to set boundaries among the tribes. The U.S. said they wanted to establish these boundaries so the tribes would not fight each other. But as with all treaties, the U.S. gained an advantage and used the new boundaries to get land from the tribes specified in the treaty. So even though, in this treaty, the Dakota people did not sign away land, they lost land because this treaty assigned previously held Dakota lands to other tribes.

**1830** A treaty called the "Half Breed Tract" that set aside land along the Mississippi River for mixed blood Dakota people.

**1837** The Dakota and Ojibwe both signed treaties with the U.S. government this year that ended up ceding, or giving away, their rights to big areas of their land. The U.S. government promised to pay the Dakota lots of money when the treaty was signed and into the future, but as with many treaties, the money ended up in the pockets of the American and European fur traders who said they were owed money from the Indians.

**1851** In these two important treaties, the Dakota lost most of their land to the U.S. government, keeping a small strip of land on either side of the Minnesota River, about 20 miles wide. In return the Dakota were promised almost \$4million. However, very little of that money was ever paid to the Dakota.

**1858** Shortly after Minnesota became a state, under significant pressure, the Dakota people signed a treaty that ceded part of their small reservation to the U.S. government. They now had a 10 mile-wide strip of land along the southern side of the Minnesota River to call home. Even within this small piece of land, settlers moved in to claim part of it for themselves.

**1862** In summer of 1862, crops fail and annuity payments owed to Dakota are late and Dakota people are starving. Fighting breaks out between the Dakota and white settlers (The U.S.-Dakota War of 1862), and the U.S. government declares that all the treaties they had signed with the Dakota are no longer valid. The Dakota are driven out of Minnesota and forced to live in Nebraska, Canada, and further west in what is now North and South Dakota.

## 7.6 Analysis of 1851 Treaty Language

For Teacher	For Students	Additional/Optional
<p><i>You might be wondering why the Dakota people agreed to these treaties and sold so much of their land. Didn't they understand how much they were ceding? Why didn't they get more money or resources or power out of the deal? Why didn't they fight back before 1862?</i></p> <p><i>The answers to these questions are complicated and there is no single answer. But one way to understand the complex history of the Dakota and U. S. government is to look more closely at the Dakota worldview that we have studied, mitakuye owas'in, and how that worldview influenced how the Dakota understood the terms of the treaties that they signed.</i></p>	<p>Turn and talk to someone next to you and try to respond to these questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Didn't the Dakota understand how much land and resources they were giving up?</b></li> <li>• <b>Why didn't they get more money or resources or power out of the deal?</b></li> <li>• <b>Why didn't they fight back before 1862?</b></li> </ul> <p><b>What does mitakuye owas'in mean?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students can also respond individually in their notebooks or as part of a larger class discussion.</li> </ul> <p>Mitakuye owas'in means "all my relatives." For the Dakota, who viewed the U.S. government as an equal sovereign power, <i>mitakuye owas'in</i> meant that they also viewed the U.S. government and its officials as their relatives.</p>

For Teacher	For Students	Additional/Optional
<p><i>Remember that mitakuye owas'iny means "all my relatives." For the Dakota, kinship ties are the most important way that people connect to each other, to the land, and all that is part of the land. To be a good Dakota person is to be a good friend and ally, and to be responsible for the well-being of all of one's relatives. They even think of the land as a relative.</i></p> <p><i>Think about this way of understanding relationships in the context of treaty-making, which are legal documents about who owns and controls land and resources. Consider what you have learned so far about the Dakota culture and language.</i></p>	<p>If students watch the video, ask them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>How did you think or feel about fences before you watched the video?</b></li> <li>• <b>After watching this video, what new associations or feelings about what fences mean (if any)?</b></li> </ul>	<p><i>If you have time, have students view "Between Fences, pt. 1" a short video (6:27) in which Ojibwe and Dakota people talk about the meaning of fences as boundaries and how fences disrupt connections to the land.</i></p> <p><b>Link to video:</b>  <a href="http://humanitieslearning.org/resource/resourceDetails.cfm?id=1315">http://humanitieslearning.org/resource/resourceDetails.cfm?id=1315</a></p>

For Teacher	For Students	Additional/Optional
<p>Ask students to respond to these two questions:</p> <p><i>As we saw in the treaty timelines, the 1851 treaties, including the Mendota Treaty and the Traverse des Sioux Treaty, were the ones where the Dakota ceded most of their land in Mni Sóta to the U.S. government. Let's take a look at how the Traverse des Sioux treaty language was translated into Dakota from English.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>How do you think the Dakota viewed European Americans and the U.S government officials with whom they interacted? As friends? family? enemies?</b></li> <li>• <b>How would you compare the way that the U.S. government viewed the land of Mni Sóta to the way that Dakota viewed the land?</b></li> </ul>	<p><i>There is no one right answer to either of these questions. Prompt students to consider all possibilities. And remind students, there is no such thing as one single Dakota viewpoint. But we can make generalizations about different cultures as a way of understanding better what connects us and what separates us from each other.</i></p>

## 7.7 1851 Traverse des Sioux Treaty Analysis Worksheet

Read these translations aloud or silently. Pay attention to the two different versions in English. The first English version is the formal treaty language written in 1851. The second English version was translated in 2012 (in Mni Sóta Maḵoḵe: The Land of the Daḵota) from the 1851 Daḵota translation. This gives us a clue as to how the Daḵota read and understood the treaty.

### **English Language From Treaty, Article One, 1851:**

*It is stipulated and solemnly agreed that the peace and friendship now so happily existing between the United States and the aforesaid bands of Indians, shall be perpetual.*

In 1851, Stephen Riggs, a missionary, translated the English into Daḵota.

### **Daḵota Language From Treaty, Article One, 1851:**

*Isantanka Oyate qa Daḵota Warpetonwan qa Sisitonwan ewicakiyapi kin hena okiciciyapi qa odakonkiciyapi kin ohinniyan detanhan cantekiciyuzapi kta e nakaha awicakehan wakiconzapi qa yuxtanpi.*

### **Language Translated From Daḵota From Treaty, Article One, 2012:**

*The people of the United States and the Wahpeton and Sisseton Daḵota people, those named, help each other and are allied with each other, earlier this day they purposefully resolved and concluded forever from this time to hold each other's hearts.*

### **Answer these questions:**

1. What is different and what is the same about the tone and the length of the two versions in English?
2. What feelings do you see in the different versions?
3. What do you notice about how the different versions describe relationship?

Relating to representatives of the government as relatives was a way for the Daḵota to see the United States through the lens of mitakuye owas'inq. But there's a big difference between the language of the treaty and how the Daḵota were actually treated. Keep in mind that most interactions between the U.S. government and its officials and the Daḵota were oral—they talked to one another. When it came time to write things down the language got more legal and specific, and the true nature of what they were signing was not always clear to the Daḵota or to other tribes.

## 7.8 Background Reading for Instructors

These readings provide additional information on the Dakota experience during an era of change and upheaval in Minnesota.

1. **Summary of an Era of Change & Loss, Teresa Peterson**
2. **Documents of United States Indian Policy, Prucha**
3. **Mni Sóta Maḵoḱe: The Land of the Dakota (Westerman and White), Chapter 4**
4. **Speaking of Indians, Part 3, pp 75-135**

### 1 Summary of an Era of Change & Loss

Our Minnesota and American history includes story of colonialism and imperialism that is often unspoken. Smith (1999) provides an explanation why this story is an important juncture, “The talk about the colonial past is embedded in our political discourses, our humour, poetry, music, storytelling and other common sense ways of passing on both a narrative of history and an attitude about history” (p 19). We must know this story in order to make sense of our past, present and future realities.

During early contact, the U.S. government, negotiated treaties for land cessions, peace agreements and other agreements with tribes, including with the Dakota nation. While many of the treaties are questionable in legality and fulfillment, the first identified treaty with the Dakota was in 1805, or more commonly, the Pike Treaty, to consequently build Fort Snelling. Subsequent treaties for most of the Dakota lands continued with the Dakota Oyate (nation) up until the final Dakota treaty of 1858, made one month after Minnesota became a state. This final treaty resulted in losing the strip of land north of the Minnesota River, requiring the Dakota to live on annuity payments and farming. The summer of 1862, with poor crops, late annuity payments and starving Dakota, led to the U.S. – Dakota War of 1862. It resulted in a horrific forced march, the largest mass hanging in U.S. history, imprisonment and exile of Dakota men, women and children. The Dakota were now removed from the state of Minnesota, nevertheless, additional wars, massacres, killings and government bounties on the Dakota nation occurred farther west. Subsequently, Dakota reservations were established outside of Mni Sóta Maḵoḱe into Canada, Montana, North Dakota and South Dakota. Now as wards of the United States, Indian people were left belonging to a system that was foreign, and a misalignment of values and worldview (Zitkala-Sa, 2003). The Oceti Šakowiŋ (seven council fires, seven bands of Dakota) that once made up the great Sioux nation was no longer the strong political force it once was. The systemic removal and relocation from homelands were in fact detrimental to the oyate (nation, community) structure of the Dakota people.



Beginning with the Dawes Act in 1887, allotment of lands became another government political policy and maneuver to take control of more Indian lands. The allotment of 160 acre sections were granted to heads of household, with excess lands sold for settlement to non-Indians. This specific assimilation and land-grab policy dismantled the tiospaye (extended families) structure of the Dakota people. While Christianity was already introduced in the 1830s, first established near Fort Snelling, Christianity, along with government farming programs were more forcibly pressed as assimilation policies among the Dakota people. The antithesis role of missionaries and Christianity, resulted in illegalizing the practice of sacred ceremonies among the Dakota people, which furthered the breakdown of the tiospaye (Zitkala-Sa, 2003). The government policies affected a way of life, including gender roles (for example, European cultures are primarily male-centered, whereas, Dakota culture is maternal), spiritual practices, traditional subsistence methods, including hunting were all replaced with a completely different way of life and values.

During this same era, boarding schools were introduced to further the assimilation of Indian people and specifically resulted in the break-up of tiwahe (family). Children as young as four and five years old were required to attend boarding schools, often times, clear across the United States, making it difficult for families to visit and of which, children were often denied visits home (Child, 1999). Unfortunately, the onset of Indian education in the late 1800s was oppressively defined and headlined as, "Kill the Indian, save the man," by Richard Henry Pratt, introducing the educational paradigm from which Indian boarding schools carried out the education of Indian students (Child, 1999). This early education centered around assimilating American Indian people in every aspect of their life, including socially, mentally, physically, spiritually and of course educationally. Boarding schools, supported by the 1891 Compulsory Attendance Law for Indian children, forced or coerced American Indian families to give up their children for a life that was most often geographically distant and foreign. Strayhorn (2012) explains that severing our supportive relationships with members of our own cultures, is called cultural suicide, of which he further expounds, leads to academic failure (p 33). The paternalistic education policy was disguised as good intentions, when in fact its underlying motives were political and economic in nature. The primary tool of assimilation was the introduction of English only as the medium for all communication and was often physically, and certainly negatively enforced, causing trauma that has carried forward to current generations (Lambert 2008). The boarding school era set the stage for an engrained negative experience with a formalized American education and has had devastating and lasting effects on American Indian people, families and community. Boarding schools survived several decades beyond the recognition of their devastating effects, as outlined in the 1928 report, "The Problem of Indian Administration", most commonly referred to as the Meriam Report (Meriam et al, 1928). Within this report, the U.S. government began recognizing the past and current policies as ineffective and having devastating outcomes on American Indian people.

Unfortunately, U. S. policies systematically broke up the kinship structures of the Dakota people, beginning with the oyate during the treaty and reservation era, the

tiospaye, during the allotment era and the tiwahe, during the boarding school era. The destruction of Dakota kinship structures is the destruction of the very foundation of sense of belonging.

During the end of the 19th century and early 20th century, some Dakota people, longing for home, returned to Mni Sóta and began purchasing back their homelands. In an effort to correct devastating federal Indian policies, under President Roosevelt, the 1934 Indian Reorganization Act was signed. In Minnesota, this resulted in establishing small Dakota communities through the purchasing of small lands (some of which had already been purchased by Dakota people). In 1938, the Upper Sioux Community was established with 746 acres. Three other Dakota communities were established; Lower Sioux Community, Prairie Island Indian Community and later Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community. While the Minnesota Dakota communities were safe from termination, the Termination Era lasted from 1945 to 1961, where 109 other tribes were terminated in another effort to assimilate American Indian people.

It became clear that termination was not a successful policy and with the civil rights issues emerging, American Indian people made their mark in the world as well. In fact, the American Indian political force organized in Minnesota as the American Indian Movement (AIM), which, resulted in the passage of the Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968, Indian Education Act of 1972, the Self Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975, and the Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978, as the most-notable. The federal government acknowledged the lack of control by tribal nations for the education of Indian students through the 1969 Senate report, A National Tragedy – a National Challenge (Senate Special Subcommittee on Indian Education Report, 1969). The report called for the correction of historic and paternalistic policies and practices.

The era of self-determination continues today, whereby tribes and Indian people are determining their own future, including constitutional reform and boldly exercising tribal sovereignty. However, the challenges left in the wake of the U.S. government's paternalistic policies continue to haunt tribes today. Tribes and Indian communities are confronted with recovering language loss, land loss, disenfranchisement of relatives, a mismatch of values within tribal governance, the loss of resources and loss of other tribal assets that contributed to the resilience of Indian people. It is important to note the Indian communities and families, including the Dakota people have found courageous ways to persist, adapt, and resist the effects of colonization. True, Dakota people have experienced a great era of disruption – a disruption of their Dakota ways of life. However the truth is that Dakota people have survived, a true testament to the strength and resilience found in those who have and continue to persist, adapt, and resist. –by Teresa Peterson