Leveraging Hybridity: Alfonso Ortiz as Native American, Activist, and Anthropologist

*Julian Ibarra**

Department of Anthropology, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ

https://doi.org/10.33697/ajur.2025.153

*Student: julianibarra@princeton.edu**
Mentor: jhimpele@princeton.edu

ABSTRACT

Two major efforts by Indigenous scholars include advocating for Indigenous sovereignty and theorizing relation-building with non-Indigenous people. As attempts are made to indigenize the academy, can inspiration be drawn from past Indigenous scholars who were ahead of their time in a dual commitment to both goals? This paper focuses on Alfonso Ortiz, a former Native American scholar, activist, and anthropologist. Exploring his archival collection, held at Princeton University, lends insight into his hybrid positionality in higher education. Seeking to unravel the way Ortiz mediates between institutions, epistemologies, and people, a thematic analysis of archival materials unravels three forms of hybridity: Native-educational, institutional-activist, and anthropologist-activist. Ortiz's case shows that hybridity is not a roadblock to Native American priorities; on the contrary, hybridity provides tools for agentive action carried out on behalf of Native American communities. More importantly, the implications of each form of hybridity raise new questions for non-Indigenous institutions and individuals, which may need to rethink their purposes as they are called into relation with Indigenous students, faculty, and communities.

KEYWORDS

Indigeneity; Hybridity; Alfonso Ortiz; Relationality; Sovereignty; Native American Studies; Archival Analysis; Agency

INTRODUCTION

What does it mean to indigenize higher education? Any answer to this question must begin by recognizing the broader settler colonial context faced by Indigenous peoples. Patrick Wolfe describes settler colonialism as involving a persistent attempt by settlers to eradicate and replace Indigenous peoples from a particular territory.[1] Assimilation is a key tool used to achieve the settler colonial vision; in the United States context, assimilation has involved the forcible, violent incorporation of Native Americans into the nation state through mechanisms such as boarding schools.[1] More recently, in the higher educational context, assimilation entails the inclusion but continued domination of Indigenous epistemologies and values by Western universities. For Devon Mihesuah and Angela Wilson, this is a particularly insidious issue as "the academy has much invested in maintaining control over who defines knowledge, who has access to knowledge, and who produces knowledge."[2] Likewise, observing that "academic institutions create the attitudes and beliefs that sustain imperial relations," Taiaiake Alfred highlights the urgency of scrutinizing the epistemological commitments of higher education.[3]

Indigenous sovereignty confronts assimilation and the larger eliminatory goal of settler colonialism; although it can be defined in many ways, one definition is the "self-governance or the right of [I]ndigenous peoples to maintain their unique forms of social, political, and cultural integrity."[4] For Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, indigenizing higher education means re-centering this goal of Indigenous sovereignty in Native American Studies (NAS) programs;[5] for others, such

as Mihesuah and Wilson, the indigenizing movement must assert Indigenous sovereignty across academia more broadly, addressing many issues and contexts such as the relationship between Native students' knowledge and Western academic knowledge or the institutional privileging of Western epistemologies by the university.[2] In supporting Indigenous sovereignty, the goal is not to subsume Indigenous knowledges into Western institutions in the name of "diversity," but to elevate Indigenous epistemologies to co-equal status and center Native voices in the academy. Kim TallBear writes about the incompatibility of Indigenous "incorporation *into* a (liberal) settler worldview"[6] further explained by Bryan Brayboy, who notes that Indigenous peoples embody both racial *and* political identities.[7] Indigenizing education must therefore focus less on inclusive multiculturalism—which may be useful for empowering racial, but not political minorities—and more on Indigenous autonomy. Moreover, those interested in indigenizing education must be wary of critical theory intending to empower people by gender ("whitestream" feminism) or class (Marxism), which Sandy Grande describes in *Red Pedagogy*.[8] These theories oppose Indigenous sovereignty on multiple grounds: first by advocating incorporation into a democratic settler state, and second by consigning Indigenous cosmologies to a primitive and necessarily past stage of human development.[9]

Yet, many of the same Indigenous scholars who advocate Indigenous sovereignty also acknowledge the need for relationality with non-Indigenous people. For example, rather than incorporating Native peoples into the nation-state, TallBear proposes "making kin," so that Indigenous peoples "can call non-Indigenous people ... to be more accountable to Indigenous lifeways."[10] Grande thinks about Indigenous to non-Indigenous relationality by hoping to "situate groups in relation (not in binary opposition) to each other, thereby avoiding ... the subsequent impulse to act or behave oppositionally."[11] Binary discursive distinctions between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, such as "us" versus "them," are particularly damaging, Sharilyn Calliou points out, for perpetuating settler colonial cosmologies.[12] In the higher education context, what does it mean to advocate Indigenous sovereignty while also relating to or—as will be more directly explored here—coming into contact with non-Indigenous institutions, epistemologies, and people?

I am interested in analyzing this contact across three different contexts. First is the non-urban Native community context, from which thousands of Native American youth can be estimated to leave to attend American higher educational institutions.[13, 14] What is the relevance of Western ways of knowing to a Native community? Does Western knowledge have to replace Indigenous knowledge, as in many English as a Second Language models? Are past understandings lost in the acquisition of new content? Or might Native communities take advantage of Western knowledge to better understand the social power dynamics that they face? Second, there is the context of the Western institution, which is important as there are approximately 3,300 Native American faculty employed by American universities.[15] How does an Indigenous scholar navigate the demands of their employer while remaining committed to Native interests? Are there ways that the Western institutional platform may be used for Indigenous activist ends? Finally, there is the classroom context. Can disciplines known to have historical ties to colonialism be used for Native American activism?[16] What is the role of NAS programs primarily serving non-Native American students, such as the American Indian Studies major at South Dakota State University reported to be "almost 90 percent white"[17] or the Native American and Indigenous Studies Initiative at Princeton University, where only two percent of the entire student body self-reports as Native American, Native Alaskan, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander?[18] Can non-Native students be taught about epistemic violence, a phenomenon that disparages Native students' ways of knowing?[19] Literature has explored how to indigenize the classroom for Indigenous students,[20–22] but little work has examined how Indigenous teachers can effectively challenge non-Indigenous students about their epistemologies. And for the many non-Native instructors teaching Native Studies topics, it is also worth considering what sort of relations they might foster between Native Studies content and non-Native students.

To answer these questions about contact across the three different contexts, I explore the archival materials of Alfonso Ortiz, whose career was defined by his hybridity, serving at once as an anthropologist, Native activist, professor, and member of the San Juan Pueblo. A member of Princeton University's Department of Anthropology from 1967 to 1974, Ortiz advocated for the recruitment of Native American students and was chairman of the First Convocation

of Native American Scholars (henceforth "Convocation"), held on the Princeton campus in 1970.[23] He authored *The Tewa World* (1969), *New Perspectives on the Pueblos* (1972), and edited *Handbook of North American Indians*; among the many titles he held include President of the Association on American Indian Affairs, member of the Newberry Library Advisory Council, and consultant to the National Endowment of the Humanities.[24] Before Princeton, he taught at the Claremont Colleges for a year; in 1974, he moved from Princeton to the University of New Mexico (UNM), where he remained until his death in 1997.[25] He described himself as a "cultural anthropologist of structural persuasion," teaching symbolic and structural theory courses as well as courses on Native Americans and their related stereotypes.[26]

In my analysis, I use 'hybridity' to describe the quality of multiple positionalities or an engagement with multiple spheres. In his speech to the American Anthropological Association's 1970 session titled "Anthropology and the American Indian," Ortiz does not use the word 'hybridity,' but he does speak about his multiple affiliations as activist and anthropologist: "I have taken a position in the middle, fully aware of the dangers of being shot at from both sides."[27] My use of the hybridity concept draws on Kirin Narayan's perspective that an anthropologist is part of both a research culture and daily culture,[28] and Lila Abu-Lughod's presentation of her personal hybridity as anthropologist, reflecting on the process of pregnancy in Egypt and the United States.[29] Hybridity is also used by anthropologist Néstor García Canclini; he studies "the abrupt opposition between the traditional and the modern" in Latin American societies and the cultural formations that emerge from it.[30] Notably, some scholars outside of anthropology have discussed the concept of "two-eyed seeing," that is, "learning to see from one eye with the strengths of Indigenous ways of knowing and from the other eye with the strengths of Western ways of knowing."[31] While aspects of two-eyed seeing are certainly relevant to Ortiz's life, hybridity allows this project to remain grounded in Ortiz's agency, not just his knowledge. In other words, the object of analysis in this paper is not so much what Ortiz can know as it is what he can do.

In reading Ortiz's archival materials, it is clear that his hybridity allows him to interface with Western interests, relations, and epistemologies without assimilating into them. I show how hybridity can be leveraged to empower, rather than attenuate, efforts towards indigenizing higher education in the Native community, Western institutional, and classroom contexts.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The Alfonso Ortiz Papers (AOP) is a set of over 80 boxes containing research notes, correspondence, newspaper clippings, reports, and teaching materials housed at the Princeton University Library's Special Collections. The current research began with my exploration of archival materials specifically related to Ortiz's involvement with the Convocation, as part of the Princeton Department of Anthropology's attempt to recover its own history for its 50th anniversary celebration. At the same time, I brought a personal interest in the anthropology of education. This subfield of anthropology appraises the cultural dimensions of education in a broad sense, so the focus is not only youth in traditional schools but also, for example, members of civic engagement programs and faculty at colleges or universities.[32, 33] Participant observation dominates as the primary methodology for educational anthropologists, and I believed that the AOP was a ripe opportunity to inject archival insights to the field.

I ultimately completed a first pass through all 83 AOP boxes. During this stage, I noted any folders containing materials relevant to Ortiz's teaching, perspectives on Native American Studies, or the Convocation (held at Princeton). In a second pass, I put aside any of the noted folders containing materials without Ortiz's (or his students') own words. The remaining 59 folders constituted the corpus of materials analyzed for the project.

In the second pass, I took "fieldnotes" of the contents in the corpus folders. On the one hand, this process involved distilling what Elsie Rockwell calls "the material culture, graphic representations, and sensory and emotional milieu of schools" in the syllabi, lecture notes, Convocation correspondence, and other materials.[34] What sort of epistemic work was visible in the materiality of the AOP? What were the affective dimensions of Ortiz's work embodied in the archive? On the other hand, this work moved beyond analyzing individual document properties, instead following

the suggested methods of John and Jean Comaroff and, later, Hervé Varenne, synthesizing interconnections to distill themes from the corpus as a whole and the context constructing it.[35, 36] Following the second pass, I analyzed my fieldnotes alongside select digital scans of the corpus materials. Taking events described in documents as "ethnographic scenes," this was the point when I began organizing materials thematically given the insight they provided about hybridity. When necessary, I revisited the materials for a third pass.

Throughout the planning, archival analysis, and writing of this research, I often reflected on my positionality as a non-Indigenous researcher. As an Asian American, I have had firsthand experience with issues of race in the United States, and having grown up in Honolulu, I am familiar with aspects of Native Hawaiian history and cultural context. These experiences support my ability to empathize with Indigenous communities. However, I acknowledge that the Native Hawaiian context cannot be read metonymically for Indigenous communities writ large, and that Asian Americans occupy a position in Hawai'i that has relied upon settler colonialism.[37] Linda Tuhiwai Smith says that Indigenous people want "to determine priorities, to bring to the centre those issues of [their] own choosing, and to discuss them amongst [themselves]."[38] In light of this view, I entered the research process affirming that my work be in dialogue with—rather than privileged above—existing Indigenous scholars' perspectives. My goal here as a non-Indigenous researcher is to focus on the exploratory nature of the project, and I highlight themes emerging from Ortiz's work that may inform how to better serve Indigenous communities as well as non-Indigenous students. Recognizing that certain themes may have struck me particularly due to my positionality, such as those that resonated with my previous understanding of Native Hawaiian history or experience in education as an Asian American, I ground my discussion below in Ortiz's words as much as possible to leave room for additional insights emerging from a reader's own interpretation. At the end, I synthesize my results but consider the goal of this paper to be an impetus for further discussion.

A note about terms: I use 'Indigenous' in relation to broader discussions of indigenizing the academy and Indigenous peoples' common goal of sovereignty. I also use 'Native' to describe Indigenous peoples and contexts—not only in America, or else I say 'Native American'—including Ortiz's context. I only use 'Indian' when quoting Ortiz from his archival materials.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Native context

A key issue for Native youth at Western universities is the question of their pre-existing Indigenous knowledge. Ray Barnhardt and Oscar Kawagley write that "Native people may need to understand Western society, but not at the expense of what they already know and the way they have come to know it."[39] How can Ortiz's work inform how Native youth come into relation with Western institutions and remain committed to Native knowledges and priorities?

In this section, I draw upon Ortiz's typewritten notes that read as an outline for a speech to Pueblo youth.[40] This ethnographic scene is complemented by Ortiz's perspectives voiced in three other materials: a transcript of a panel discussion at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) to consider a master's degree program in Native American Studies,[41] a set of questions for the steering committee of the Convocation,[42] and a letter to a Native elder.[43] Simultaneously a Tewa community member and Western educated scholar, Ortiz has what I call "Native-educational hybridity." Taken together, the materials in this section show his confidence in this hybridity as a productive tool for Native American communities. I begin by briefly discussing Ortiz's own Native-educational hybridity before turning to his conceptualization of this form of hybridity, presented in his advocacy of it to Pueblo youth.

Ortiz was born to a Hispanic mother and Tewa father but was raised primarily by his grandmother, Saya, in Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo, then known by the colonial name 'San Juan Pueblo.'[44] Ortiz left his Pueblo to pursue a bachelor's degree in sociology at the University of New Mexico (obtained in 1961), and later, a master's degree (obtained in 1963) and doctorate (obtained in 1967) in anthropology at the University of Chicago.[45] Bryan Brayboy describes the concept of transformational resistance as "the acquisition of credentials and skills for the empowerment and liberation

of American Indian communities."[46] In many ways, Ortiz's educational and career trajectory is an example of Brayboy's concept par excellence: via exposure to resources and the credentialism of Western educational institutions, Ortiz was empowered to serve his Pueblo (or perhaps Native American groups of the Southwest more broadly, through eventual scholarship and activist efforts). To be sure, the Native community is not only where Ortiz spent his childhood, but a place with which he maintained strong connections and to which he returned frequently. These connections are evident in the letter he writes while considering a position at Stanford, as he describes the "strongly-expressed wish of New Mexico Indian leaders that I be right here at hand in order to continue our mutual involvement in several projects."[47] Reflecting on his return from the East Coast to New Mexico, he describes it as his family's "13-year-old wish" finally fulfilled in 1974.[24]

In his speech to Pueblo youth, Ortiz advocates Native-educational hybridity, saying, "You owe it to yourselves and to your people, if you have special talents, to develop these talents to the highest degree so tha[t] you can put them to use on behalf of your people."[40] Such advocacy resonates with the writing of Vine Deloria Jr. on "new Indians" who face pressures from the academy to disengage from their communities while their communities simultaneously expect maintained engagement.[48] Deloria challenges young Native scholars to push back against these pressures from the academy and to remain connected to Native communities.[48] Likewise, Ortiz believes the youth have a responsibility to Pueblo members in not only horizontal (contemporary) relations, but vertical (generational) relations, too. In the speech, he ponders the question: "What is the ultimate value of a man's life?" He says that the youth are "links—the latest links—in an unbroken chain which stretches back in time for thousands of years" and asks listeners to reject any thought that "history began on the day [they] were born."[40]

Further rejection of individualism in Native-educational hybridity appears in the UCLA panel transcript. Ortiz is concerned that a potential master's program might be used as an "identity certification ... for Indian students whose identity crisis hit a little late."[41] An advocate of a longer, more rigorous doctoral program, he fears that the master's degree "can be a way of or used as an excuse for some urban-born and raised Indian students to use as a chan[c]e to affirm their ties and find their ways back to their communities ... hence [it] is an identity certification process ... which may not have much of an enduring impact on the quality of Indian existence now and in the future."[41] Whereas Ortiz encourages Pueblo Natives' educational attainment rooted in Pueblo identity and goals of service, he sees the potential master's degree credentialism of urban Natives as superficial and unsustainable. I recognize that Ortiz's comments here may be disparaging towards displaced Natives. One way of understanding Ortiz's words is through the lens of lateral violence, which involves "intra-racial abuse" amongst members of historically oppressed populations, such as Indigenous groups.[49] Crucially, lateral violence is produced by a combination of factors, including ongoing identity work in a settler colonial situation and disappearing traditional epistemologies.[50] This tie to broader structural violence is important to avoid painting Ortiz as intentionally harmful, even if his comments are damaging. Moreover, having acknowledged that lateral violence is at play, I still wish to emphasize Ortiz's point about rootedness in communal rationalities. To Ortiz, a university education is valuable for the potential benefit to the Native community, not the individual degree-seeking student. This observation underlines how Native-educational hybridity prioritizes rather than weakens collective Indigenous goals, and a similar finding about rationalities surfaces in the other two hybridity contexts.

As tools, educational credentials are not replacements for Native community wisdom. Ortiz makes this clear in his letter to friend Rolling Thunder, whom he asks to speak to his students in a letter: "They need to know of traditional wisdom such as that which speaks through you, to help guide their lives in better directions than they understand now. I know of such wisdom but do not have it myself as [of] yet."[43] Despite his possession of a doctorate, Ortiz feels lacking in traditional Native wisdom, something reinforced by another comment he makes in his speech outline. To Ortiz, Native elders do not have the same credentials supplied by Western academic institutions, yet they have credentials "in how to be Indian," which he respects because the elders "carry the knowledge of many thousands of years."[40] Similarly, Western higher education is not, by itself, a solution to Native issues, according to the archival documents. Writing about emergent higher education Native leadership programs, Ortiz says, "Leadership is already there in all Indian

communities ... [but community members] must have the opportunity to develop certain managerial-technical skills to understand and interpret the complex maze of federal programs now hitting them from all sides."[42] Western educational credentials, Ortiz implies, are valuable for their use with concrete purposes; in his speech, Ortiz believes that the uneducated "will not know how to defend our ways against enemies they do not understand."[40] Of course, without a grasp of what "our ways" are, a Western-educated individual has nothing to defend; this echoes Brayboy's conceptualization of Natives' "knowledge of survival" being a combination of both academic (Western institutional) and Native cultural knowledges.[51]

In sum, Ortiz believes that Native-educational hybridity is not counterproductive to Native American goals; on the contrary, he finds it a productive tool to be leveraged, so long as the 'Native' dimension is the impetus for engaging with Western educational institutions. As scholars such as Bryan Brayboy, Jessica Solyom, and Angelina Castagno call on institutions "to rethink ... what it means to be responsible to and for Indigenous peoples,"[52] it is important for universities to think of Indigenous students not simply as enrolled pupils but as community representatives with the potential to use their educational credentials for tribal empowerment. At the University of New Mexico, for example, Native American Studies programs have offered Native American students "the learning channels for directing their education and applying their knowledge in community-centered ways."[53]

The institutional context

Deloria says that in his day, close to the time Ortiz was at Princeton, "we were not recruited as scholars but as high-profile Indians."[54] Hiring policies have evolved since the period Deloria describes, but many of the questions applicable to Ortiz's situation at Princeton remain pertinent today: How can Indigenous scholars remain committed to Indigenous—rather than Western—priorities when employed in Western institutional contexts? Are all hopes of activism undermined by Indigenous faculty members' relations with their employing institution, or can a job at a Western university and potent Indigenous activism coexist?

During Ortiz's tenure at Princeton, he held simultaneous Princeton and Native American activist affiliations, which resulted in what I term "institutional-activist hybridity." This hybridity is clearly visible in the planning of the First Convocation of Native American Scholars, so the archival materials analyzed here revolve around that scene. The event itself took place on the Princeton campus between March 23rd and 26th, 1970, bringing what a press release says were "192 of this nation's outstanding leaders in education, the sciences, the arts, and humanities."[55] I begin by analyzing how Ortiz's institutional-activist hybridity manifests before turning to the generative capacities of this hybridity.

As a member of the Princeton community, there is a clear tension between Ortiz's activist stance and his responsibility to the university. In the "Call for a Convocation," he asks Native American scholars to be the ones who "take the lead in formulating clear-cut stands and goals."[56] In the absence of Native American students at Princeton, he expresses his thoughts in a letter to a man interested in the Convocation: "I started agitating on this front almost as soon as my feet touched the ground here more than two years ago ... when we get applications, you may be made to feel sure that I will be breathing hot and heavy over the shoulders of the admissions officers."[57] At the same time, though, throughout the planning of the Convocation, he serves as a primary liaison for Princeton to the American Indian Historical Society (AIHS) planning the event. He emphasizes to steering committee members the need for obedience to Princeton's expectations, saying, for instance, that accommodating twelve members of the Princeton community "is not a request; it is a statement of fact because this is the way the University operates."[58] After the conclusion of the Convocation, despite his fellow activist and president of the AIHS Rupert Costo's criticisms of Princeton personnel disrespecting Native American agency and commandeering the event,[59] Ortiz remains at the university until his departure for the University of New Mexico in 1974.

Ortiz's simultaneous positionality as Princeton professor and Native American activist can be read as an accommodation that benefits Ortiz, to use Stephanie Masta's concept.[60] Initially deploying the term to describe "the decision to

adopt some practices or values for the benefit it provides the [Native] student,"[61] Masta gives varied examples of accommodation used by Native students in a predominantly white school. These include actively identifying as Native, demonstrating affability to white peers, and falsifying information to white peers when teased.[60] In Ortiz's case, the notion of accommodation is not applied to a student, but rather a Native American scholar. Indeed, in correspondence with Rupert Costo, Ortiz stresses identification with Princeton and the beneficial security provided to him by the university: "My contribution as well as that of the others here must be seen as a Princeton contribution ... Princeton pays all of my bills, and when all is said and done I have to account for my existence here."[62]

Although affirming his responsibility to Princeton could, on the one hand, be read as submission to institutional power, it could also be seen as Ortiz's affirmation of a platform for continuing Native activism. Sherry Ortner, a peer of Ortiz in graduate school and a visitor at Princeton from 1969 to 1970, has proposed the manifestation of agency in two related forms: power and projects.[63] For subaltern peoples, she says, agency-via-power is often overt resistance, while agency-via-projects need not be.[63] Ortner gives the example of Tswana women who both directly resist cultural inculcation to passivity (agency-via-power) and embrace the Methodist cause (agency-via-projects).[63] Through respect for institutional rules, Ortiz gives himself opportunities for the expression of agency-via-projects, which for Ortiz is his scholarly activism in the larger movement for Native American sovereignty. This latter interpretation of the institutional identification with Princeton is better understood when considering the broader institutional-activist hybridity of the Convocation leveraged by activists such as Ortiz.

Writing the "Call for a Convocation," Ortiz writes that "the leadership and authority of the American Indian in all fields affecting our history, culture, economic improvement and social development must be asserted if any progress is to be attained for our people."[56] Clearly, the Convocation was a scholar-activist event. At the same time, the planning process took careful consideration of Princeton's interests, and of course, Ortiz takes his work and identity as a scholar as seriously as anything else. Ortiz, for instance, says in the aforementioned correspondence to Costo: "We simply don't want the University to get a black eye with its students and with reasonable men everywhere because of some outsider's personal jealousies and prejudices. We are scholars and educators here, not polemicists or politicians and we would like to keep it that way."[62] The "Call for a Convocation" emphasizes Native American sovereignty, but it also stresses the event's relevance for non-Native American "friends."[56]

The Convocation's institutional-activist hybridity produced an accommodation: a performance. The planners of the event took great pains to ensure how the Convocation would be perceived. In Ortiz's letter to the steering committee, he says, "We should like to go on record as believing that we like to hear from people who disagree with our views, because we learn from them."[58] Likewise, in Ortiz's letter to musician Louis Ballard, he says, "What we will not do ... is to gather ... so that ... the media can watch us kill one another off because of misunderstandings. Many non-Indians undoubtedly expect us to do this because it would reinforce their stereotypical view that we Indians cannot work together."[64] Again, while the Convocation's performativity and concern for outsiders' views may be considered a constraint on Native American agency, viewing the event as a beneficial accommodation underscores how it enacts agency-via-projects.

For example, in the "Call for a Convocation," Ortiz emphasizes how the event is an opportunity for the articulation of Native American leadership: "Especially lacking is the reasoned and disciplined voice of Indian scholars speaking in concert to the grand issues before our people and before the nation."[56] Rupert Costo, like Ortiz, sees the value of the event in training young Native American voices, asserting this in a letter: "We must dredge up and make articulate ... our best students, not alone for purposes of Convocation attendance, but to give them some sense of responsibility and bolster up their endurance in the current situation."[65] Critically, not only is the Native voice put to work, but non-Native American peoples are made to listen. As Ortiz states in the "Call for a Convocation": "Many people in this country, especially the young, look to the long-suffering but enduring Indian for inspiration and guidance ... People, not only in this country but elsewhere in the world, are listening for the voice of the American Indian."[56] Planning

documents show the wide range of non-Native American invitees, including those from organizations such as the National Education Association, the Donner Foundation, and the New York Times.[66] The presence of these entities is an act of political solidarity, echoing Deloria's point that "contacts at the higher levels of university administration, within the professional journals, or at competing universities" serve as protection for Native scholars' interests;[67] the hybridity of the Convocation manifests itself in part through these relationships with non-Natives. The setting of the Convocation, where so many non-Natives can be called into relation with Native American activists as listeners, is precisely where the potency of articulate Native voices can have a large impact. Accommodation through performance is an exercise of self-determination that counts, because there is a stake (listeners' impressions) involved.

In this way, Ortiz leveraged his institutional-activist hybridity to make possible an event—the Convocation—that was marked by its own institutional-activist hybridity. Like Native-educational hybridity, institutional-activist hybridity was not used for individual, but rather communal, gain. Returning to Deloria's statement that in his day, universities recruited Native American personnel "as high-profile Indians,"[54] in Ortiz's case, he certainly did not work for the sole purpose of enhancing his profile. Instead, Ortiz put his institutional affiliation to use so that a Convocation could be held at Princeton and address pressing political, legal, and social concerns of Native Americans.

The classroom context

In the classroom, Ortiz was simultaneously positioned as a Native activist and anthropology professor; I refer to this as his "anthropologist-activist hybridity." As evidenced by an assortment of course materials, this hybridity has two manifestations; indeed, the word "anthropologist" in the term refers to two distinct positions. The first is Ortiz's position between the anthropological *discipline* (and its knowledge) and Native American activism. The second is Ortiz's position between being an anthropology *professor* to mainly non-Native American students and Native American activism.

In regard to the first position, Deloria's *Custer Died for Your Sins* criticizes how anthropology determines others' truth and identity, uses cultural difference between whites and Native Americans to explain contemporary issues, and constructs theories and abstractions about Native peoples;[68] the book is emblematic of more widespread wariness of anthropologists by some Native Americans. Underlying Deloria's criticisms is a conflict between Native American knowledges and Western knowledge. How can anthropologists support Native American goals when anthropological knowledge is derived from Western ways of thinking? In addition to Native American individuals such as Deloria criticizing anthropology, Ortiz himself is, at times, critical of anthropologists, too. He laments anthropology's "25-hour-a-day practitioners and the utter irrelevance of so much anthropological research,"[69] and, in course notes for his 1973 course, "People and Cultures of Native North America," feels that "anthropologists ... have, knowingly or unknowingly, boxed us into categories which ... misrepresent, but often demean and debase the actual Indian cultures they purport to describe and analyze."[70] Despite the criticisms of anthropology by many Native activists and Ortiz's own admission of some anthropological problems, he believes in anthropology, particularly because he sees individual anthropologists as empowered to develop and utilize their own flavor of anthropology. In his presentation at the 1970 American Anthropological Association's (AAA) "Anthropology and the American Indian" conference, he argues that anthropology "can be abused, but it can also be used humanely and ethically, as well as scientifically. This depends on the individual and the personalities of anthropologists are as diverse as those of any other random academic category."[71] He refuses to lump all anthropologists together, believing that "those of us who do not come from the land of cultural background which fosters this [Western] attitude can reject categorically in our own work the neo-colonialist underpinnings and trappings."[72] Such logic aligns with Brayboy's feeling that Western-deriving knowledge can still be practiced in the classroom if it is applied for Indigenous ends.[7] Furthermore, with respect to the practice of anthropology today, the discipline continues to evolve as newer anthropologists work to refine their epistemological commitments.[73, 74]

The second hybrid position arises from Ortiz's unusual circumstances when examined through the lens of Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. In his work, Freire distinguishes between oppressors and the oppressed, the latter of which have the sole capacity (and responsibility) to take charge in liberation.[75] In this context, Freire advocates a

dialogic, problem-posing teaching (where the teacher learns as much as his or her students) over a "banking" style of teaching; the former style results in liberation via education.[75] While a Freirean pedagogy might seem useful for a historically oppressed (through settler colonialism) population, it is not necessarily the case. Julie Kaomea, for instance, has studied elementary students' Hawaiian studies presentations on Hawaiian culture and takes issue with the student-centered approach, finding teachers to be complicit in students' colonial imaginaries of Hawaiians and their corresponding stereotypes.[76] Célèste Kee and Davin Carr-Chellman, in their investigation of Freirean approaches to Indigenous literacy in Canada, stress how a Freirean intervention "too easily operationalizes liberation as a universal concept that can be lived-out in the same way for all people in all places, ignoring the idiosyncrasies of liberation in diverse contexts."[77] In fact, the context of Ortiz's pedagogy is quite different from Freire's context, which centered the peasant class as the oppressed.[75] Ortiz's case has him as the oppressed (a Native American scholar) teaching the oppressors (primarily non-Native American students who are settlers on Native American lands). How can a Native scholar teach non-Native students in ways that further Native goals?

Through an analysis of archival materials, I will show how anthropologist-activist hybridity is productive for Native American goals in a predominantly white classroom context. By deploying anthropological knowledge in a subversive way and by practicing a pedagogy of provocation—which I identify as neither aligned with nor diametrically opposed to the stewardship of learning explained by Freire—Ortiz leverages anthropology for Native American activism.

The practice of anthropology

A comparison between Ortiz's approach to assigning authors for anthropological theory courses versus Native American Studies courses reveals major differences. In various reading lists for theory courses, primarily symbolic and structural, Ortiz draws upon traditionally canonical scholars including Lévi-Strauss, Turner, Geertz, Gluckman, Douglas, Rappaport, and Sahlins.[78–80] In notes for Native American courses he taught in 1973 ("People and Cultures of Native North America") and 1996 ("The North American Indian"), respectively, Ortiz sometimes omits anthropological texts, maintaining that he is "not anti-anthro but pro-Indian" and stressing the course aim of "learn[ing] about Indian cultures directly + Indian experiences directly ... [so the] readings focus on authentic Indian experience, rather than only on anthro interpretations of those experiences—distinction critical."[70, 81] This contrast suggests that Ortiz finds anthropological ways of thinking rather than obedience to canonical texts to be most important in his courses pertaining to Native Americans.

What are these anthropological ways of thinking utilized by Ortiz in teaching predominantly non-Native American students? A review of archival materials highlights Ortiz's belief in anthropology as a lens for viewing cultural diversity, in turn breaking down stereotypes, aligning neatly with Grande's hope that essentialist views of Indigenous peoples (leading to binary oppositions with non-Indigenous peoples) be eradicated.[8] For instance, in his 1968 syllabus for "Peoples and Cultures of the American Southwest," he outlines one course goal as understanding "the main axes of diversity among the Indian and Hispanic cultures of the southwestern United States and Mexico."[82] Or, in notes introducing his 1973 course "People and Cultures of Native North America" to students, he writes that "the term Indian is yours, and in proceeding from the arbitrary lumping denoted by that term there is a tendency to believe that there is a single Indian culture. This is not so ... I hope you develop a sense for the subtleties of Indian cultures, and a healthy respect for the tremendous divergences found therein."[70] Specific approaches, such as requiring each student to adopt, research, and present about a particular tribe,[83] or focusing on contrasts between distinct tribes, such as the Hopi and Navajo,[84] are a manifestation of this goal towards seeing Native multiplicity.

Many of Ortiz's courses derive from his research on major Native stereotypes that served particular purposes throughout American history. To Ortiz, anthropology offers the arena to understand power, that is, "how stereotyping shaped the nature of the encounter between white and red."[85] In doing so, students can "look at historical and contemporary Indian stereotypes and, hopefully, get beyond them."[85] Resonating with the earlier point about anthropology as an ever-evolving discipline, Ortiz also asks students to criticize older anthropological texts for their ethnocentrism. His

notes say, "As you read some of these grand generalizations and sweeping characterizations of whole peoples ask yourselves this question: Could these characterizations of whole people be true, or am I looking at a tidy and convenient system of Western categories overlaid on these cultures. Don't adopt a nihilistic attitude, please, but please do distrust familiarity of characterization when you find it."[86] One might wonder, of course, to what extent Ortiz's attention to diversity as a way of destabilizing a monolithic stereotype was a sensibility derived from his own hybridity. Ortiz's Native-educational and institutional-activist hybridity are important factors in his pedagogical decisions; by standing in front of non-Native students to teach, he is destabilizing a stereotype himself.

Ortiz's pedagogy is a form of cultural mediation, to draw on Terrence Turner's use of the term in a different context.[87] Through his teaching, Ortiz is converting his position as a researcher in the anthropological discipline into an instrument of Native American advocacy and sovereignty; in this way, he achieves anthropologist-activist hybridity. Furthermore, the cultural mediation concept underscores the way Ortiz's teaching reflects his responsibilities to the broader Native American community. Ortiz must be read as a community representative who professes anthropology, not a Western scholar solely interested in his own career.

A pedagogy of provocation

How does Ortiz espouse a pedagogy of provocation in relation to his students, and how is this productive for a Native American agenda? At the risk of obscuring the varied manifestations of this pedagogy, I use the term "provocation" to capture Ortiz's frankness and his intention to stir students to reflect. It is precisely the fact that this provocation is directed at non-Natives by a Native instructor that defines anthropologist-activist hybridity here.

One particular moment of provocation is in Ortiz's comments on two student papers from his 1972 Princeton course, "Native Peoples and Cultures of North America." The paper prompt is to compare John Neihardt's *Black Elk Speaks* and Peter Farb's *Man's Rise to Civilization*, and to consider weaknesses of each approach as well as raise further questions.[88] One student's paper finds deficiencies in Farb's work; reviewing Black Elk Speaks, the student says, "One of the only ways a non-Indian can learn about and come to understand Indian wisdom is through the Indian oral tradition ... Black Elk's words have meaning because he is Indian and because he has great personal wisdom ... Farb outlines the skeleton of Indian culture, Black Elk adds the flesh and blood and makes it live."[89] Ortiz approves of the paper but writes, "The distinction is also that between a true man of knowledge (Black Elk) and a pimp (Farb)."[89]

Another student's paper criticizes both Man's Rise to Civilization and Black Elk Speaks as "neither ... tries to understand the inner workings of persons from different cultures; neither ... searches further than his own culture for explanations."[90] Ortiz comments (as before) that he thinks Black Elk is "true knowledge" and Farb is "a pimp."[90] He tells the student, "You demonstrate here a piercing critical and analytical acumen; this assures you of successes in any competition and company around here, but you should also think about the hard questions of knowledge—knowledge for what? For whom? How can one avoid pimping for someone else in the pursuit of knowledge?"[90] These interactions, where Ortiz provides feedback to students, are a useful example of the provocation Ortiz produces in guiding students. As papers, both students' works can be read as intertextual translations in dialogue with Ortiz's course content and the works of Farb and Neihardt; additionally, the students certainly bring their own predispositions (towards anthropology and Native American studies) with them. Ortiz's comments, however—although they do not change the outcome of either paper—advocate a particular interpretation of Black Elk and Farb; in his comments to the second student, specifically, Ortiz distills epistemological questions for his pupil. Ortiz's students are afforded the space to develop their own responses, but this does not preclude Ortiz from being firm in his guidance of their thinking; hybridity is once again enacted through these generative Native to non-Native encounters.

There is also evidence that Ortiz seeks to optimize his limited opportunity to shape the thinking of his non-Native American pupils. In the aforementioned transcript from the UCLA panel discussion on a proposed American Indian Studies master's degree program, Ortiz emphasizes that a common Western view is to seek "objective truth" by dis-

tancing oneself from the past: "The further removed it is, the better it is."[41] In criticism of this perspective, he feels that the past can become dangerously obscure, to the point where "it's so far away, so receded, that it's too late ... We haven't got time to wait that long."[41] The (potentially subjective) interpretations that Native American scholars have to offer, in other words, are well worth sharing in the present, even if they don't fit the standards of Western objectivity. Ortiz also focuses on his limited time as professor in preparation for a temporary teaching role at Colorado College, explaining his capabilities and closing a letter by saying: "This is how you can best utilize me and my presence there for a block."[91] Perhaps a fully Freirean, dialogic approach to pedagogy is ideal, but Ortiz lacks time. A pedagogy of provocation makes good use of this time and enables Ortiz to carry out the larger project of Native American self-determination, which perpetuates Native American knowledges.

What becomes of provocation? Another interaction between a UNM student and Ortiz, captured in a 1990 letter, suggests an answer. Learning similar topics in Ortiz's course as the aforementioned students, this student says, "I certainly never thought of myself as a person who carrys [sic] around biases but obviously, after the discussion of the Farb book this morning, I have much to learn about me."[92] He goes on to write, "Hopefully, this will help me to become more aware of what I need to know about the past and inevitably, the present."[92] This scene suggests the fruitful outcome of class discussions under Ortiz's purview: transformative learning that Jack Mezirow advocates, where "learners become aware and critical of their own and others' assumptions."[93] Moreover, the student suggests that the morning class session may have triggered emotions of surprise and guilt, aligning with Megan Boler and Michalinos Zembylas' pedagogy of discomfort, where "by closely examining emotional reactions and responses ... one begins to identify unconscious privileges as well as invisible ways in which one complies with dominant ideology."[94]

Still, Ortiz's provocations are compatible with students' own synthesis of course content; Ortiz may not embrace a truly Freirean pedagogy, but he isn't anti-dialogic, either. While some examinations focus on content recall,[95, 96] epitomizing the anti-Freirean "banking scheme," others ask students to think for themselves. A 1975 final exam question for Ortiz's "Indian/White Relations" course reads, "Why, by your reading of Brown's book, supplemented by class discussions, was the stereotype not based on a tribe from the Southwest or Northwest or from some other region?"[97] Or, in a 1980 final exam question for "The North American Indian" at UNM, Ortiz writes: "It has been argued in class that N. Scott Momaday presents an authentic Kiowa tribal experience in his book, *The Way to Rainy Mountain*. It has also been argued that the book represents a good 'bridge' between Indian traditional knowledge and history. If you agree that both assertions are true, what evidence can you bring to bear to prove that each is, indeed, true? ... If you would like to argue against both assertions above, please feel free to do so."[98] A pedagogy of provocation is not meant to be wholly didactic; instead, it serves as a guide and an impetus for reflection, and through it, students are called into relation not only with Ortiz (as their professor) but with broader Native American thought. It is not only that Ortiz practices hybridity in his anthropologist-activist encounter with non-Native pupils, but that pupils also begin to develop a hybrid position in newfound association with Native communities, of which Ortiz is a representative.

In summary, Ortiz leverages anthropologist-activist hybridity to—with the discipline of anthropology—subvert hegemonic notions of Native Americans and—when teaching with a pedagogy of provocation—guide and challenge individual students' knowledge, at times stirring uncomfortable but beneficial self-reflections. Ortiz has the agency to practice a pedagogy of his choice, so while anthropology is a Western discipline, Native American goals remain front and center. A commitment to these communal goals—as is shown when reading Ortiz's pedagogy as a form of cultural mediation instantiating relations with the Native American community—goes far beyond any individual rationalities.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper has focused on hybridity—a positionality emerging from Indigenous peoples' contact with non-Indigenous institutions, epistemologies, and people—in higher education. Moving across the Native community, institutional, and classroom contexts of Alfonso Ortiz's career has revealed the productive—rather than detrimental—potential of hybridity for indigenizing education. A key theme across each of the contexts examined might be called "leveraging." In the

Native community context, Ortiz encourages Western university credentials to be leveraged; in the institutional context, a Western university's power, resources, and stage are leveraged; and in the classroom context, Western ways of thinking that subvert stereotypes and an opportunity to confront non-Native American students are leveraged.

What I do not wish to show is a dependency: it is not that Indigenous priorities *rely on* an interaction with non-Indigenous institutions, epistemologies, and people to be productive. On the contrary, I have been interested in how Indigenous priorities might remain prioritized when a Native student attends a predominantly non-Native college, a Native activist finds a job at a Western institution, and a Native scholar finds himself in front of non-Native students as a practitioner of a discipline with Western origins. Additionally, while hybridity enables individual actors' agency, in Ortiz's case, the coupling of this agency with communal rationalities (rather than individual ones) makes hybridity productive for Indigenous goals.

An analysis of hybridity is important as Indigenous scholars continue to think about relationality; Ortiz's hybridity raises questions for "making kin"[10, 99] or "situat[ing] groups in relation"[13] in higher education settings. If Native-educational hybridity produces tools for Native community empowerment, how might universities come to terms with the fact that, in the service of Native students, the knowledge they provide is but complementary to the wealth of Native knowledge the students receive at home? If institutional-activist hybridity produces a platform for Native American activism, how can NAS programs, especially those based in predominantly white institutions, better design themselves as conduits for Native American activism? And if anthropologist-activist hybridity produces a subversive lens for non-Indigenous students, how might other disciplines support the questioning of hegemonic discourses about Indigenous peoples?

This paper has based the hybridity concept on multiple positionalities and applied the hybridity concept to understand relationality. Why not, then, simply think in terms of positionality and relationality, rather than introducing the hybridity concept? In the first instance, using "hybridity" points to Ortiz's capacity to leverage a particular set of positionalities. Ortiz certainly has other positionalities (father, husband, male), but this paper has argued how specific positionalities become generative opportunities for Ortiz and the larger Native American community. To think only about positionality, not hybridity, would miss the point that certain positionalities are uniquely productive. As for the question of relationality, much of the insight about relationality was made possible by first following Ortiz's hybridity. Hence, hybridity is a launching pad for uncovering particular relationalities that might not have been identified if the focus was on relationality, broadly defined, from the start.

Beyond continuing to explore Ortiz's career as an inspiration for the current indigenizing movement—for there are more archival materials to be analyzed—more work must be done to rethink the West's responsibilities if it is brought into relation with Indigenous faculty, students, and communities. As powerful as hybridity can be for Ortiz, the onus remains on him to leverage it. What if Western institutions, disciplines, and non-Indigenous students actively supported, rather than simply created the positional circumstances for, Indigenous peoples' hybridity? Scholarship has demonstrated that Native American students' sense of belonging at universities is a persistent issue.[100] How much more beneficial might, for instance, an experience at a Western university be for a Native student if the institution amended its purpose to explicitly support such students' transformational resistance? There is also room to think about whether hybridity is something that can inform the practice of non-Native educators and students. The corpus analyzed for this paper belonged to a Native scholar, and the discussion above pertains to the hybridity practiced by Ortiz, but might hybridity be a structuring concept for incorporating Native content into mainstream classes? How might the concept be a model for how non-Native students engage in learning alongside Native students?

If settler colonialism is a structure,[1] it is certainly a structure that is forever incomplete. As this paper has shown, one of the structure's key openings is in the opportunities for Indigenous hybridity. When Indigenous students and teachers

take advantage of these opportunities, they can assert and build their sovereignty while calling non-Indigenous people and institutions into new relations, two goals essential to the process of indigenizing higher education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks Dr. Jeffrey Himpele for supporting the project, particularly the feedback during the manuscript drafting process. The author thanks the two anonymous reviewers for their insightful feedback. The author also thanks the Class of 1952 Fund for Undergraduate Research at the Office of Undergraduate Research at Princeton University. Lastly, the author thanks the staff at Princeton University Library's Special Collections department for enabling and facilitating the use of archival materials.

REFERENCES

1. Wolfe, P. (2006) Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native, *J Genocide Res* 8(4), 387–409. *https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520601056240*
2. Mihesuah, D.A., and Wilson, A.C. (2004) Introduction, in *Indigenizing the Academy* (Mihesuah, D.A. and Wilson, A.C., Ed.) 1st ed., 5, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.
3. Alfred, T. (2004) Warrior Scholarship, in *Indigenizing the Academy* (Mihesuah, D.A. and Wilson, A.C., Ed.) 1st ed., 93, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.
4. Sturm, C. (2017) Reflections on the Anthropology of Sovereignty and Settler Colonialism: Lessons from Native North America, *Curr Anthropol* 32(3), 341. *https://doi.org/10.14506/ca32.3.03*
5. Cook-Lynn, E. (1997) Who Stole Native American Studies?, *Wicazo Sa Rev* 12(1), 9–28. *https://doi.org/10.2307/1409161*
6. TallBear, K. (2019) Caretaking Relations, Not American Dreaming, *Kalfou* 6(1), 37. *https://doi.org/10.2307/1409161*
7. Brayboy, B. (2005) Toward a Tribal Critical Race Theory in Education, *Anthrop Educ Q* 37(5), 425–446. *https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-005-0018-y*
8. Grande, S. (2015) *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought*, 10th ed., Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD.
9. Grande, S. (2015) *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought*, 10th ed., 117, Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD.
10. TallBear, K. (2019) Caretaking Relations, Not American Dreaming, *Kalfou* 6(1), 38. *https://doi.org/10.2307/1409161*
11. Grande, S. (2015) *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought*, 10th ed., 152, Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD.
12. Calliou, S. (1998) Us/Them, Me/You: Who? (Re)Thinking the Binary of First Nations and Non-First Nations, *Can J Native Educ* 22(1), 28–52. *https://doi.org/10.14288/cjne.v22i1.195793*
13. Annie E. Casey Foundation, A Look at the Latest Population Trends for Native Children, *https://www.aecf.org/blog/a-look-at-the-latest-population-trends-for-native-children* (accessed Oct 2024)
14. Office of Minority Health, American Indian/Alaska Native Health, *https://minorityhealth.hhs.gov/american-indianalaska-native-health* (accessed Oct 2024)
15. National Center for Education Statistics, Full-time faculty in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by race/ethnicity, sex, and academic rank: Fall 2020, fall 2021, and fall 2022, *https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d23/tables/dt23_315.20.asp* (accessed Oct 2024)
16. James, W. (1973) The Anthropologist as Reluctant Imperialist, in *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*, (Asad, T., Ed.) 1st ed., 41–70, Ithaca Press, London.
17. Meyers, R. (2016) Who Stole Native American Studies II, *Wicazo Sa Rev* 31(1), 135. *https://dx.doi.org/10.5749/wicazosareview.31.1.0132*
18. Trustees of Princeton University, 2022-2023 Diversity, Equity, Inclusion Annual Report,

https://www.calameo.com/read/000804975499799355d722 (accessed Oct 2024)

19. Cech, E., Metz, A., Smith, J., and deVries, K. (2017) Epistemological Dominance and Social Inequality: Experiences of Native American Science, Engineering, and Health Students, *STHV* 42(5), 743–774. *https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243916687037*
20. Bishop, R. (2008) Te Kotahitanga: Kaupapa Māori in Mainstream Classrooms in *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies* (Denzin, N., Lincoln, Y., and Smith, L., Ed.) 1st ed., 439–458, SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA. *https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483385686*
21. Huaman, E.S., and Abeita, S. (2018) Indigenous Teachers and Learners: Higher Education and Social Justice, *Anthrop Educ Q* 49(2), 201–209. *https://doi.org/10.1111/aeq.12239*
22. Papp, T.A. (2019) A Canadian Study of Coming Full Circle to Traditional Aboriginal Pedagogy: A Pedagogy for the 21st Century, *DIME* 14(1), 25–42. *https://doi.org/10.1080/15595692.2019.1652587*
23. Parnell, P. (1970) Recruiting programs neglect Indian, *Daily Princetonian*, *https://tinyurl.com/3a3wvxwn* (accessed Oct 2024)
24. Ortiz, A. (n.d.) Career narrative for Guggenheim application, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 7, "Guggenheim" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.
25. The Newberry Library (1998) *Remembering Alfonso Ortiz*, 1st ed., Newberry Library, Chicago.
26. Ortiz, A. (1972) Alfonso Ortiz to Preston Cutler, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 62, Princeton University Library Special Collections.
27. Ortiz, A. (1973) An Indian Anthropologist's Perspective on Anthropology in *Anthropology and the American Indian*, 1st ed., 91, Indian Historical Press, San Francisco.
28. Narayan, K. (1993) How Native Is a 'Native' Anthropologist?, *Amer Anthrop* 95(3), 671–686. *https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1993.95.3.02a00070*
29. Abu-Lughod, L. (1996) A Tale of Two Pregnancies in *Women Writing Culture* (Behar, R. and Gordon, D.A., Ed.) 1st ed., 339–349, University of California Press, Berkeley.
30. Canclini, N. (1995) *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity*, New ed., University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.
31. Hatcher, A., Bartlett, C., Marshall, A., and Marshall, M. (2009) Two-Eyed Seeing in the Classroom Environment: Concepts, Approaches, and Challenges, *Can J Sci Math Techn Educ* 9(3), 146. *https://doi.org/10.1080/14926150903118342*
32. Kwon, S.A. (2008) Moving From Complaints to Action: Oppositional Consciousness and Collective Action in a Political Community, *Anthrop Educ Q* 39(1), 59–76. *https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1492.2008.00005.x*
33. Handler, R. (2018) Undergraduate Research in Veblen's Vision: Idle Curiosity, Bureaucratic Accountancy, and Pecuniary Emulation in Contemporary Higher Education, in *The Experience of Neoliberal Education*, (Urciuoli. B., Ed.) 1st ed., 32–55, Berghahn, Oxford.
34. Rockwell, E. (2011) Recovering History in the Anthropology of Education in *A Companion to the Anthropology of Education* (Levinson, B. and Pollock, M., Ed.) 1st ed., 73, Blackwell Publishing, West Sussex. *https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444396713.ch5.*
35. Comaroff, J., and Comaroff, J. (1992) *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination*, 16, 1st ed., Westview Press, Boulder.
36. Varenne, H., and Koyama, J. (2011) Education, Cultural Production, and Figuring Out What to Do Next in *A Companion to the Anthropology of Education* (Levinson, B. and Pollock, M., Ed.) 1st ed., 58, Blackwell Publishing, West Sussex. *https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444396713.ch4.*
37. Achacoso, K. (2022) Afterword: Is The Ocean a Metaphor? On the Oceanic Turn, Asian Settler Colonialism, and Filipinx Studies in Hawai'i, *Alon: J Fil Am Dias St* 39(1), 389–397. *https://doi.org/10.5070/LN42360552*
38. Smith, L.H. (2021) *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, 42, 3rd ed., Zed Books, London.
39. Barnhardt, R., and Kawagley, A.O. (2005) Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Alaska Native Ways of Knowing, *Anthro Educ Q* 36(1), 9. *https://doi.org/10.1525/aeq.2005.36.1.008*

40. Ortiz, A. (n.d.) Challenges, Opportunities and Prospects for Indian Youth in the Years Ahead, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 35, "Anthropology 436" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.
41. Panel discussion transcript for UCLA symposium on master's program (1977) *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 4, "UCLA Symposium" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.
42. Ortiz, A. (n.d.) Additional Questions for Steering Committee Discussion, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 61, Princeton University Library Special Collections.
43. Ortiz, A. (n.d.) Alfonso Ortiz to Rolling Thunder, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 38, "People and Cultures of Native North America 1972" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.
44. The Newberry Library (1998) *Remembering Alfonso Ortiz*, 3–4, 1st ed., Newberry Library, Chicago.
45. The Newberry Library (1998) *Remembering Alfonso Ortiz*, 26, 1st ed., Newberry Library, Chicago.
46. Brayboy, B. (2005) Transformational Resistance and Social Justice: American Indians in Ivy League Universities, *Anthrop Educ Q* 36(1), 196. *https://doi.org/10.1525/aeq.2005.36.3.193*
47. Ortiz, A. (1979) Letter to Bernard Siegel of Stanford University, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 30, Princeton University Library Special Collections.
48. Deloria, V. (2004) Marginal and Submarginal, in *Indigenizing the Academy* (Mihesuah, D.A. and Wilson, A.C., Ed.) 1st ed., 17, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.
49. Whyman, T., Adams, K., Carter, A., and Jobson, L. (2021) Lateral Violence in Indigenous Peoples, *Austr Psyc* 56(1), 1. *https://doi.org/10.1080/00050067.2021.1893595*
50. Whyman, T., Adams, K., Carter, A., and Jobson, L. (2021) Lateral Violence in Indigenous Peoples, *Austr Psyc* 56(1), 1–14. *https://doi.org/10.1080/00050067.2021.1893595*
51. Brayboy, B. (2005) Toward a Tribal Critical Race Theory in Education, *Anthrop Educ Q* 37(5), 434–435. *https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-005-0018-y*
52. Brayboy, B., Solyom, J.A., and Castagno, A.E. (2015) Indigenous Peoples in Higher Education, *JAIE* 54(1), 155. *https://doi.org/10.1353/jaie.2015.a8355281*
53. Lee, T.S. (2017) Native American Studies: A Place of Community, *AlterNative* 13(1), 24. *https://doi.org/10.1177/117718011668903211*
54. Deloria, V. (2004) Marginal and Submarginal, in *Indigenizing the Academy* (Mihesuah, D.A. and Wilson, A.C., Ed.) 1st ed., 18, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.
55. American Indian Historical Society (1970) Press release, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 61, Princeton University Library Special Collections.
56. Ortiz, A. (n.d.) Call for a Convocation, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 61, "Publicity and Public Relations" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.
57. Ortiz, A. (1969) Alfonso Ortiz to Duane Bird-Bear, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 61, Princeton University Library Special Collections.
58. Ortiz, A. (1969) Alfonso Ortiz to members of Steering Committee, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 61, "Convocation – 1970" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.
59. Costo, R. (1970) Rupert Costo to Jeremiah Farrington, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, box 61, "Convocation – 1970" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.
60. Masta, S. (2018) Strategy and Resistance: How Native American Students Engage in Accommodation in Mainstream Schools, *Anthrop Educ Q* 49(1), 21–35. *https://doi.org/10.1111/aeq.12231*
61. Masta, S. (2018) Strategy and Resistance: How Native American Students Engage in Accommodation in Mainstream Schools, *Anthrop Educ Q* 49(1), 31. *https://doi.org/10.1111/aeq.12231*
62. Ortiz, A. (1970) Alfonso Ortiz to Rupert Costo, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 61, "Convocation – 1970" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.
63. Ortner, S. (2006) *Anthropology and Social Theory*, 1st ed., Duke University Press, Durham. *https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv11hppcg*

64. Ortiz, A. (1969) Alfonso Ortiz to Louis Ballard, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 61, "Misc." folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

65. Costo, R. (1969) Rupert Costo to Alfonso Ortiz, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 61, "Convocation – 1970" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

66. Outside observers list (n.d.) *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 61, "Professional Participants" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

67. Deloria, V. (2004) Marginal and Submarginal, in *Indigenizing the Academy* (Mihesuah, D.A. and Wilson, A.C., Ed.) 1st ed., 27, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

68. Deloria, V. (1969) *Custer Died for Your Sins*, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, OK.

69. Ortiz, A. (1973) An Indian Anthropologist's Perspective on Anthropology in *Anthropology and the American Indian*, 88. Indian Historian Press, San Francisco.

70. Ortiz, A. (1973) First session Anthropology 333 "Peoples and Cultures of Native North America" class notes, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 35, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

71. Ortiz, A. (1973) An Indian Anthropologist's Perspective on Anthropology in *Anthropology and the American Indian*, 87. Indian Historian Press, San Francisco.

72. Ortiz, A. (1973) An Indian Anthropologist's Perspective on Anthropology in *Anthropology and the American Indian*, 89. Indian Historian Press, San Francisco.

73. Trouillot, M.R. (2003) *Global Transformations*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.

74. Gupta, A., and Stoolman, J. (2022) Decolonizing US Anthropology, *Am Anthropol* 124(4), 778-799. *https://doi.org/10.1111/aman.13775*

75. Freire, P. (2014) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 30th anniversary ed., Bloomsbury Press, New York.

76. Kaomea, J. (2005) Indigenous Studies in the Elementary Curriculum: A Cautionary Hawaiian Example, *Anthrop Educ Q* 36(1), 24–42. *https://doi.org/10.1525/aeq.2005.36.1.024.*

77. Kee, J.C., and Carr-Chellman, D.J. (2019) Paulo Freire, Critical Literacy, and Indigenous Resistance, *Educational Studies* 55(1), 101. *https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2018.1562926*

78. Ortiz, A. (1974) Syllabus for Anthropology 321 "Ritual, Symbols, and Behavior" class notes, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 40, "Anthro 541 – Spring 1973" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

79. Ortiz, A. (1974) Syllabus for Anthropology 398 "Ritual, Symbols, and Behavior," *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 57, "Course material 76-77" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

80. Ortiz, A. (1980) Syllabus for Anthropology 536 "Theories of Symbolic Action," *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 41, "Anthropology 530 – UNM Spring 1979-80" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

81. Ortiz, A. (1996) Anthropology 331 "The North American Indian" class notes, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 35, untitled folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

82. Ortiz, A. (1968) Anthropology 530 "Peoples and Cultures of the American Southwest" syllabus, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 40, untitled folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

83. Ortiz, A. (1970) Anthropology 333 "Native America: Peoples and Cultures" syllabus, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 38, "Peoples and Culture of North America 1972" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

84. Ortiz, A. (1970) Pueblo – Navajo Contrasts, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 35, untitled folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

85. Ortiz, A. (n.d.) Anthropology 530 "Peoples and Cultures of the American Southwest" syllabus with long description, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 57, "Course material 76-77" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

86. Ortiz, A. (1978) Loose course notes, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 35, untitled folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

87. Turner, T. (2002) Representation, Politics, and Cultural Imagination in Indigenous Video: General Points and Kayapo Examples in *Media Worlds* (Ginsburg, F.D., Abu-Lughod, L., and Larkin, B., Ed.) 1st ed., 75–89, University of California Press, Berkeley.

88. Ortiz, A. (1972) Anthropology 333 "Peoples and Cultures of Native North America" midterm, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 38, "Peoples and Culture of Native North America 1972" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

89. Student #1 Paper in Anthropology 333 "Native Peoples and Cultures of North America" (1972) *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 38, "Anthro 305" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

90. Student #2 Paper in Anthropology 333 "Native Peoples and Cultures of North America" (1972) *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 38, "Anthro 305" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

91. Ortiz, A. (1980) Alfonso Ortiz to Marianne Stoller, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 64, "Colorado College Visiting Professorship" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

92. Student #3 to Alfonso Ortiz (1990) *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 35, untitled folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

93. Mezirow, J. (1997) Transformative Learning: Theory to Practice, *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 1997(74), 10. *https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.7401*

94. Boler, M., and Zembylas, M. (2002) Discomforting Truths: The Emotional Terrain of Understanding Difference, in *Pedagogies of Difference* (Trifonas, P.P., Ed.) 1st ed., 108, Routledge, New York.

95. Ortiz, A. (1978) Anthropology 371 "Indian/White Relations" midterm, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 38, "The North American Indian Spring 1977" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

96. Ortiz, A. (1980) Anthropology 305 "The North American Indian" midterm, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 57, "Reading lists" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

97. Ortiz, A. (1975) Anthropology 371 "Indian/White Relations" final exam, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 8, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

98. Ortiz, A. (1980) Anthropology 305 "The North American Indian" final exam, *Alfonso Ortiz Papers*, WC126, box 57, "Reading lists" folder, Princeton University Library Special Collections.

99. Haraway, D. (2016) *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*, 1st ed., Duke University Press, Durham.

100. Tachine, A., Cabrera, N., and Bird, E. (2016) Home Away From Home: Native American Students' Sense of Belonging During Their First Year in College, *J High Educ* 88(5), 785–807. *https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2016.1257322*

ABOUT THE STUDENT AUTHOR

Julian Ibarra will graduate from Princeton University in 2026 with a Bachelor of Arts in Anthropology. He intends to pursue a career in the anthropology of science and technology, with a special interest in epistemology.

PRESS SUMMARY

Many Indigenous scholars have called for indigenizing higher education as part of the larger movement towards decolonization. As it exists currently, the American higher education system sets up Indigenous students and faculty members to engage with non-Indigenous institutions, people, and ways of thinking. This study explores how one particular Native American faculty member, Alfonso Ortiz, commits to Indigenous goals while also relating to non-Indigenous entities, including Western universities, Western-derivative disciplinary knowledge, and non-Native students. I explain how he leverages engagement with non-Indigeneity to advance Native American communities and activism.