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Until America begins to build a moral record in her dealings with the Indian people she should try not to fool the rest of the world about her intentions on other continents. America has always been a militantly imperialistic world power eagerly grasping for economic control over weaker nations... There has not been a time since the founding of the republic when the motives of this country were innocent.¹

— VINÉ DELORIA JR.

In 2008, the State of Minnesota is celebrating 150 years of statehood. Parades, festivities, and much whoopla are accompanying this important anniversary in Minnesota history. The state government, institutions, and appointed Sesquicentennial Commission are asking all of us to reflect on what Minnesotans have gained in the last century and a half as well as what progress Minnesotans have achieved. Minnesota’s original inhabitants, the Dakota Oyate (Nation), have a different perspective on those 150 years. Rather than measuring the years by what we have gained, Dakota people more often measure what we have lost. We ask ourselves such questions as

- What does it mean that settler society established the State of Minnesota at the expense of Indigenous Peoples?
Addressing Harms Internationally

We pose these questions at a time when the international community is beginning to address both the historical harms perpetrated against Indigenous Peoples globally and the contemporary harms we suffer because of ongoing subjugation and oppression. On September 13, 2007, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples with an overwhelming majority. This declaration affirms both the individual and collective rights of Indigenous people as a way to promote justice and peace for all human beings throughout the world without discrimination. Article 8 of the declaration is particularly relevant to the discussion of Minnesota history:

1. Indigenous peoples and individuals have the right not to be subjected to forced assimilation or destruction of their culture.
2. States shall provide effective mechanisms for prevention of, and redress for:
   (a) Any action which has the aim or effect of depriving them of their integrity as distinct peoples, or of their cultural values or ethnic identities;
   (b) Any action which has the aim or effect of disposing of their lands, territories or resources;
   (c) Any form of forced population transfer which has the aim or effect of violating or undermining any of their rights;
   (d) Any form of forced assimilation or integration;
   (e) Any form of propaganda designed to promote or incite racial or ethnic discrimination directed against them.

Every one of these applies to the internationally recognized crimes perpetrated by Minnesota citizens and the United States government against the Dakota people of Minnesota to obtain Dakota lands and resources as well as eliminate our populations. By eliminating or severely debilitating the original owners of the land and its resources, White Minnesotans ensured that Dakota people could no longer threaten the genocidal and exploitative policies that would continue to enrich them and other U.S. citizens.

Article 8 of the declaration directly challenges Minnesota's right to establish itself at the expense of Indigenous Peoples. It dictates that the United States (as the State) and Minnesota have an obligation to acknowledge and ensure some kind of reparative justice for these harms. Furthermore, the declaration would certainly condemn the celebration of that which was gained at the expense of Indigenous populations such as the Dakota. In this context, Minnesota's decision to celebrate the sesquicentennial is completely out of sync with an international community committed to working toward peace and justice.

In fact, rather than celebrating, other world powers are apologizing for their treatment of Indigenous Peoples. On February 13, 2008, as the first item of business for Australia's new parliament, Prime Minister Kevin Rudd apologized to Aboriginal Australians for the "laws and policies of successive parliaments and governments that have inflicted profound grief, suffering and loss on these our fellow Australians." He apologized
especially to the stolen generations of Aboriginal children forcibly removed from their families because of federal policies that lasted through the late 1960s.

Like Indigenous Peoples in the United States, Aboriginal Aborigines comprise only a small percentage of the population (2 percent), yet they suffer the highest rates of infant mortality, drug abuse, alcoholism, and unemployment. Many hope the apology will "allow Australia to re-commit to improving the lives of Indigenous people." In the best-case scenario, this apology would mark just the beginning of a long process toward creating Aboriginal justice in Australia. It remains to be seen, however, whether the country will act on the apology, or if they will remain just words. As the Aboriginal leader Noel Pearson put it, "Blackfellas will get the words, the Whitefellas keep the money." Still this event is now part of a worldwide discourse regarding truth telling, acknowledgement of harms, and reparative justice.

Frankly, it is more comfortable for White Minnesotans to consider what is happening to Indigenous Peoples in other parts of the world, rather than to investigate what is happening to Indigenous Peoples in their own backyard. Minnesota's restorative justice workers, for example, frequently empathize with suffering elsewhere and join in the global chorus of voices demanding justice for oppressed Peoples across the oceans. They help victims and offenders engage in transformative healing practices elsewhere while condemning violence and holding perpetrators of harms accountable for their actions. Meanwhile, the monumental harms perpetrated against Dakota people remain unacknowledged and unaddressed. Yet, all Minnesotans continue to benefit from Dakota dispossession and every day they continue to deny justice to Dakota people.

The Minnesota Context

In this volume, I will center the focus on the land we call home. I will offer Minnesotans an alternative, ethically grounded way to think about the historical legacy created by the establishment of Minnesota statehood and the ongoing oppression experienced by Dakota people. Within a contemporary context, I will also address the difficult questions posed at the beginning of this chapter. Most importantly, I will address how the beneficiaries of genocide in this instance might begin to undo the damages wrought from gross injustices. This includes a plan to return Dakota people to our homeland as well as restore the integrity of the landscape so that we can create some semblance of justice in Minnesota.

Ho-Chunk people have a similar legitimate claim to justice in Minnesota as co-victims of Minnesota's ethnic cleansing policy. However, only Ho-Chunk people can speak to the objectives of their struggle and articulate their vision for a liberated future. Thus, for this project, I will specifically address Dakota concerns from a Dakota perspective.

In addition, given Minnesota's largely unfettered celebration of statehood in 2008, it is clear there is a desperate need for reflection on the meaning of Minnesota statehood in the context of a genocidal and oppressive historical legacy. This book will thus utilize the rhetoric surrounding Minnesota's sesquicentennial to illuminate White ignorance regarding the contemporary Dakota struggle for justice. Perhaps then Minnesotans will understand why their ongoing celebration of what was gained at Dakota expense is just another assault on Dakota humanity.

Another provocative backdrop for this project is the current lawsuit filed against the federal government on behalf of 7,500 descendants of the "loyal Mdewakanton." In May 2004, a group of Dakota people held a constitutional convention in Redwood Falls, Minnesota, to create and approve a new constitution as well as to elect officers to establish the Minnesota Mdewakanton Dakota Oyate. These individuals are descendants of a small segment of Bdekwatunwan Dakota who were loyal to the United States government during the U.S.--Dakota War of 1862. The government allowed this small group to remain in Minnesota
and eventually provided land to them as a reward for their loyalty, but only on the condition that they would sever all tribal ties.

Today, the descendants of those “loyal Mdewakanton,” claim that the other Bdewakantunwan living on lands in Minnesota are wrongful beneficiaries of three Dakota reservations reserved specifically for them. They have filed a suit in the United States Court of Federal Claims (Sheldon Peters Wolfchild, Ernie Peters Longwalker, Scott Adolphson, Morris J. Pendleton, Barbara Feezor Buttes, et al. vs. United States, Case No. 03-2684-L) to “recover damages for Defendant’s trust mismanagement, breach of trustee fiduciary duties and breach of contract by the defendant.” Ultimately, they want those parcels of land back (and everything on the land), exclusively for the descendants of the “Loyal Mdewakanton.”

While the success of their lawsuit has yet to be determined, the considerable support for the lawsuit among Dakota people suggests that there is a popular desire for land restoration in Minnesota. It clearly indicates that land issues are by no means settled in Dakota eyes. Yet, there are also implications of this lawsuit that may be detrimental to the Dakota struggle for justice. I will address the negative implications of the lawsuit in the last portion of this book.

In light of these two major events—Minnesota’s sesquicentennial and the “Loyal Mdewakanton” lawsuit—it is clear that we need a vision for an alternative future in this place we call Minisota. At this reflective moment, it is useful for everyone—the populations of people who colonized Dakota lands as well as Dakota people in Minnesota and in exile—to consider their roles, ideas, expectations, and hopes for the future in the context of a broad view of Minnesota history. This book attempts to provide one such revisioning with the hope that it will generate useful discussions, deep reflection, and subsequent action. Neither Dakota people nor the non-Dakota people who call our homeland theirs have ever engaged in a collective discussion or debate about the meaning of Minnesota statehood. Furthermore, we have not engaged in public discussions with an eye toward truthfully exploring what White Minnesotans gained at the expense of Indigenous Peoples. With this work, I hope to foster that collective discussion among all Minnesota populations.

In chapter 1, I will provide an historical overview of Minisota Makoce from the Dakota perspective. Dakota people consider Minnesota the site of our creation and we have existed on this particular land base for thousands of years. It is Dakota homeland. No other population in the world can claim this deep connection to Minnesota. Because I cannot explore this long history in depth in a single text, this chapter will only briefly highlight the nature of this ancient relationship. It will also explain how White Minnesotans violently and painfully wrested the land out of Dakota hands as well as the subsequent painful repercussions to both Dakota people and the land. Rather than providing detailed chronological accounts of the history of Dakota-White relations, I will place special emphasis on categories of human injustices perpetrated against Dakota people that I will illuminate with specific examples. I will conclude this chapter with a discussion of the conditions resulting from this painful legacy within Dakota communities and a discussion about what this tells us about our relationship to settler society.

Following the discussion of the historical and contemporary context for examining a restoration of justice in Dakota homeland, this book will then address four possible stages for reparative justice: the establishment of a Truth Commission in the state of Minnesota; the need for a process to “Take Down the Fort”; a program of land restoration and reparations; and, finally, the end of American colonization of Dakota people and homeland. While these dramatic stages may seem radical and impossible, they are, in fact, essential to creating a moral and just society in which Dakota and non-Dakota can peacefully co-exist and respectfully share this place we call Minisota Makoce.

Despite the fact that Minnesota’s ethnic cleansing of Dakota
and Ho-Chunk Peoples is well documented, most Minnesotans remain naively or purposefully ignorant of the reality that violent and morally reprehensible crimes were perpetrated so they could not only freely obtain Indigenous lands, but could also settle on them without fear of any violent retribution. The genocidal practices such as the mass hanging of Dakota resisters, the forced removal of both Dakota and Ho-Chunk Nations, the bounties placed on Dakota scalps, and the punitive expeditions sent to hunt down the fleeing Dakota, all have left disturbing and devastating legacies.

This is precisely why we cannot put this history behind us. The contemporary circumstances compel us to look at the root causes of our current dysfunction and pain. Many people, even Dakota people, believe it is time for us to put all this terrible history behind us and move on, but our contemporary problems suggest deep-rooted pain. Furthermore, when we expose the root causes of our pain and question whether those root causes still affect our lives, we see that the same oppression facing our people in the nineteenth century still exists today.

For example, the vast majority of Dakota people still live in exile. That is, most of our people still have no home in our ancestral homeland. In addition, nascent Dakota communities (inside and outside the state boundaries) are plagued with horrendous social conditions, such as high substance use and abuse rates, high rates of family violence including physical and sexual abuse, high mortality and suicide rates, high rates of high school dropouts, and high rates of disease. This, of course, is not attributable solely to Minnesota’s extermination policies, but those policies laid the groundwork for subsequent and extraordinarily successful colonization of the people. Today’s social conditions are a direct result of those combined processes. Thus, to put the past behind us requires turning a blind eye to both the ongoing injustices and the ongoing effects of colonization.

Furthermore, the ethnic cleansing of Dakota and Ho-Chunk Peoples out of Minnesota was extraordinarily successful. In fact, the ethnic cleansing of the Ho-Chunk nation was so successful that they have no formally designated land base in the state of Minnesota today. Similarly, the land base for Dakota people today can only be considered outrageously small, given the breadth of the boundaries of our ancestral homeland. Today we hold approximately 3,200 acres out of what used to be millions of acres, making our four Dakota communities tiny dots on the map. Yet, settler society has not held itself accountable for their part in the ongoing denial of justice. In fact, settler society has routinely silenced, suppressed, or denied Dakota and Ho-Chunk accounts detailing our experiences as victims of crimes against humanity.

**Initiating an Era of Truth Telling**

A truth-telling forum, therefore, would allow us to bring those accounts to the forefront of the consciousness of the settler society in the state of Minnesota. This would disallow Minnesotans from denying or ignoring the history of genocide and the perpetration of human injustices. The sesquicentennial offers an ideal time to initiate a new era of truth telling in Minnesota to counter the 150 years of myth making.

**Taking Down the Fort**

Awareness of truth, however, compels some kind of action. Once settler society acknowledges injustices and demonstrates some sort of contrition, they will create a moral imperative for restorative justice. The process of restorative justice is perhaps more easily conceived in stages. Once we initiate a phase of truth telling, it will necessarily cause us to rethink the foundations upon which the state of Minnesota was created. One of those foundations is that the “settlement” of Indigenous land is benign or even benevolent. When the violence and nastiness of the imperial business is unmasked, we must question the morality of continuing to celebrate Minnesota’s imperial and colonial
icons. With that unmasking, not only do we realize that we cannot celebrate those icons, we also realize we must pursue a campaign to "Take Down the Fort," both literally and metaphorically. While this phrase applies most tangibly to historic Fort Snelling, the site of the Dakota concentration camp during the winter of 1862–63, it also applies to all monuments, institutions, place names, and texts that continue to celebrate the perpetrators of genocide or the institutions and systems that facilitated the implementation of genocidal and unjust policies.

Making Reparations

To create a moral society, Minnesotans and Americans must then engage the next step in the movement toward reparative justice: land restoration and reparations. While this usually invokes tremendous fear within settler society, there are ways to conceive of land return that do not involve current settlers to relinquish their individual property rights, unless they wish to do so in the name of justice. We can identify more than 11 million acres within the state of Minnesota currently designated as federal, state, county, or metro-commissioned lands. Settler society could immediately return those millions of acres to Dakota People without touching a single acre of privately held lands.

Land return alone, however, is not enough to create justice. Instead, Minnesotans also have to restore those lands to a pristine condition. This would require extensive cleanup efforts, particularly on the part of corporations, farmers, and resource extractors who have left horrendous environmental destruction in the wake of their activities. Together, we will need to address systematically all of these issues. The reality is, however, that restitution for land theft—no matter how long ago the crime was perpetrated—eventually requires land return.

In addition, non-land-based reparations will also be a necessary element of restoring justice in Dakota homeland. Once settler society guarantees a land base to Dakota People, for example, we can then negotiate a system to cover relocation expenses for populations in exile. I would argue that monetary compensation should not be the end goal, but what we need instead is essential support for the creation and development of an Indigenous infrastructure that will allow Dakota People to live according to our values and worldviews.

Creating an Oppression-Free Society

In the end, however, none of this makes sense if institutions and systems of colonization remain in place. Ultimately, if Minnesotans, and Americans in general, are going to create a peaceful and just society, all oppression must cease. Colonization, by its very nature, is antithetical to justice. Therefore, complete decolonization is a necessary end goal in a peaceful and just society. This would entail overturning the institutions, systems, and ideologies of colonialism that continue to affect every aspect of Indigenous life. In a nutshell, we must rethink our ways of being and interacting in this world to create a sustainable, healthy, and peaceful co-existence with one another and with the natural world.

Human beings are on the cusp of a great change in the world. The flourishing of empire has advanced societal models based on principles of domination, exploitation, and violence. This has served to harm human beings, plants, and animals, as well as the air, lands and waters, thereby pushing us into a planetary crisis. Today we are witnessing the beginning of catastrophic collapses of the existing systems, both natural and man-made, as empire is ultimately self-destructive. But, we have a choice. As author David Korten relates, this transformation "can play out in the mode of Empire, as a violent, self-destructive, last-man-standing competition for individual advantage. Or it can play out in the mode of Earth Community, as a cooperative effort to rebuild community; to learn the arts of sufficiency, sharing, and peaceful conflict resolution; and to marshal our human creativity to
grow the generative potential of the whole. I, for one, would prefer the latter option. If Minnesotans choose Earth Community, it will require all of us to rework the existing social order and adopt a new set of values based on mutual respect and sustainability.

Contemplating this future requires expansive thinking on the part of all of us. For non-Dakota people, it asks that you challenge, re-examine, and reject the racist and colonialist programming to which you have grown accustomed. It also asks that you rethink the values of domination, consumption, and exploitation that have become a part of American society. For Dakota people, it requires that we awaken our consciousness to the potential for liberation. Most importantly, however, it requires all of us to move beyond a simple re-education and acknowledgment of past harms. It requires action that will fundamentally alter the current power imbalance. It requires action that will serve to ensure justice to the Original People of this place we call Minisota.

Note


5. The legal term for the council fire we call the “Dwellers by Mystic Lake” is Mdewakanton. The Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Com-
How Minnesotans Wrested the Land from Dakota People

The Sioux Indians must be exterminated or driven forever beyond the borders of the State.

—Governor Alexander Ramsey, 1862

Banishment from the homeland, the diaspora of a nation, the exile of a people, and ongoing colonization—these are the legacies Minnesotans and Americans have left to Dakota people. What do these legacies mean to the hearts and spirits of Dakota people? Most of us do not care to think too deeply about them, because the difficulties of everyday living as colonized peoples would be infinitely more difficult if we dwelt in a place of inconsolable grief. So, we do not contemplate at length that place of pain and grief and we attempt to avert our eyes when it is brought to our attention. Indeed, even non-colonized people prefer not to dwell in this history because it has the potential to fill them with grief, outrage, guilt, and despair.

Today, I am going to ask you, the reader, to join me on a journey into that dreaded place. I want you to contemplate it with me, experience the sense of moral indignation, and, finally, emerge with a strengthened spirit ready to engage in the Dakota struggle for justice. In the end, it is my hope that we might restore the humanity of everyone.

A Story of Dakota Creation

First, however, I want to share with you a story. This is the creation story of the Bdewakantunwan (Dwellers by Mystic Lake)
recounted from memory as I heard respected storyteller Dale Childs tell it on many occasions. Mr. Childs was from the Prairie Island Reservation located in southeastern Minnesota, and though he passed away a number of years ago, his stories remain with us.¹

A very long time ago, *Wakantanka* (The Great Mystery) created many children. As he did so, he placed a part of himself into each being. For instance, he gave the quality of swiftness to the deer, perseverance to the turtle, strength to the buffalo, and majesty to the eagle. Every bird, plant, animal, and tree was created so that each was unique and had a part of *Wakantanka*.

One day, *Wakantanka* was walking in the *Paha Sapa*, or the Black Hills, and he was looking sad. As he was walking he began to shed tears. They would fall from his eye and would splash and dry into nuggets of gold. *Maka*, the Earth, also known as *Ina*, meaning Mother in our language, wondered why her husband was sad. She asked, "Have I offended you in some way? Have I been unfaithful to you? Have I not given you many children?" When he responded negatively to all those questions, she asked, "Why then are you looking so sad? Why do I see tears fall?"

*Wakantanka* replied, "I have many children and they are all beautiful, but I have another piece of myself to give. When our children are frightened, they nestle in you for safety. When they are thirsty, they turn to your waters. And, when they need sustenance, they receive food from your meadows. I want children who speak to me and call me by name." *Wakantanka* wanted a creature to look to him for help and to need him.

When *Ina Maka* heard this, she wanted to give a piece of herself to help create a being who would look like her husband. She called on the waters to help her. She instructed them to come at her in great magnitude and carve into her flesh. But, the waters did not want to harm her. She reassured them that they would not harm her, that it was a gift she wished to give. So they came at her and began to carve into *Ina*'s body, but the first attempt was unsuccessful. It didn't work. So she then called on the help of the winds from the four directions. They also refused at first, saying they did not want to harm her. She told them, "You will not harm me. Blow into my body." So the winds agreed. They blew a giant gash into her and exposed the red clay of her body. She called to *Wakantanka*, "My body is open to you. Reach into my body and make a body in the image of yourself."

This was the creation of the first human being. *Ina* told *Wakantanka*, "You will recognize your children. They will be as red as the day. They will call to you, give thanks to you, and share with you your voice." *Wakantanka* put everything into his two-legged children. He gave them love, and the ability to communicate that love. They have a special voice that *Wakantanka* wanted to hear. With that voice we can say, "Thank you for all the blessings," or "On this day I give you thanks." When we are scared, we go to our father and we say, "Look down upon me. Have pity on me. Have pity on my relatives. Help us."

This particular story marks what I believe to be the beginning of interaction between human beings, the river the Dakota refer to as *Hahawakpa* (The River of Falls), and *Minsota Makota*. In the story I just told, *Ina Maka*, or Mother Earth, instructed the waters to come at her. That first time they were unable to complete their task without the help of the winds. But, in this first attempt, the waters were coming with such force that they created images in rock that could be found along the Mississippi River. Dakota people call the first of those *Caske Tanka* and he is located just south of Red Wing. He was given this name because *Caske* is the name we give to the first-born child in the Dakota family if the child is male, and because *Tanka* means large and this refers to the larger child. Non-Dakota people call this outcropping Barn's Bluff. Dakota people could observe the profile of a Dakota face there until 1954 when settler society dynamited that portion so that they could construct a bridge across the Mississippi River from Minnesota to Wisconsin. Observers can still find another
rock image, a little further down river from Caske Tanka and it is known as Caske Cistinma, cistinma meaning little or small in the Dakota language.

Bdewakantunwan Dakota elders tell of the actual creation of humans occurring in our homeland of Minisota Makoce, but specifically at the place called Maka Cokaya Kin, or the Center of the Earth. This place is at Bdote, which means the joining or juncture of two bodies of water and in this instance refers to the area where the Minnesota River joins the Mississippi. Minnesotans have retained this word as Mendota and it is located in the midst of the Twin Cities, with Fort Snelling overlooking the sacred juncture of Bdote.

The Dakota people comprise four fires of the Oceti Sako-win (Seven Council Fires) that make up the Oyate. They include the Bdewakantunwan (Dwellers by Mystic Lake), the Wahpekute (Shooters of the Leaves), Wahpetunwan (Dwellers Among the Leaves), and the Sisitunwan (Dwellers by the Fish Campground).

The creation account I just shared is for Dakota people. I am not sharing it with the expectation that non-Dakota people will subscribe to it or that they will begin to conceive of Bdote as their place of origin. Our origin story does not dictate that because the Bdewakantunwan emerged at Bdote, that all human populations must have emerged there. That is not our way. Instead, the reason I am sharing this story is to demonstrate the ancient and sacred relations we have with this landscape. This is the same sacred and ancient relationship that Christians, Jews, and Muslims have with Middle Eastern sites such as Jerusalem, Mecca, or Nazareth. I am also sharing this story to demonstrate that we do not believe we emigrated from any other place. Rather, our stories assert that we were created here and that we have always lived here. We recognize that we traveled to and lived in other parts of North America over the centuries. We also recognize that our territorial boundaries have fluctuated during the thousands of years we have inhabited this land. And, we recognize that other Indigenous nations shared Minisota Makoce with us for periods of time. However, our historical record indicates that there is absolutely no ambiguity about Minisota as Dakota homeland.

White Accounts Regarding the Dakota Past

Anthropologists, on the other hand, have proposed a variety of scenarios regarding Dakota presence in Minnesota. They have created an elaborate system of classifications, names, and methods for analyzing Indigenous life before Europeans. University of Minnesota anthropologist Guy Gibbon, for example, has developed a model of “Sioux Prehistory.” He based his model on archeological evidence, including the desplicable study of Indigenous human remains (obtained without Indigenous consent), and linguistic data. While he admits, “At present, the data upon which this reconstruction of the prehistory of the Sioux is based are weak,” he nonetheless asserts the claim that the ancestral “Sioux” arrived from the Central Mississippi Valley shortly before AD 800. Further, he states that it was not until about AD 1300 that we became the People of the Seven Council Fires.

Gibbon’s assertions are extremely problematic because they run contrary to every shred of Indigenous evidence and some of his assertions are simply fabrications. This occurs any time academics attempt to imagine the past of another group of human beings based on faulty assumptions (in this case that Dakota people must have originated from elsewhere). Gibbon’s assertions run contrary to thousands of years of oral tradition that places Dakota people within Minisota Makoce. Furthermore, it is problematic, to say the least, to attribute a cultural (or national) identity to people occupying a specific site based on archeological evidence. Even when ancient cultures leave a different archeological record than more recently dated sites, it does not preclude an ancestral connection between the two. Rather, it may simply indicate that the culture has not been static.
Other archeologists, however, do acknowledge the ancient relationship we have with the land. For example, another twentieth-century scholar, Eldon Johnson, states "The ancestors of the native American groups encountered by the French visitors in the seventeenth century are Minnesota's prehistoric peoples," and this would certainly include the Dakota people.4

Still other ethnologists, especially early ones, claim that all the tribes of the Siouan linguistic stock traveled from the East. Royal Hassrick, for example, claims Dakota people arrived from the Northeast, while Albert Jenks asserts that we arrived from the eastern Piedmont and coastal regions of what are now Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina before traveling westward to this region (apparently after first arriving via the Bering Strait land bridge and traversing the continent to be positioned on the eastern seashores).5 Dakota people, however, do not attribute our origins to the eastern seaboard. We also do not attribute our origins to a crossing from Asia via the Bering Strait.

Unfortunately, part of the American imperial enterprise has been to define and rename Indigenous Peoples to diminish our humanity and exploit our resources. In fact, this has been such a dehumanizing practice perpetrated by colonizing powers against Indigenous Peoples that the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples states "Indigenous Peoples have the right to revitalise, use, develop and transmit to future generations their histories, languages, oral traditions, philosophies, writing systems and literatures, and to designate and retain their own names of communities, places and persons."6 The Dakota Oyate has also been a victim of this radical renaming of people and our landscape.

Anthropologists such as Gibbon, for example, have worked very hard to wrest interpretive control away from Dakota people regarding our own history and origins. They can then supplant our interpretations with their own colonialist vision. This is the ultimate imperial enterprise. Consequently, we have a whole slew of unrecognizable names attributed to Dakota people that include Gibbon's unruly verbiage of bands known as the "Terminal Woodland Blackduck-Kathio-Clam River Continuum."7 Gibbon is merely carrying on an academic tradition that involves naming the people according to site locations—primarily site locations that colonizing society has already stripped of Indigenous names and supplanted with colonialist names. This only serves to eradicat further Indigenous presence and Indigenous claims. University of Minnesota scholars such as Albert E. Jenks and Lloyd A. Wilford began this practice in Minnesota.8

We simply call these populations of people our ancestors. Most people would agree with the notion that Dakota people have the exclusive right to determine who is Dakota today (a right of self-determination that is even held up in U.S. colonial courts), yet most archeologists still unabashedly believe they have a right to define Dakota people of the past regardless of Dakota assertions.

While Dakota oral traditions reach back thousands of years, the first written Wesicu (White) records documenting our populations and locations date back to the early French explorers and missionaries of the mid-seventeenth century.9 Historian Gary Anderson estimates that the population of Dakota people in the Mississippi watershed in 1650 was approximately 38,000, but that by 1780 the population was reduced to about 25,000 due to economic pressures, warfare, and disease. If his estimates are accurate, this indicates a population loss of 35 percent without factoring in normal rates of population growth, all which occurred before massive waves of White invasion.10

Anishinabe Invasion

Life began to change radically for Dakota people once French fur traders penetrated Dakota territory and Anishinabe people successfully invaded our northern lands. The Anishinabe were facing European invasion and colonization of their lands in the east, as well as the consequent intertribal warfare characteristic
of populations struggling for survival in a rapidly changing landscape. Reasons for Anishinabe migration into Dakota lands are diverse, however, and some claim that climate changes compelled Anishinabe relocation before European contact.11

According to their oral tradition (prior to their settlement of the Lake Superior area that included the northern homelands of Dakota people), Anishinabe people resided on the Atlantic Ocean near the Gulf of the St. Lawrence River. There they suffered misery and death and began following the Megis (seashell) westward until they finally arrived, centuries later, on the Island of LaPointe where the people settled.12 La Pointe Island is located off the shore of northern Wisconsin in Lake Superior. Edward Benton Banai relates the message of their first prophet who said to the people, "In the time of the First Fire, the Anishinabe nation will rise up and follow the sacred shell of the Midewiwin Lodge. The Midewiwin Lodge will serve as a rallying point for the people and its traditional ways will be the source of much strength. The Sacred Megis will lead the way to the chosen ground of the Anishinabe. You are to look for a turtle shaped island that is linked to the purification of the earth. You will find such an island at the beginning and at the end of your journey. There will be seven stopping places along the way. You will know the chosen ground has been reached when you come to a land where food grows on water. If you do not move you will be destroyed."13 The rice beds they found belonged to the Dakota Oyate. According to their oral tradition, then, the Anishinabe had a divine sanction to occupy what was Dakota homeland. Centuries of violence and animosity have consequently characterized relations between our two nations.

The areas in Minnesota typically associated with Anishinabe people today are those they took by force from Dakota people. According to early twentieth-century historian Newton Winchell's research, for example, in the time of Father Louis Hennepin's missionary and exploratory work among the Dakota (late seventeenth century), various Dakota bands were located as follows:

the Mdewakantonwan Dakota occupied the Mille Lacs region and the upper Rum River, Wahpetunwan Dakota at Sandy Lake north and west of Mille Lacs, the Sisitunwan Dakota north of Cass and Winnibegoshish lakes, the Ihanktonwan at Leech Lake, the Red River, and Pipestone, and the Tittunwan around Big Stone Lake and Lake Traverse.14 With the exceptions of the Pipestone, Big Stone Lake, and Lake Traverse village sites, every other site is now associated with the Anishinabe. Winchell also attributed the ancient mounds at Mille Lacs to the ancient "Sioux," citing the then "expert" opinion of Jacob V. Brower who had conducted an early archaeological survey of the Mille Lacs site.15

Writers on the Dakota past have generally attributed the Dakota loss of our northern homeland to the weakening of our population to disease and the widespread acquisition of European arms by Anishinabe people prior to Dakota acquisition of European arms. Nineteenth-century missionary Samuel Pond, for instance, noted "The Ojibways obtained fire-arms sooner than the Dakotas, and therefore were able to drive them out of the wooded country about the sources of the Mississippi and Rum rivers. If they had come into possession of fire-arms as early as their enemies did, it is not probable that they would have lost any of their lands."16

Scholars frequently indicate the eagerness with which the Dakota embraced the fur trade, but this eagerness was at least, in part, an act necessary for survival.17 In what would become an arms race among Indigenous populations, each Indigenous nation was drawn into the European market economy. By the late seventeenth century when the French established fur-trade relations, Anishinabe people had already moved into the Lake Superior area. This began an era of violent confrontations. Historian Roy Meyer suggests it was likely that the "Chippewas, moving westward along the south shore of Lake Superior and armed with firearms obtained through trade, developed expansionist ambitions similar to those displayed earlier by the Hurons and Ottawas."18 However, regardless of whether the Anishinabe
were interested in empire or simply acquiring adequate lands to ensure the survival of their people, the Dakota population suffered severe losses. European invasion and colonization of Indigenous lands throughout the continent had set into motion a chain of events that was eventually detrimental to all Indigenous Peoples.

Historians generally consider the well-known Battle of Kanhio, estimated to have occurred between 1745 and 1750, to be one of the last major battles between the Anishinabe and the Dakota. It represented the final push of Dakota people out of our northern homeland. Anishinabe historian William Warren characterized the Anishinabe-Dakota relationship as that of “mortal enemies, waging against each other a bloody and exterminating warfare.”

Warren, however, also relates examples of peaceful interactions over spans of several years in which Dakota and Anishinabe people visited each other’s villages and married into each other’s families. Nonetheless, these periods of peace were short-lived and by the mid-eighteenth century hostilities escalated again culminating in a fierce battle at Mille Lacs.

Warren attributes Anishinabe success at Mille Lacs to “more deadly weaponry” and details an incident in which Ojibway warriors put small bundles of gun powder in the smoke-holes of Dakota homes: “Not having as yet, like the more fortunate Ojibways, been blessed with the presence of White traders, the Dakotas were still ignorant of the gunpowder.” Thus, at the end of the three-day struggle, the Dakota people were “swept away for ever from their favorite village sites.” Some of the fleeing Dakota settled in a village along the Rum River for a period, but the Anishinabe drove them out, too, after the battle of Crow Wing in 1770. From that point forward, the Dakota people were permanently forced from this northern region. According to the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe Web site, their ancestors arrived in the area about 1700, but no mention is made of battles with the Dakota.

While Dakota people had engaged in some form of agriculture for centuries prior to Anishinabe and European invasion, Dakota people relied heavily on wild rice and maple sugar as important food sources. While these could be obtained on a much smaller scale in southern Minnesota (patches of wild rice existed along small stretches of the Minnesota River, for example), the abundance with which those food sources were found in northern Minnesota could not be replicated. This meant the dramatic loss of subsistence for Dakota people that continues to the present day.

The United States government then codified and legalized the occupation of Dakota lands by Anishinabe people when they entered into treaties with the Anishinabe. Through treaties, the Anishinabe ceded and reserved for themselves parcels of Dakota homeland. The Anishinabe Treaty of 1837, for example, ceded much of the land north of the boundary articulated in an 1825 agreement (an agreement orchestrated by the United States government between the Anishinabe and Dakota). Governor Lewis Cass of Michigan and Governor William Clark of Missouri mediated the 1835 treaty on behalf of the United States. Through this agreement, the United States intended to create a territorial boundary between “Chippewa” and “Sioux” lands so that our two nations would refrain from intertribal warfare. This boundary, however, became the dividing line for future Anishinabe land cessions.

Despite its intent, the 1825 agreement was not successful in ensuring peace between the Dakota and Anishinabe, and violent relations continued. For example, Indian Agent Major Lawrence Taliaferro wrote to the Fort Snelling commander, Major Bliss, in 1835 that “the Chippewa would not observe the landmarks, but on the contrary had been throwing them down and attempting to demolish many of them.” He believed violence would consequently erupt because their country was not sufficient for the population and they would, thus, force themselves onto Dakota hunting grounds. Periodic violence persisted between the Anishinabe and the Dakota until 1862–63.

These tensions became secondary to the threat posed by
invading Whites, however, and a ruthlessly expansionist United States government. Land cessions, for both Indigenous nations, were soon wrested away using whatever means were necessary.

**Wasicu Invasion**

The hunger for Indigenous lands by the swelling American population cannot be overstated. In fact, as Minnesota history will demonstrate, Europeans and Euro-Americans would commit some of the most heinous crimes in human history to obtain Indigenous lands. Unfortunately, Minnesota history is not unique. Europeans and Americans perpetrated similar crimes against humanity from coast to coast upon hundreds of Indigenous nations.

By the mid-nineteenth century when Whites began flooding into what was first claimed by them as Northwest Territory (1797), then Wisconsin Territory (1836), and then Minnesota Territory (1849), they had already established a pattern of aggression and violence. Indian traders were the advance guard for an exploitative process that would not end until settler society had stripped Indigenous Peoples of nearly everything we held dear. Military forts, ultimately designed to protect White economic interests, followed the traders and they, in turn, provided a base of protection for the soldiers, missionaries, and thousands of predominantly White settlers who followed. Whites who came to Minnesota had no intention of living side by side with either Dakota or Anishinabe Peoples; rather they arrived believing that the “Indian problem” would be dispelled in short order. They also believed the risk-taking associated with their early arrival would be rewarded with the best and biggest parcels of land for the smallest cost.

The exceptions to this rule might be the traders whose business required them to often live amongst the “Indians” so they could better exploit them (and their actions were hardly benign), or the missionaries and Indian agents whose professions required their living in close proximity to the “savages” (about whom they professed to be concerned). However, even the missionaries and agents had no intention of living side by side with “savages” indefinitely. Instead, they intended to engage in a radical campaign to “civilize” and “Christianize” the “heathen red men.” While many Americans tend to look fondly on the work of missionaries and do-gooders claiming to bring lightness to the corners of the world where all the dark-skinned people dwell, this is not how Indigenous Peoples usually perceive their efforts. We identify these practices not only as a form of fanatical religious imperialism, but also as a form of ethnocide.

Thus, we must be clear that there was nothing benign about the actions or the goals of those Americans and Europeans who arrived in Dakota homeland. On the contrary, the first populations to invade these lands did so with complete disregard for the welfare or humanity of the Peoples who already dwelt here. Americans simply wanted the land and they did not care what they would have to do to obtain it.

**Legalized Land Theft**

Treaties are peculiar documents in United States history. Theoretically, if nations negotiate an agreement and one side violates the terms of the treaty, that unilateral violation would render the treaty null and void, and conditions would return to their pre-treaty status.³⁶ This has not been the case, however, when the United States consistently violated their treaty obligations to Indigenous nations. Vine Deloria Jr. shocked the country when in 1969 he wrote in the midst of the Cold War, “America has yet to keep one Indian treaty or agreement despite the fact that the United States government signed over four hundred such treaties and agreements with Indian tribes. It would take Russia another century to make and break as many treaties as the United States has already violated.”³⁷ Consequently, Indigenous nation after Indigenous nation has ceded lands and resources
for promises the U.S. never fulfilled. Or, such fraudulent tactics were used to obtain Indigenous signatures that the treaties never should have been ratified. By the mid-nineteenth century, most of the treaties had simply become a form of legalized land theft. Nowhere is this more apparent than the treaties negotiated with the Dakota people of Minnesota.

The first Dakota land cession demonstrates the duplicitous nature of U.S. negotiations with our ancestors as well as the legal farce that would typify all subsequent treaties. In 1805, Zebulon Pike was commissioned by the federal government to negotiate a treaty for the purpose of establishing U.S. sovereignty in the region. Through the acquisition of Dakota lands, the Americans could build a military post, thereby challenging British influence and presence. Dakota people were caught in a contest between imperial powers, each intent on acquiring and exploiting Indigenous lands and resources for their own purposes. Pike feebly attempted to secure Dakota signatures to the treaty, but when he could only secure two, it did not stop him from proceeding as though the treaty had a measure of legitimacy (nor did it stop the Senate from later ratifying the treaty). At best, two signatures could represent only two villages and two of the Seven Council Fires of the Dakota Oyate (and it is more likely they were both from the Bdewakantunwan Council Fire). This was grossly inadequate for a treaty that was supposed to represent the will and agreement of the entire “Sioux” nation, which even Pike estimated to be 21,675.27

This treaty demonstrates that the U.S. government was not interested in fair negotiations, just that it could claim to have someone’s signature on record agreeing to relinquish land. Moreover, at the end of the council, Pike provided 60 gallons of liquor to the Dakota men in attendance.28 U.S. government negotiators frequently employed this method of enticement to achieve their desired aims in dealings with Indigenous Peoples. It helped them achieve the advantage in treaty negotiations by gaining the acquiescence of individuals they could lure with the promise of alcohol, or in some cases, by lubricating the deal-making at the start. In 1805, at the time of this treaty negotiation, Dakota people would have likely never experienced alcohol in that quantity before.

In addition, Pike never specified an amount for payment to the Dakota Oyate in the treaty, so when it was finally ratified in 1808, the Senate filled in the blank. They directed the U.S. government to pay only one hundredth of the amount initially estimated by Pike for acceptable payment. While $200 worth of gifts and alcohol were distributed at the treaty site to the two signatories, in the end, the United States claimed at least 100,000 acres of prime real estate in what is now the Twin Cities metropolitan area for the unconscionable price of $2,000, a mere two cents an acre. Even then, it was not until 1819 that the U.S. finally offered $2,000 in goods to the Dakota as belated payment.29 This treaty set the tone for Dakota—U.S. relations and Dakota people have never forgotten the unethical means by which the United States initially took our lands.

By the nineteenth century, the U.S. government realized that it could not afford costly wars with every Indigenous nation. Yet, at the same time, its expansionist policies required somehow wrestling control of Indigenous lands away from Indigenous Peoples. Europeans and Euro-Americans assumed when they invaded Indigenous lands that the United States government would eventually acquire those lands. For example, an 1849 map of southern Minnesota depicting potential railway lines indicates that long before the U.S. would negotiate the 1851 treaties (which eventually ceded those lands and confined Dakota people to reservations along the Minnesota River), it was assumed that Dakota people would be dispossessed from that land base. Americans obtained every square inch of land they now occupy at the expense of Indigenous Peoples. Similarly, Minnesotans obtained every acre of Minnesota at the expense of Indigenous Peoples. Treaties became a means to avoid warfare, temporarily at least, while also gaining access to Dakota lands.
and resources. The Treaty of 1805 exemplified that point and the United States continued to use rank means to secure Dakota lands. In future years, our people fared no better in succeeding treaty negotiations. The United States further divested us of our homeland in the treaties of 1830, 1837, 1851, and 1868. The most outrageous treaty examples, however, are the Treaties of Traverse des Sioux and Mendota negotiated in 1851.

1851 Treaties

In his chapter detailing these treaty negotiations, entitled “The Monstrous Conspiracy,” historian Roy Meyer describes how Dakota leaders were alternately promised and threatened in order to secure signatures on treaties. He argues that these treaties are “equal in infamy to anything else in the long history of injustice perpetrated upon the Indians by the authorized representatives of the United States government in the name of that government.”

The Treaty of Traverse des Sioux (negotiated with the Sisitunwan and Wahpetunwan) and the Treaty of Mendota (negotiated with the Bdeawakantunwan and the Wahpekute) ceded all remaining Dakota land claims, except a twenty-mile-long strip of land bordering the Minnesota River, from Lake Traverse to the Yellow Medicine for the “Upper Sioux,” and from Yellow Medicine to the Little Rock stream for the “Lower Sioux.” Ultimately, to obtain the necessary signatures, U.S. treaty negotiators—including Commissioner of Indian Affairs Luke Lea and Minnesota Territorial Governor Alexander Ramsey—had to repeatedly threaten the Dakota with the withholding of rations (ration theoretically guaranteed from previous treaties) or threaten to take the land by force leaving the Dakota with no compensation. Lea went so far as to suggest that if they did not sign, the Great Father could come with 100,000 men and drive the Dakota to the Rocky Mountains. Thus, fear of starvation and loss of lands by force compelled our Dakota leaders to sign the treaties.

To compound the deceit, as leaders signed first the original treaty, then a copy, they were pulled by the blanket to a third table and pressured to sign what became known as the “trader’s papers,” documents the Dakota leaders could not read. These documents (in violation of the Act of 1847 that required that all moneys due Indians be paid to the heads of families or individuals) signed over moneys directly to traders in payment of alleged debts accrued by the Dakota. At the Treaty of Traverse des Sioux, trader Joseph Brown held the pen as the chiefs were encouraged to sign the paper that was never read or explained to them. Even missionary Thomas Williamson believed it to be a triplicate copy of the treaty. After they realized what they had signed, Dakota leaders contested their validity, but the United States ultimately upheld them as legitimate.

Through the grossly inflated figures specified in the trader’s papers, traders gained substantial wealth at Dakota expense. For example, just through the shenanigans associated with the Treaty of Traverse des Sioux, Henry Hastings Sibley was paid
principal amount would not revert to the Dakota at the end of the fifty-year period. Instead, the U.S. government would pay the Dakota off the interest and then keep the principal, never paying even the meager amount of thirteen cents an acre (almost nine cents an acre if the land cession is 35,000,000) offered for the 1851 land cessions. In the end, the government would keep the money and get the land. That means the government paid $690,000 for the land cession and the Dakota actually received not quite three cents an acre for 24,000,000 acres (or about two cents an acre if we use the 35,000,000-acre land cession). However, even that figure is not accurate because White Minnesotans immediately directed $370,000 to the traders and mixed-bloods rather than to the Dakota people who were supposed to be the beneficiaries of moneys from the land ceded. With that figured into the computations, Americans, theoretically, would pay the Dakota about a penny an acre on this major land transaction.

When the treaty arrived in Washington, new debates emerged within the Senate. Consequently, the Senate barely passed it with amendments. The amendments were egregious, however, and entirely detrimental to the Dakota. The Senate struck the provisions guaranteeing the Dakota reservations, essentially leaving the Dakota landless by legal principles and wholly subject to the whim of the president. Instead of a legal title, the Senate authorized the president to select what he deemed a suitable site for a Dakota reservation for as long as he deemed necessary. While the terms of the original treaty were in no way representative of just dealings with the Dakota, the Senate's striking of the land provision was more than callous; it was criminal. The appropriation bill for payment to the Dakota contained two provisos, however. The first one required that government officials obtain the assent of the Dakota to the amendments. The second required the money to go directly to the Dakota, "unless the imperious interest of the Indian or Indians, or some treaty stipulation, shall require the payment to be made otherwise, under the direction of the President."
To obtain Dakota consent, White Minnesotans used various tactics ranging from violence and coercion to extortion and bribery to gain signatures indicating agreement to the Senate-amended treaties and the trader’s claims. The Dakota went into the negotiations as cold weather loomed with limited food supplies, so it was no surprise that Ramsey used 1837 treaty annuities as a bargaining chip against the Bdewakantunwan, withholding the annuities until they concluded “negotiations.” Ramsey also used bribery as a means to obtain signatures. For example, he told the Dakota that if they signed the amendments, he would make sure that soldiers would finally release five imprisoned Dakota warriors held at Fort Snelling.

However, historian William Folwell attributes Ramsey’s most effective “negotiating” tactic to his divide and conquer strategy. By making separate distributions of gold to individual leaders, Ramsey was able to pit the chiefs against one another and play on their individual fears. By negotiating with them individually, Ramsey could convince them that if they did not sign, they would be left with no money while the other chiefs who did sign would receive their share. Ramsey divided twenty thousand dollars among seven Bdewakantunwan chiefs, and Wabasha and Wacouta were the first to accept the gold at a late-night private meeting with Ramsey. The other chiefs then followed suit.

Yet, even after the Bdewakantunwan signed the new papers, the “Upper” Dakota continued to contest the terms. To silence one of the leaders of the opposition and thereby diminish the organized protest, Ramsey incarcerated chief Red Iron until after he obtained the necessary signatures. Even then, he had to resort to bringing in chiefs singly or in pairs and handing out annuities to them if they would sign privately. He then added the date to the document with their signatures, as if they all signed together in formal council.

In the end, Whites flooded into Dakota homeland under the banner of treaties that undoubtedly represent some of the most outrageous and fraudulent examples in American history. Even then, the United States government did not keep these deplorable treaty terms. Repeated violations included skipped or delayed treaty payments, unrealized terms directing educational or agricultural funds for the Dakota, and a constant influx of White settlers on Dakota lands, both before and after ratification. The treaties of 1851 were not the last ones the United States negotiated with Dakota people, nor were they the only ones secured by fraudulent means. The United States “negotiated” another set of treaties in 1858 using similarly deceitful methods and faulty premises. They exemplify both the gross power imbalance existing in favor of the United States over Dakota people as well as the total disregard for fair dealings exhibited by the United States.

While the United States negotiation of the treaties and their unfulfilled terms are shameful, they represent only the beginning phases of White crimes against Dakota people that would grow increasingly violent and inhumane. At this point in the historical narrative, it is appropriate to shift to another framework for examining what followed: the United Nations Convention on Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

**International Standards for Genocide**

The UN Convention details agreed upon international standards for determining what constitutes genocide in Article II, which states: “In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

(a) Killing members of the group;
(b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
(c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
(d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within
the group;
(e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another
group.\textsuperscript{44}

I must emphasize that any one of these criteria met singly con-
stitutes genocide. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries,
however, the United States government and its citizens violated
all of these criteria in multiple ways. Certainly, Whites in Min-
nesota perpetrated these crimes. This next section will highlight
examples in each of the categories to demonstrate how genocide
was committed in Dakota homeland against Dakota people.

\textbf{Criterion A}

Criterion "(a) Killing members of the group" is most apparent
in the actions of White Minnesotans during events surround-
ing the forced expulsion of Dakota people from our homeland.
Many Minnesotans are familiar with the U.S.–Dakota War of
1862 (previously referred to as the "Sioux Uprising" or "Dakota
Conflict") and understand that the war did not begin because of
a single wrong perpetrated by White settlers. Rather most people
familiar with the history understand that war was declared
by Dakota warriors as a last desperate attempt to save Dakota
homeland and way of life from White invasion and conquest, or
to die trying in what appeared to many of them as a futile effort.
Dakota people initiated the war in response to treaty violations
and the accompanying violence originating from White invasion
and colonization. Yet, White Minnesotans were able to use the
U.S.–Dakota War of 1862 as their justification for complete land
theft and an extraordinarily successful policy of genocide and
ethnic cleansing. White Minnesotans carried out many of the
events that followed with the ultimate aim of eliminating Dakota
presence from the state of Minnesota, in one way or another.

For example, on September 9, 1862, Governor Alexander
Ramsey declared before the Minnesota state legislature
"The Sioux Indians of Min-
nesota must be exterminated
or driven forever beyond the
borders of the State."\textsuperscript{45} This was
an unambiguous directive in 1862
and it remains a clearly and concisely
stated genocidal decree today. Ramsey’s statement provides the
first element required in defining genocide, and that is the as-
pect of intent. Boldly stated, there is no question about Ramsey’s
interest in destroying Dakota people, and the physical acts that
followed his directive fulfill the physical element required in de-
termining genocide, particularly under the first criteria. Furthem-
more, the events that followed in Minnesota make the most sense
in the context of Ramsey’s declaration. That is, he provided the
genocidal ideology that drove White actions in the aftermath of
the war.

Upon the defeat suffered by Dakota people militarily, many
Dakota people fled westward or northward in hopes of escaping
what they suspected would be inhumane treatment by the United
States military and citizenry. While Dakota men, in particular,
lost their lives during the war, most of the purposeful killing
of Dakota people occurred after the war had ended and when
Dakota people offered little threat to White settlement. Military
conquest of the Dakota was not enough to satisfy the aims of
Governor Ramsey, however, who responded with relish to the
appeals for mass killings shouted by Minnesota’s citizenry.

At the end of the war, when the surrendered or captured
Dakota people remained, General Henry Hastings Sibley and his soldiers immediately separated the Dakota men from the women and children. The men allowed for this separation voluntarily after soldiers told them that for payment of their overdue treaty annuities, the men would need to be counted. Believing the lie espoused by Sibley and his men, Dakota warriors were disarmed, shackled, and subjected to outrageous trials before a military tribunal composed of White Minnesotans.

The five-man tribunal eventually sentenced over three hundred Dakota men to death by hanging and another sixteen to prison terms. This was an attempt to execute immediately over 15 percent of the surrendered Dakota population. Since this group was composed of the able-bodied resisters to American invasion and land theft, if fully carried out, Minnesotans would have largely eliminated the capacity for Dakota reproduction and resistance. A population cannot survive long without its able-bodied male population.

In the end, President Abraham Lincoln ordered the execution of thirty-nine of those men and pardoned one more at the last minute, killing thirty-eight Dakota martyrs in what remains the largest mass execution in United States history. The hanging occurred the day after Christmas, on December 26, 1862. This mass hanging was such a phenomenon that at one time it earned a place in the Guinness Book of World Records for the largest simultaneous mass hanging from one gallows.

Several years after the 1862 war, when Dakota warriors were still imprisoned and Dakota people had no capacity to threaten White Minnesotans, White soldiers hanged two more Dakota leaders. Leaders Sakpe and Medicine Bottle had fled to Canada for safety at the end of the 1862 war, but it did not stop Whites from pursuing their capture and execution. Because they remained on the other side of the border, however, White soldiers had to use illegal and foul means to secure their arrest. Canadian officials, Captain John H. McKenzie of Fort Garry, Onisime Giguere, and Andrew Bannatyne, drugged Sakpe and Medicine Bottle with wine spiked with laudanum and then tied a chloroform-saturated handkerchief over Sakpe's face. They then bound both Medicine Bottle and Sakpe, tied them to sleds, and delivered them into the hands of American Major Edwin Hatch at Pembina in Dakota Territory. White soldiers next set up a military tribunal similar to the previous one and put Medicine Bottle and Sakpe on trial. The makeshift tribunal issued judgments of execution against the two leaders in late 1864, but it took nearly a year before President Andrew Johnson confirmed the execution order and White Minnesotans could finally implement it. On November 11, 1865, White soldiers executed Sakpe and Medicine Bottle by hanging at Fort Snelling.

These were not the only deaths suffered by Dakota people, however. Settler society perpetrated numerous killings, not only through direct violence, but also through the forced removals and incarceration of Dakota people without providing adequate food, clothing, shelter, and protection. Populations simply cannot survive without adequate provisions. The resulting deaths
are therefore killings, rather than inevitable or unpreventable consequences. Nowhere is this clearer than in the forced removals and concentration camp imprisonment of Dakota people during the winter of 1862–63.

After the surrender and capture of Dakota people in the fall of 1862, Sibley and his men instituted a severe system of gender segregation. They dealt with the men in one group and the women and children in another. As already mentioned, White soldiers singled out and subjected Dakota men to military tribunals. Then, while the men were awaiting President Lincoln's execution orders, soldiers first kept them at Lower Sioux and then forcibly removed them to a concentration camp in Mankato. On November 8, 1862, Dakota men, shackled two by two, were loaded onto wagons and they began their painful journey to Mankato. White mobs assaulted them, throwing rocks, sticks, and brickbats at them, and wielding bullwhips and pitchforks against them until they were bloody and beaten. One soldier guarding a wagon commented that eight out of the ten Indians he was guarding in his wagon were hurt as they went through New Ulm, some sustaining mortal wounds. It did not matter that these men were unarmed. Even White children felt that those Dakota men deserved whatever horrors could be meted out against them because they had dared to attack White settlers. In 1862, White settlers could understand wanting to kill the people attacking them in their homes and towns, but they could not see the similarities with the Dakota defense of our homeland. Indeed, they considered Dakota use of violence in defense of homeland as savage. They felt they had a superior right to Dakota homeland, because they were, well, superior and White.

Minnesotans treated Dakota women and children in a similar fashion. Soldiers paraded them through White towns as well, as they made their way to the concentration camp at Fort Snelling. Most of the Dakota women and children walked, however. Only small numbers rode on carts reserved for the very elderly and the very young. Furthermore, this population was experiencing a widespread epidemic of measles with symptoms such as a rash, fever, cough, red and watery eyes, vomiting, diarrhea, ear infections and pneumonia. This epidemic would likely have affected about 85 percent of the women and children, all while they were force-marched over twenty miles a day. In addition to accounts of sickness, Dakota families carry oral accounts detailing assaults by both White soldiers and citizens alike. For example, we have Dakota stories about White soldiers stabbing and shooting elderly grandmothers as well as stories of brutal assaults by White townspeople. One of the more horrific details remembered among the descendants of those who survived the death marches involves White townspeople pouring hot, scalding water on the elderly women and children who were riding in carts as they traveled through New Ulm. Torture and killings were the norm along this route rather than the exception. To this day, Dakota people do not know what happened to the bodies of our ancestors murdered by White Minnesotans on this forced death march.

Unfortunately, the deaths continued during the winter of 1862–63 as White Minnesotans intentionally imprisoned Dakota people without adequate food, shelter, clothing, or protection.
On November 27, 1862, a girl from Red Wing, for example, reported about Fort Snelling, "There are a few squaws killed up at the fort every week...always cut their throats by running against a knife. The Third Regiment buries them in a hole, face downwards." White soldiers could routinely perpetrate sexual violence against Dakota women and girls and then simply dispose of their bodies. Moreover, they could do so without fear of retributive violence from male Dakota relatives who were helpless to defend their women and children because they were imprisoned elsewhere.52

Other deaths occurred from the epidemics still spreading through the Fort Snelling concentration camp. In reference to Dakota arrival at Fort Snelling, Gabriel Renville commented, "We all moved into this inclosure, but we were so crowded and confined that an epidemic broke out among us and the children were dying day and night."53 In late January 1863, Stephen Riggs wrote to his brother, "It is a very sad place now. The crying hardly ever stops. From five to ten die daily." Good Star Woman related, "Sometime 20 to 50 died in one day and were buried in a long trench, the old, large people underneath and the children on top."54 Others were so sick with grief that they no longer wanted to live. Wabasha's wife, for example, literally starved herself out of a sense of grief she experienced over the hanging of her brother, White Dog, at Mankato.55

Ironically, in the twenty-first century some writers of history still maintain the perverted colonialisit perception of these events. Corinne Monjeau-Marz, for example, rejects the term concentration camp as an accurate identifier. Instead, she considers Fort Snelling a site of Dakota preservation stating, "in post-war Minnesota, this option helped preserve them." This perspective completely denies and renders benign the violent and brutal processes of invasion, conquest, and ethnic cleansing that accompanied White "settlement." In reality, Dakota people would have been well preserved without Fort Snelling if White
people simply stopped making false promises, invading, stealing, and desecrating Dakota lands and resources, and killing Dakota people. To put it clearly, if they left Dakota homeland, White Minnesotans would not have to imprison Dakota people in concentration camps. It is precisely because White Minnesotans wanted to continue their occupation of Dakota homeland that Dakota populations were threatened. Fort Snelling did not protect Dakota people. Rather, it served to concentrate and subjugate our population as Minnesotans prepared to remove us from our homeland.

In spring 1862, the stage was set for White Minnesotans to launch a full-scale campaign of ethnic cleansing, thus helping to fulfill Governor Ramsey’s call for extermination or forced removal. Minnesota’s soldiers forced the remaining populations on boats that went down the Mississippi River. The condemned men (those the soldiers did not hang in Mankato) were imprisoned in Davenport, Iowa. The military escorted the women and children to a new concentration camp site in Crow Creek,
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South Dakota (via the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers). Conditions were no better for the men in Davenport or the women and children at Crow Creek than they were in the previous concentration camps.

But, let us return to the UN Genocide Convention. There are still more examples that meet criterion “(a) Killing members of the group.” Once Minnesotans achieved the forced removal of Dakota people out of Minnesota, Ramsey ordered punitive expeditions into Dakota Territory to hunt down Dakota people in flight. While Sibley’s enemies saw the 1863 expeditions as ineffectual because the soldiers were unable to kill or capture large numbers of Indians, the expeditions were incredibly harmful to Dakota people. In addition to causing terror, the expeditions destroyed vast quantities of Dakota supplies and equipment. Thus, the victories were one-sided in favor of White interests. The battles primarily consisted of Dakota warriors trying desperately to fend off White soldiers while their women and children fled behind them. Of course, most of the casualties of these expeditions would occur the following winter when the Dakota populations on the run starved or died of exposure.

Still, that was not enough to satisfy the quest for total annihilation. Minnesotans placed bounties on the scalps of Dakota people beginning in the summer of 1863. They began at twenty-five dollars and eventually reached two hundred dollars. Though bounties on human beings were illegal at the time, even according to United States laws, it did not prevent White Minnesotans from enacting the bounty system and awarding money to beneficiaries. For example, Winona’s newspaper, The Daily Republican, issued the call for bounties on September 23, 1863, stating, “The State reward for dead Indians has been increased to $200 for every red-skin sent to Purgatory. The sum is more than the dead bodies of all the Indians east of the Red River are worth.”

White Minnesotans were clamoring for complete extermination or removal, the state government was obliged with public policy, and the media was encouraging indiscriminate Indian
killing. This undoubtedly meets several of the criteria set out in the Genocide Convention.

**Criterion B**

The second criterion is "(b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group." Bodily harm in this case may be more easily determined and includes all the examples cited above in which Whites killed Dakota people, as well as all the instances in which Dakota people suffered physical trauma short of death. These would include such examples as those who suffered beatings, whippings, and scalding water on the forced marches; those who suffered sickness and exposure because of inadequate shelter; those who suffered starvation as White soldiers hunted them down; and the women who suffered sexual assault while under government confinement.

Mental harm, however, is not readily apparent to settler society because in many instances settlers still believe in the superiority of their ways of being and living. From that perspective,

settler society might even view colonization as beneficial to Indigenous Peoples. However, perpetrators in this context are not morally positioned to make the determination of mental harm for Indigenous Peoples. Rather, only the victims can determine if they have suffered mental harm. Obviously mental harm accompanies bodily harm, but there are additional circumstances that also warrant consideration under this criterion. I would argue that the processes of invasion, conquest, and colonization also fit under this criterion because of the severe psychological harms that consequently occurred to the Dakota psyche. What kind of mental harm is perpetrated against a people's leadership when the more powerful nation is not fulfilling its treaty obligations? What kind of mental harm is perpetrated upon a people overwhelmed by hopelessness and powerlessness because they have no effective way to defend their lands and people from an outside threat? What kind of mental harm is done to a people dispossessed of their homeland?

These harms did not end in the nineteenth century. One of
the federally mandated boarding schools located in Minnesota, for example, was Pipestone Indian School. The purpose of federal boarding schools was to perpetrate ethnocide. While the UN Convention on Genocide does not specify ethnocide as genocide, the effects of ethnocide upon the victims certainly constitute mental harm.\(^5\) Within the federal boarding schools, the general policy was “Kill the Indian, Save the Man.” School officials implemented systematic efforts to strip away all traces of Indigeneity (including language, dress, long hair, spirituality, diet, worldview, economy, political and kinship systems, and of course, attachment to the land), while supplanting those ways with White, Christian values, worldview, and ways of being.

What makes this particular policy of ethnocide so heinous is that the U.S. government perpetrated this crime against the children, the most vulnerable segment of the Indigenous population. The confusion, self-hatred, identity conflicts, and trauma were so detrimental to the children who attended boarding schools that we still experience the disturbing effects in our communities today. Furthermore, the abuses at the boarding schools surpassed mental harms. They also included bodily harm through extreme forms of corporal punishment as well as physical and sexual abuse.\(^5\) Certainly, the ethnocide that accompanied missionary efforts and boarding schools were violent and harmful enough to constitute genocide according to this particular criterion in the UN Genocide Convention.

In Minnesota, the government usually sent Dakota children to Pipestone Indian School, located in the southwestern portion of the state near the South Dakota border. Pipestone's buildings were erected in 1892 and doors opened to students the following year. The school remained in operation until 1953 when it was finally closed, affecting not just a single generation, but multiple generations of Dakota families. Many children entered the boarding schools when they were very young (five or six years of age). They consequently experienced years of indoctrination in anti-Indian ideology and frequently experienced a range of abuses perpetrated against them. As historian Andrea Smith points out, “Some colonists supported boarding schools because they thought cultural genocide was more cost-effective than physical genocide.”\(^6\) Though federally mandated boarding schools were characterized as part of U.S. policies of Indian assimilation, that presentation is much too benign. It would be much more accurate to describe the ethnical institutions as part of U.S. policies of brutal colonization and genocide.

**Criterion C**

The third criterion in the UN Genocide Convention, “(c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or part,” also applies to the Dakota experience in Minnesota. By the 1860s, the U.S. government had already removed hundreds of thousands of Indigenous Peoples from their homelands because citizens and all levels of government were intent upon wresting Indigenous lands away from Indigenous Peoples. Ethnic cleansing became a means to not only dispossess Indigenous Peoples, but also to eliminate the populations that would continue to contest or threaten the new White landlords.

Thomas Jefferson, for example, rigorously advocated for the extermination of Indigenous Peoples, stating, in 1807, “And... if we are constrained to lift the hatchet against any tribe, we will never lay it down till that tribe is exterminated, or is driven beyond the Mississippi... in war, they will kill some of us; we shall destroy all of them.” Similarly, in 1813 Jefferson wrote, “that the American government has no other choice before it than to pursue [the Indians] to extermination, or drive them to new seats beyond our reach.”\(^6\) When Governor Ramsey made his similar declaration in 1862, he was merely following a tradition laid out previously by America’s founding fathers. Jefferson was certainly
the most articulate brainchild of the extraordinarily successful policies of forced removal that would become codified and executed under future presidential administrations.

The administration of Andrew Jackson in the 1830s, for example, was responsible for the forced march of the Tsalagi (Cherokee) on their Trail of Tears. This is perhaps the best-known forced march in American history, causing the deaths of approximately 8,000 of 17,000 Tsalagi men, women, and children because of their death march to Indian Territory.62

Sociologist Russell Thornton has documented losses for Indigenous Peoples due to genocide, and he comments that many, if not most, Indigenous Peoples were “removed, relocated, dispersed, concentrated, or forced to migrate at least once.” He further states, “Both the concentration of American Indians in small geographic areas and the dispersal of them from their homelands caused increased mortality in Indian populations, typically because of associated military actions, disease, starvation, extremely harsh conditions during the moves, and the resulting destruction of ways of life.”63 Historian David Stannard agrees with Thornton regarding the widespread implementation of forced removals. He asserts, “The story of the southeastern Indians, like that of the northeastern tribes, was repeated across the entire expanse of the North American continent, as far south as Mexico, as far north as Canada and the Arctic, as far west as the coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California.”64

The congregating of Dakota people in concentration camps and the ethnic cleansing of Dakota people out of Minnesota, therefore, fit into a long history of American brutality. Consequently, the deaths that occurred because of these policies would have been both foreseen and disregarded. It was certainly no secret to the U.S. government, state governments, or to White citizens that Indigenous people died during such brutal and traumatic experiences. Yet, the U.S. government and American citizens repeatedly and systematically continued to carry out policies of removal. They did not simply consider Dakota people expendable and appropriate targets of violent crimes; Dakota deaths provided an added bonus. With Dakota deaths, White citizens could get Indigenous land without fearing Indigenous retribution. Because many Whites would have preferred total extermination, they would have considered deaths from concentration camps or forced removals as beneficial.

In 1863, the legislation for Dakota ethnic cleansing was entitled “An Act for the Removal of the Sisseton, Wahpeton, Medewakanton, and Wahpokota Bands of Sioux or Dakota Indians, and for the disposition of their Lands in Minnesota and Dakota.” Tellingly, it accompanied another bit of legislation entitled “An Act for the Relief of Persons for Damages sustained by Reason of Depredations and Injuries by certain Bands of Sioux Indians.”65 These acts allowed for the unilateral abrogation of Dakota treaties, for the release of Dakota treaty annuities to White settlers in Minnesota, and for the U.S. military to implement a policy of ethnic cleansing. Because Dakota forced removal was legislated, we must consider the resulting deaths associated with the implementation of that legislation as deliberate. Furthermore, we must also consider as deliberate the deaths caused by the horrendous concentration camp conditions at Lower Sioux,
Mankato, Fort Snelling, Fort McClellan (Davenport), and Fort Thompson (Crow Creek). Imprisonment was no accident. It was a callous and inhumane government and citizenry that continued to subject Dakota people to long-term confinement while our people were dying. Yet, they continued to deny our Dakota ancestors their freedom.

Because the U.S. government repeated forced removals across the continent, by the 1860s it was clear that when they denied Indigenous Peoples their homelands and their ways of life, Indigenous Peoples tended to die in unusually high numbers. This was certainly true of the Dakota people, who began to die in unprecedented numbers when denied access to our traditional homeland. More than a third of the population, or 120 men, confined at Davenport (Fort McClellan) died during their three-year incarceration. Similarly, at the Crow Creek concentration camp in South Dakota where the women, children, and “friendlies” were confined, the death toll was extreme. Children frequently suffered the most as the death toll affected young people more dramatically. The missionary John P. Williamson wrote about the forced exile and the subsequent deaths, capturing the impact on the population:

When 1300 Indians were crowded like slaves on the boiler and hurricane decks of a single boat, and fed on musty hard tack and briny pork, which they had not half a chance to cook, diseases were bred which made fearful havoc during the hot months, and the 1300 souls that were landed at Crow Creek June 1, 1863, decreased to one thousand.... So were the hills soon covered with graves.66

Other factors also affected birth and death rates among Dakota people. Thornton states that because of contact with Europeans, Indigenous People generally experienced diminished fecundity (ability to reproduce) and decreased fertility. While the influx of diseases certainly contributed to decreased fertility, so too did alcohol use as well as “warfare, genocide, removals, relocations, and destructions of ways of life.”67 Furthermore, at the same time that many factors were contributing to decreased fertility, mortality rates were also increasing.

Criterion D

In addition to the factors above contributing to a decreasing Dakota population, the United States government, the state of Minnesota, and White citizenry all helped ensure an additional reduction in population through the forced gender segregation occurring at the various concentration camp sites. This practice of separating out the women and children from the able-bodied men meets criterion (d) of the Genocide Convention, “Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group.” A population cannot possibly reproduce when the government disallows sexual relations between men and women. That is precisely what happened in the 1860s in conjunction with Minnesota’s ethnic cleansing policies.

In the 1860s, Dakota people were experiencing enforced subfecundity (a diminished ability to reproduce) as a direct consequence of gender segregation. Furthermore, this segregation went on for prolonged periods. Considering that Dakota men were initially shackled and separated from their families by fall 1862, over a third of them were killed, and the rest of the imprisoned men were not released until spring 1866, it meant nearly four years of separation. This was devastating to the Dakota population at Crow Creek. Their population continued to decline while the United States government kept the men incarcerated. Furthermore, many of the births that did occur during that time would have been children born of the rape of Dakota women by White soldiers.

Unfortunately, in the twenty-first century, Dakota people continue to suffer disproportionately higher rates of incarceration than Whites. This means that enforced gender segregation is still
negatively affecting the fecundity rates. We must remember that prior to colonization, Dakota people never experienced incarceration. We had a system of justice that allowed for the healing of harms without prisons. Indigenous people in prisons, therefore, are just another manifestation of colonialism at work in the United States, one with dire consequences for our people.

The United States has a poor track record in terms of violations against Indigenous women and our capacity for reproduction. One of the most flagrant violations of the UN Genocide Convention in this area involves the involuntary sterilization of Indigenous women in the late twentieth century. Various scholars have documented aspects of this 100 percent federally funded program administered to Indigenous Peoples through Indian Health Service (IHS) Hospitals as part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare programs. We have yet to realize, however, the full extent of harm perpetrated under IHS. For example, in 1979 the General Accounting Office released a report based on a study of only four out of twelve IHS service areas (Albuquerque, Phoenix, Aberdeen, Oklahoma City), but that report was damaging enough to indicate a widespread genocidal practice. Within those four service areas, IHS sterilized 3,001 Indigenous women of childbearing age between 1973 and 1976, representing 5 percent of Indigenous women of childbearing age in those areas. Other surveys suggest that the practice of involuntary sterilization was much more widespread, with rates that ranged from 25 percent in the Oklahoma City area to 80 percent on other reservations.68

Many of the Dakota people living in exile, including those living on the Crow Creek, Lake Traverse, and Spirit Lake reservations, would have received healthcare within the Aberdeen service area, a known site of Indigenous involuntary sterilization practices. The same would be presumably true of the Indian Health Service facilities serving the Minnesota Dakota (as well as Anishinabe, Ho-Chunk, and other Indigenous populations in the region). We still need to investigate this matter further to disclose the truth regarding the full extent of involuntary sterilization practices, because current studies have only begun to skim the surface.

Furthermore, we have yet to learn the role of facilities such as the hospital built at the Pipestone Indian Training School that was completed in 1932. If sterilizations were performed at other government administered and funded institutions, it is not unreasonable to wonder what might have happened to Indigenous children while attending the boarding school at Pipestone with a hospital facility on the campus. What is certain is that the documented practice of involuntary sterilization was widely performed in the United States. According to international standards, this clearly constitutes genocide.

**Criterion E**

The last criterion (e) delineated in the UN Genocide Convention involves “Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.” The federally mandated boarding schools qualify under this criterion, as the government took Indigenous children away from their families of birth and delivered them into the hands of predominantly White, government-run institutions. Further, while the staff had the children away from the influence of their families and communities, they worked to destroy Indigenous ways of being. These institutions consequently caused irreparable harm to whole generations of children who grew up without Indigenous parenting skills. To make matters worse, the institutional staff often initiated vulnerable students into cycles of abusive behavior. Upon leaving the schools, students then carried those behaviors with them into their own families and communities.

This is not the only example of genocide that would fall under this criterion, however. Throughout the twentieth century, government officials took Indigenous children from their birth families in other ways as well. They abducted children for placement in White homes with White families. The dominant society frequently believed Indigenous families were inadequate in some
way. Reasons for removing children were sometimes clear in terms of a record of violence or abuse. In other instances, however, the government removed children because their birth family was considered to be too poor, without the appropriate “necessities of civilization” such as indoor plumbing and electricity, or because their home was considered to have too many extended family members inhabiting it. Through foster and adoption care programs, the government placed Indigenous children in White homes, sometimes loving, sometimes not, so that they would theoretically “benefit” from the influences of “civilization.” Historian Andrea Smith has written, “In Minnesota, Indian children were 500 percent more likely to be in foster care or adoptive care than non-Indian children” and “in South Dakota, Indian children were 1,600 percent more likely to be in foster or adoptive care.”

Loss of Indigenous children occurred unhindered until the passing of the Indian Child Welfare Act in 1978, and while that has slowed the flow of adoptions out of Indigenous communities, it has not halted it completely. Through such policies, the government has devastated Dakota children, families, and whole communities. Consequently, some of our people have been permanently lost from us.

This is of such widespread concern to Indigenous Peoples throughout the United States that Indigenous communities are now inventing new ways to attempt to self-heal communities and reconnect with one another. In October 2007, the White Earth Reservation sponsored a homecoming gathering for their Anishinaabe people who had been adopted out. It was, perhaps, the first of its kind in the United States, but it indicates the sense of loss and grief from a tremendous harm that has not yet been satisfactorily resolved.

**Consequences of Genocide**

This chapter has only briefly touched on a few of the examples of genocide perpetrated against Dakota people by White Americans, primarily so they could continue to occupy Dakota land unhindered. If we delve deeper into the historical record, we would find many more examples of other crimes against humanity and human injustices perpetrated for a variety of reasons. Furthermore, the crimes done to Dakota homeland, which I have not yet detailed here, are so extensive as to warrant the term ecocide. That is another category of harm that has deep and severe implications for the well-being of the planet and for Dakota people. Minnesotans and Americans need to address those harms as well.

Perhaps the clearest indication of the extent of harm caused by Minnesota’s policy of ethnic cleansing is the lack of Dakota presence in Dakota homeland. We can see the evidence both in terms of Dakota land base and Dakota population. Before invasion and ethnic cleansing, Dakota land base would have included approximately 54,017,532 acres. Now Dakota people occupy about .006 percent of our original land base. Similarly, the population of Dakota people in Minnesota remains disproportionately small in the twenty-first century. According to the 2000 Census (including self-identified Dakota people among both reservation and urban populations), about 5,300 people claiming Dakota blood reside in the state. The 2003 Northwest Area Foundation statistics indicate that 2,265 of those individuals are citizens of the four federally recognized Dakota communities in Minnesota. Meanwhile, contemporary data identifying Dakota populations in the United States and Canada is difficult to assess, in part because census materials do not always differentiate between Dakota, Lakota, and Nakota people. Self-identifiers as well as census officials maintain the use of the term “Sioux,” making precision impossible. Thus, the “Sioux” population is calculated in the 2000 U.S. Census to be 167,869, with a portion of that being Dakota. Many thousands more Dakota people still reside in Canada.

Because of the Dakota diaspora, most of our nation is still born into exile hundreds of miles away from our beautiful homeland.
We cannot relegate this reality to the depths of a single historical event or period in history. Instead, every generation of Dakota people has experienced this injustice since 1862. The injustice continues through the present day along with the other devastating consequences of living as colonized peoples. We continue to bear witness to the destruction of our homeland and to advocate for its survival. Settler society continues to deny us access to our sacred sites as well as the protection of our sacred sites. Settler society also continues to deny us access to many of the subsistence practices within the borders of Minnesota. Our populations continue to face oppression in the existing educational, social welfare, economic, and criminal (in)justice institutions governing these lands. Our people continue to experience disproportionately high rates of early mortality, disease, suicide, depression, incarceration, chemical dependency, and violence. We are still suffering. While we need to do our part to recover healthy and sustainable ways of being, those recovery efforts will be futile if settler society continues to deny the inherent rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Notes

1. Because I am recounting this story from memory and Dale Childs is no longer available to verify this version, I apologize to him and to my elders for any errors in the story.

2. Dakota lands at one time would have at least included parts of what are now Wisconsin, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Manitoba, Canada. Other scholars and tribal historians have argued that Dakota territory extended as far as Saskatchewan, Alberta, Montana, Wyoming, Nebraska, Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Illinois. Leo Omani from the Wahpeton Reserve near Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, for example, cites the work of James Morrison and oral tradition of Robert Good Voice. See, Leo Omani, “The Dakota Diaspora from Minnesota into Canada After 1862: Dispelling North American Colonial History in the Movement to Revive the Oral Dakota History, Language, and Culture of the Tyospayes that Belong to Bde-wa-kah-ton-wan, Sisitonwan, Wahpetonwan, and Wahpekute,” a paper delivered at the “Remembering, Retracing & Retelling: The Diaspora of the Dakota People from Minnesota into Canada and the Dakotas after 1862” Conference, Southwest Minnesota State University, Marshall, Minnesota, April 2001; and, J. Morrison, Dakota/Lakota Joint Treaty Adhesion Project, Phase Two: Historical Land Use and Occupancy and Dakota/Lakota Crown Relations, Legal Historical Research, Ancaster, Ontario, 2000.

3. For example, the Iowa, Oto, and Ho-Chunk all made their homes in Minnesota at various points.


7. See Guy Gibbon, The Sioux: The Dakota and Lakota Nations (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2003). I gave this work special attention because of its recent date of publication, demonstrating that recent decades of Indigenous Peoples challenging the colonialist presumptions and methods of anthropology have had little effect on old-school practitioners of the discipline. Instead, colonialist researchers still conduct research, as well as write and publish research that continues the academic tradition of dehumanizing, objectifying, and delegitimizing Indigenous presence in our lands.

I should note that Dakota people do not deem all archeologists in Minnesota disrespectful and colonialist. Janet Spector, for example, conducted and documented her experiences with a nineteenth-century Dakota site, that of Mazoman’s village along the Minnesota River. In addition to being ethically grounded and respectful of Dakota knowledge, many academics consider her research to be better informed, more accurate, and of higher quality than other archeological works. See Janet D. Spector, What This Awel Means: Feminist Archeology at a Wahpeton Dakota Village (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1993).


For example, William Folwell cites wars with the Iroquois as the reason for their forced migration as late as the mid-seventeenth century. See William Folwell, A History of Minnesota, Volume I (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1956), 80. The Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe Web site, for example, states, “Thousands of years ago, the Ojibwe were among several Indian tribes who lived on the Atlantic coast of North America. Then, about 500 years ago, many of these tribes began to migrate west as the eastern seaboard became colonized by the European settlers. Among them were the ancestors of the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe,” see http://www.millelacojibwe.org/culture.asp (accessed September 19, 2007).


Father Hennepin lived from 1626 to 1705 and was sent on an exploratory mission by France in 1675. He was taken captive in 1680 by a war party of Dakota on the Mississippi. He spent three months as a Dakota prisoner before Sieur du Luth negotiated his release. For information about the locations of Dakota towns, see Newton H. Winchell, The Aborigines of Minnesota (St. Paul: The Pioneer Company, 1911), 73. It should be noted that the location of the Sistunwans is a guess based on a reference in Hennepin’s report regarding the “Chongaskobe” that Winchell assumed to be them. Local accounts offer similar explanation. See, for example, Arthur P. Rose, An Illustrated History of Yellow Medicine County (Marshall, MN: Northern History Publishing Co, 1914), 19.

15. Winchell, The Aborigines of Minnesota, 64–65. Other archeologists today might disagree with this analysis. However, a reading of the anthropological reports produced throughout the twentieth century about Minnesota’s Indigenous inhabitants demonstrates the tremendous variety of what I would consider wildly contrasting opinions among “experts” regarding our origins. While feigning to deal in the realm of “truth” and “facts,” it is clear that their rules for analysis are quite arbitrary and they would be comical if they did not negatively affect Indigenous Peoples. For example, when discussing evidence that suggests human populations in the Glacial epochs, Winchell notes the dismissal of evidence by some experts: “While probably most American geologists and archeologists fully accept the foregoing as demonstrating the Glacial age of man in America, a few still remain skeptical, and with superfluous caution, or with carping criticism, call attention to defects in the evidence, and are inclined to explain all these instances by some accidental circumstances that may have caused intrusion of the specimens into the drift since the deposition of the same. Others attribute the reports to faulty observation and mistaken interpretation,” 20. Scott Anfinson demonstrates that archeologists still employ such practices nearly a century later stating, “Many of the dates from the Prairie Lake Region are either inaccurate (six deviate substantially from expectations and four others are less than 200 years old) or they have poor cultural associations.” See, Scott F. Anfinson, Southwestern Minnesota Archaeology: 12,000 Years in the Prairie Lake Region (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1997), 5. It seems to be a regular anthropological practice to simply dismiss whatever evidence (amassed according to their own methods and standards) does not support their reigning theory about the past. It thus makes it impossible to cite any anthropological work with a high degree of confidence.

17. See for instance Gary Anderson's *Kinsmen of Another Kind*.


20. See, for example, the account of a descendant of a former chief from Mille Lacs, Warren, *History of the Ojibway People*, 157–58.


22. Ibid., 230–34.


28. See “Endnotes” for the *Treaty with the Sioux Nation of Indians—1805*, compiled by Howard J. Vogel, Professor of Law, Hamline University School of Law. hvogel@hamline.edu.


35. An indication of the arbitrary and fraudulent nature of the amounts paid to the traders is exemplified in the initial adjustment the traders made to scale down their claims in accordance with the treaties. In the case of the Treaty of Traverse des Sioux, for example, claims were reduced from $431,735.78 to $210,000. Sibley’s claim alone was arbitrarily reduced from $144, 984.40 to $66,459.00. See Folwell, *A History of Minnesota*, 283, 287 through 303. In addition, Gary Anderson reports that Sibley’s fur trade company alone took $105,685.54 that was divided among four White men: Sibley, Dousman, McLeod, and Ramsey Crooks, Anderson, *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, 197.

36. Folwell notes that the area has never been accurately computed, but cites other writers. Thomas Hughes computed “over 19,000,000 acres in Minnesota, nearly 3,000,000 acres in Iowa, and over 1,750,000 acres in South Dakota making all nearly 24,000,000 acres of the choicest land on the globe,” and the celebratory commissioner’s report that stated that an area of 35,000,000 acres had been acquired. See Folwell, *A History of Minnesota*, 287.


38. Folwell, *A History of Minnesota*, 281. Folwell also notes that Ramsey helped negotiate a treaty with the Anishinabe at Pembina for the cession of some five million acres in the Red River Valley under similar terms with 5 percent interest payments for twenty years with the principal amount reverting back to the government at the end of that period. However, that treaty was not ratified by the Senate, 288, 291. Gary Anderson also comments that the money that was supposed to be held in trust was never put in the Treasury and Congress had to appropriate the interest each year, see Gary Clayton Anderson, *Kinsmen of Another Kind*, 186.


42. Ibid., 397–99.


45. Message of Governor Ramsey to the Legislature of Minnesota,


51. Ibid., 59.

52. Monjeau-Marz documents several of these examples in addition to the young women with their slit throats, such as the "sowaw" reported killed during soldier's target shooting, later explained to be subjected to "infamous outrage." For further examples, see chapter 3, The Dakota Indian Internment at Fort Snelling.


54. Ibid., 60.

55. Ibid., 72.


57. Ibid., 135n3.

58. Raphael Lemkin who coined the term genocide, however, firmly believed that ethnocide was a form of genocide. "His definition included attacks on political and social institutions, culture, language, national feelings, religion, and the economic existence of the group." See, David Stannard, American Holocaust: The Conquest of the New World (New York: Oxford, 1992), quoting Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn, 279.

59. Instances of boarding school abuses are being disclosed and documented every day. While corporal punishments included such acts as washing out children's mouths with lye for speaking Indigenous languages, forcing children to kneel for hours, whippings, beatings, strapings, other instances of abuse include rape and terrorism. These are documented in works such as Howard Adams, Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1997), Ward Churchill, Kill the Indian, Save the Man: The Genocidal Impact of American Indian Residential Schools (San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2004), and Andrea Smith, Conquest: Sexual Violence and the American Indian Genocide (Cambridge: South End Press, 2005).

60. Smith, Conquest, 37.


62. Ibid., 124.


64. Stannard, American Holocaust, 125.


66. This is quoted in Meyer, History of the Santee Sioux, 146, though the quote is originally cited in Stephen Riggs, Mary and I: Forty Years with the Sioux (Boston: Congregational Sunday-School and Publishing Society, 1880), 224.


A Call for Truth Telling

It is a consistent practice among progressives to bemoan the genocide of Native peoples, but in the interest of political expediency, implicitly sanction it by refusing to question the legitimacy of the settler nation responsible for this genocide.

—Andrea Smith, Conquest

To many Minnesotans truth telling may seem an unnecessary educational goal because there is no awareness of a denial of truth. In this way, we could argue that contemporary citizens of the state are residing in a kind of ideological matrix. The need for truth telling espoused here assumes that what has passed for the truth may not be truthful after all. It assumes that the educational system has not engaged our history in a satisfactory way and that most Minnesotans still operate in the realm of myth making. This means that many well-intentioned people, who ordinarily would be horrified at the notion of being complicit in the cover-up of genocide and the ongoing denial of justice for Indigenous Peoples, have done just that. They have maintained ignorance about this history while continuing to enjoy their lives, unchallenged, in Dakota homeland at Dakota expense.

For those of us who believe in the transformative potential of education, our hope derives from the expectation that once people understand the truth, they will be compelled to act more justly. Indeed, it has been my experience that the thought of harming others disturbs most morally conscious individuals. They are consequently upset when they learn the circumstances regarding the invasion, conquest, and ethnic cleansing of Dakota
Developing Peaceful Co-Existence

To remain true to a struggle conceived within Onkwehonwe [Original People] values, the end goal of our Wasase—our warrior's dance—must be formulated as a spiritual revolution, a culturally rooted social movement that transforms the whole of society and a political action that seeks to remake the entire landscape of power and relationship to reflect truly a liberated post-imperial vision.

—TAIJAKE ALFRED, WASASE

In order to create a society dedicated to peaceful co-existence, oppression in all its forms must end—particularly forms of oppression that have been institutionalized. Thus, we must begin by implementing acts of reparative justice that will ensure a homeland for Dakota people as well as ensure an infrastructure that will support Dakota ways of being. Then, we also must expose and overturn all the institutions that allow for the systematic exploitation of people and resources, the oppression of groups, and the degradation of the environment. We must eradicate the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized and overturn the institution of colonialism. Finally, we must replace those harmful ways with systems and ways of living that are respectful to all of creation.

Assessing Our Values

As a beginning, we need to examine the underlying value assumptions that guide our personal lives and assess whether we
are fulfilling those values at the broader, public level. When a group of Dakota people developed their presentation for the Minnesota Sesquicentennial Commission to address the history of genocide and ethnic cleansing, we began with a discussion of the values that were informing our presentation. They included:

- Genocide is a crime against humanity.
- Might is not right.
- White is not right.
- The only good society is a just society.

Few Minnesotans would outwardly disagree with those values. They represent values that most of us attempt to teach our children. Yet, when we examine Minnesota history and the treatment of Dakota People, we can see that Minnesotans have failed to live up to those values in regards to Dakota People.

Thus, we need to determine collectively what values and goals will allow us to move toward a peaceful and sustainable future. For example, most people would not embrace oppression as a core value they try to uphold. Most of us like to think of ourselves as “good” human beings and we do not self-identify as oppressors. Yet, oppression occurs every day, sometimes in our families, certainly in our local communities, and in the state more broadly. What this means is that there is a disconnect between the way we see ourselves and the way we operate as a collective society. We need to consider a dramatic rethinking of the way we exist in this world. Do the values we hold allow for the oppression of other people or the environment? Are they sustainable in the long term? That is, when we implement those values, will they contribute to global destruction, or can we practice them sustainably? Prior to colonization, most Indigenous societies in North America had developed a means for sustainable living. This is not to suggest that there were no examples of societies that rose and fell or that there were no periods of turmoil and imbalance, but most societies had mecha-

nisms for restoring balance. Our ancestors placed value on the notion of balance as it represented the ideal way of being in this world. Given the fact that we are all part of a global community in which our actions affect the lives of others, we can no longer afford to allow some segments of the population to pursue an agenda that might harm the rest of us. This means we need to abandon fundamental institutions in North America—even the current system of government.

Andrea Smith articulates in her work the need to not only dispel familiar myths regarding the permanency of the American nation-state, but also that we must rework the existing social order. Smith points out the extent of injustice embedded within America’s foundation: “The ‘freedom’ guaranteed to some individuals in society has always been premised upon the radical unfreedom of others. Very specifically, the U.S. could not exist without the genocide of Indigenous Peoples. Otherwise visitors to this continent would be living under Indigenous forms of governance rather than U.S. empire.” Thus, if all of America is based on the fundamental denial of freedoms (including the right to life) to Indigenous Peoples, then any attempt toward justice must consider the elimination of the U.S. government as a political entity. Smith further argues that because of the oppression embedded in the existing political structure, we also “need to think beyond the nation-state as the appropriate form of governance for the world.”

Similarly, capitalism, as it exists in America, needs to be overturned. We must challenge any system in which profit making is the primary objective. The capitalist system is designed so individuals and corporations can amass wealth, while ignoring the costs to other humans and the environment. If we consider how Indigenous Peoples in the U.S. have suffered because of our capitalist economic system, for example, it is clear that capitalism is not a system under which everyone can benefit, no matter how many jobs we hold or how hard we work. Instead, those who benefit the most are those who accrue wealth by exploiting
the resources of everyone while at the same time denying responsibility for public interests. The largest beneficiaries of capitalism are willing to pass on devastating costs to society and to the future generations who will inherit our desecrated planet. Furthermore, because we currently base our capitalist system on the exploitation of people and finite resources, the current model of consumerism and materialism is, simply, impossible to sustain. Our oil-based civilization is quickly ending.

Some of the most progressive and promising models for sustainability involve localizing economies, including localizing food and energy production and consumption. While such a movement does not mean a total rejection of global community engagement, it does require a critical look at our relationships with our neighbors, the land, and the other beings that inhabit our environment. It compels a conscious awareness of our environmental footprint and a subsequent desire to keep that footprint as small as possible. When we look to meet our needs and solve our problems at the local level, we foster within ourselves a sense of love for and a desire to protect our local communities. This is how we might all work toward peaceful co-existence in Dakota homeland.

Eventually, we would need to overturn every other system and institution currently oppressive to Dakota people. The extent to which the systems continue to fail or harm our people is evident in our social circumstances. Our students continue to drop out of mainstream educational facilities at extraordinarily high rates across the board. Given the educational systems dedication to creating “good citizens” and conformity to American values, it is no wonder. Rather than fostering critical thinking and embedding values that reflect a concern for all life, the educational system continues to perpetuate Manifest Destiny ideology that justifies Indigenous killing and land theft as well as blind obedience to the existing social order.

Similarly, the social welfare system, like the criminal (in)justice system, continues to break up families. Rather than working to overturn a fundamentally unjust system, social workers continue to blame families for problems, as if individuals are acting in a vacuum. Meanwhile, Indigenous children and adults are judged and sentenced more harshly and serve disproportionately higher rates of incarceration for longer sentences. When substance abuse and family violence ravage our communities, the system tells us that we are to blame, rather than the society and institutions that continue to dehumanize and oppress Indigenous Peoples and denigrate everything Indigenous.

Furthermore, the existing health care system is highly problematic because it continues to focus on treatment for disease and poor health, rather than on preventative, holistic care that incorporates Indigenous practices. While we desperately require top-notch health care today because of all the threats to our bodies as a consequence of colonialism, our health will be restored more fully when we can begin to strengthen ourselves by recovering the healthy ways of living that sustained us prior to colonization. We must eventually abandon the oppressive institutions in favor of those that fully support Indigenous Peoples and Indigenous ways of being.

A Message to Dakota People

At the conclusion of the 2002 Dakota Commemorative March, Clifford Canku, a Sisseton elder and one of our spiritual leaders from the March, articulated what many of us felt regarding being on the verge of new possibilities. His words of empowerment were expressed in his comments, “We don’t need to be complacent anymore. . . . I think it’s time that we risk bravery and say ‘this is what we feel, this is what we need to do,’ and get it done, do it . . . We’re living in exciting times and we need to vision for our people.”

Our colonizers told us that we must accept the way things are because we cannot change them. They have told us that because they are invested in maintaining the colonial status quo
and because they continue to benefit from the ongoing denial of justice to our people. More specifically, they are benefiting from Dakota lands and resources and they do not want us to imagine a future in which we have reclaimed our homeland. As revolutionary intellectual Frantz Fanon wrote, “The settler’s work is to make even dreams of liberty impossible for the native.” Thus, it is settler society in the U.S. that has constrained our imaginations regarding what is possible, even within our own homeland.

Our task as Dakota people, then, is to expand our minds and carry our thinking to the farthest possible extension, and to imagine a world profoundly different from the one we currently inhabit. We need to imagine a decolonized world free from oppression. More importantly, we need to engage in discussions within our own communities and help unleash our collective intellectual imaginations. We need to envision decolonization first and then work toward achieving it.

Michael Yellow Bird and I stated in the introduction to the Decolonization Handbook, “As Indigenous Peoples we have an inherent right to be free in our own lands. We have an inherent right to self-determination. When others invaded our lands and stole them from underneath our bodies, when they destroyed our ways of life and injured our peoples, we were prevented from living the way we were intended to live.” Now, the struggle in our era is first to begin a collective remembering of those ways of being that were intended for us as Dakota people, and then to develop intelligent and calculated strategies to recover them so that we may eventually achieve our own liberation. How many of you can imagine a time when the Dakota Oyate will be free once again? Do you believe it is possible? Or does our freedom only come with our death in this world? Can you imagine our own liberation on earth? If you cannot, freedom will remain an elusive possibility. However, if you can imagine a liberated future, then we have somewhere to go and we have a lot of work to do.

Once we reject complacency as a reasonable course of action, we realize the abundant opportunities for revolutionary change around us. For the sake of clarity, I think it is important to state that I think our work toward revolutionary change should serve the purposes of decolonization. By decolonization, I mean “the intelligent, calculated, and active resistance to the forces of colonialism that perpetuate the subjugation and exploitation of our minds, bodies, and lands” and that “decolonization is engaged for the ultimate purpose of overturning the colonial structure and realizing Indigenous liberation.” I believe that we will best achieve decolonization by recovering the ways of being and living that sustained us as Dakota people for thousands of years. The struggle for decolonization requires us to identify clearly our objectives and to critically question whether they are constrained by the parameters of thought set by colonialism, or whether they traverse those parameters and reflect our desires as free, Indigenous Peoples of the land. We can be free, but only if we first imagine, and then seek our freedom.

A Message to Wasicu (White) People

Given the current educational system in the state of Minnesota, indeed, in the United States, most of you have never learned the truth regarding the founding of the United States. Nor have you learned how each state systematically dispossessed Indigenous Peoples of our homelands in order to claim Indigenous land bases. Even in Minnesota, where the U.S.—Dakota War of 1862 is included in the state’s curriculum standards, we do not learn the broader context for, and the ideology underpinning, the war. That is, students today do not learn about concentration camps, genocide, ethnic cleansing, or bounties, which are all part of the policies of extermination and forced removal advocated by Alexander Ramsey and implemented by Minnesota’s citizens. Students do not learn that most Dakota people still live in exile and that Dakota people today possess only .006 percent of our original land base. That lack of education, or even miseducation,
means that adult citizens in the state cannot conceive of justice for Dakota people, because they do not even recognize the injustice.

I do not believe that (non-Dakota) Minnesotans are inherently evil or bad people. In fact, I believe Minnesotans are people who want to be on the right side of a moral issue. Yet, genocide is not moral and what was gained because of genocide is not moral. Minnesotans have the capacity to make radical change once they understand the history and the need to work for justice. All of you reading this can no longer claim ignorance.

It could be that this information will not move some of you—that the same kind of genocidal thinking that prevailed in nineteenth-century America is flourishing in your minds. If that is so, I do not believe you are in the majority. I would like to believe that something has changed in 150 years and that today’s Minnesotans do not want to continue to deny justice to Minnesota’s Original People. I hope I am right.

Decolonization requires the creation of a new social order, but this would ideally be a social order in which non-Dakota would also live as liberated peoples in a system that is just to everyone, including the land and all the beings on the land. Thus, Wasicu people need not fear the empowerment of Dakota people. When we are lifted up and our humanity is recognized, everyone will be lifted up. Those of us clinging to traditional Dakota values are not interested in turning the tables and claiming a position as oppressor, as colonizer, or of ruthlessly exploiting the environment for profit. Thus, what Fanon wrote about the Third World rising and the expectations of Europe might also be applied to the Indigenous struggle in North America: “What it expects from those who for centuries have kept it in slavery is that they will help it to rehabilitate mankind, and make man victorious everywhere, once and for all.” All of you today are in a position to help us rehabilitate humankind, but it has to start here. Right here, in Dakota homeland.

**Final Thoughts**

This project was motivated out of a desire for social change—a change that would allow for the return of Dakota people to our homeland and for the rebirth of the Dakota Oyate in our homeland. This is, at heart, a spiritual motivation because it calls on Dakota people to strengthen our spiritual relationships with all of creation so that we can return to healthy ways of being. It also is spiritual in that it calls on the people who have benefited from Dakota dispossession to help repair tremendous harms, so that we can all live together in a good way. This cannot proceed as long as Minnesotans deny this legacy of genocide and ethnic cleansing, or if Minnesotans continue to celebrate what was gained from our genocide and dispossession. If we eventually reach a place in which we have repaired the injustice and restored the integrity of the land and people, then all Minnesotans will really have something to celebrate. In the meantime, we have a lot of work to do.
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