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The 2013 International Seminar-Workshop on Indigenous Studies (ISWIS) was successfully held from 26 to 28 June 2013 at The Legend Villas, Mandaluyong City, Philippines. Jointly organized by the University of the Philippines Baguio through its Cordillera Studies Center and by Tebtebba Foundation (Indigenous Peoples’ International Centre for Policy Research and Education), the 2013 ISWIS was attended by a total of 74 participants hailing from all over the world. In keeping with the United Nations regional groups, the participants represented the African Group (Kenya, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Cameroon), Asia-Pacific Group (Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Philippines), Latin American and Caribbean Group (Nicaragua, Peru), Western European and Others Group (Canada, Greece, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, United States). A total of 29 papers were presented in the proceedings, divided into eight sequential sessions grouped according to topic and theme. Each day of ISWIS sessions was initiated by a keynote speech delivered by indigenous advocates from Latin America, Africa and Asia-Pacific. The panels elicited involved and spirited discussions on key and contentious issues in indigenous studies, such as indigenous peoples and education, social and historical movements, spirituality, women’s issues, language, indigenous knowledge, the relationship of the academe and indigenous peoples, cultural studies, and development, among others. Brief descriptions of the panels and papers are included in this report.

The 2013 ISWIS also became an opportunity for participants to share their talents and traditions through a Solidarity Night held on the evening of the first day. Highlights of the Solidarity Night included a film on Native American Learning Lodges by Prof. Melissa Nelson of San Francisco State University, a presentation from the Institut Dayakologi of Indonesia, songs by Asta Balto of the Sámi and Prof. Elsa Stamatopoulou of Greece as well as a number from the Latin American group, poetry reading from Dr. Elenita Strobel of Sonoma State University, community dances led by Bouba Njobdi Amadou of Cameroon and Pasang Sherpa of Nepal and a canoe chant by Wikuki Kingi of New Zealand. The following evening, two books were launched by Institut Dayakologi, namely, *Pancur Kasih Empowerment Movement* and *Pancur Kasih Credit Movement*.

Perhaps most importantly, the participants were able to share ideas and collaborate on how they will best be able to advance indigenous studies in their respective fields. Workshop groups were formed for Higher Education Institutions with existing or emerging indigenous studies programs, for the University of the Philippines, for those who have worked or are interested in the United Nations as a venue for indigenous struggles and for indigenous peoples and local communities. The results of these workshops may be found in the Workshops section of this report.
ABOUT THE 2013 ISWIS

The 2013 International Seminar Workshop in Indigenous Studies was organized by the University of the Philippines Baguio and Tebtebba Foundation. Having common advocacies in the promotion and protection of Indigenous Peoples rights and welfare, these institutions wanted a venue where a select group of local and foreign indigenous studies experts, indigenous scholars, researchers, educators, advocates, activists, policymakers and practitioners can discuss frameworks and approaches to indigenous studies that will help this discipline develop more participatory and culturally-sensitive methodologies. The ISWIS was also meant to be a forum where participants can share experiences and lessons and discuss critical issues that tend to unsettle scholars, researchers, and practitioners.

The organizers felt that a seminar-workshop attended by international delegates is well timed with the “indigenous turn” observed in the academe and elsewhere in recent years. This return to knowledges that were earlier dismissed as inconsequential because they supposedly lacked the rigours of western science is considered by the organizers as a significant opportunity for indigenous peoples and advocates to collectively rethink and reconfigure dominant western constructs that undervalued the knowledges, cosmologies and world views of indigenous peoples.

In addition to recasting the molds of western knowledge on indigenous peoples, the other relevant concerns discussed in the ISWIS were: whether the adoption of Western epistemologies, ontologies and methodologies really entail the wholesale rejection of their indigenous counterparts and whether the adoption of an indigenous worldview is still possible for one trained in Western-based knowledge systems, especially for one not generally considered an “indigenous person”. More importantly, the participants thought hard about how indigenous peoples and academics can work together to enhance the dialogue, cross-fertilization and connections between indigenous, traditional knowledge systems and scientific knowledge. This discussion was fuelled by the experiences of indigenous researchers and academics who ventured into doing research of their own situations, using their own epistemologies and world views as starting frameworks.

To meet its objectives, the ISWIS was guided by a conference design which required the conduct of plenary discussions instead of separate parallel sessions in order to allow more productive interaction and sharing among participants. The ISWIS also involved participants with various backgrounds from different continents to ensure a good representation of perspectives.
In the opening program of the ISWIS on June 26, 2013, Tebtebba Foundation Executive Director, Victoria Tauli-Corpuz welcomed the participants and expressed her delight in seeing scholars and advocates from different places gathered together to engage in important issues confronting indigenous peoples. She acknowledged the effort of the participants especially those who travelled long distances just to be in the event. She thanked some people in attendance for the key roles they played in formal structures like the United Nations to advance indigenous peoples rights.

To account for the reasons why the ISWIS was organized, she referred the participants to the Alta Outcome Document which was adopted during the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples on June 10-12, 2013 in Alta. In brief, she explained that the Alta Document includes recommendations to ensure that Indigenous peoples have sovereignty over their resources and to lobby for the creation of UN bodies and similar structures to implement the rights of indigenous peoples. Director Tauli said that this document provides the rationale and framework of the advocacies, programs, projects and other initiatives that indigenous peoples do.

For his part, University of the Philippines Vice President for Public Affairs, Prof. Prospero de Vera III, delivered an inspirational message where he commended the organizers for enabling the participants to “revisit and analyze issues, find common ground, and produce new knowledge products that will put the concerns and interests of indigenous communities as a central agenda in the academe and our society.”

Prof. de Vera recounted his personal involvement in Indigenous Peoples rights from being a boy witnessing the work of his father with the Ikalahans in the northern part of the Philippines to becoming an academic involved in policy debates, the crafting of new laws in the Senate, training IP leaders who are new in government and other similar advocacies.

He expressed the support of the University of the Philippines system for endeavors such as the ISWIS which allows seasoned advocates and younger academics to engage in dialogues to further the interest of indigenous studies.

After the speeches, all participants introduced themselves to the assembly and this was followed by invocations given by representatives from different continents.
In Session 1A, placed under the theme “Narrating IP Experiences,” four papers illustrated the struggles of indigenous peoples for the recognition of their rights in national laws and state institutions. These papers showed the failures and triumphs that these people have undergone and the challenges they still face in negotiating their contemporary conditions.

In his paper titled “Philippine indigenous cultural communities: a historical perspective” Dr. Esteban Magannon narrated that in the case of the Philippines, the unflattering treatment of the majority groups towards minority peoples is a byproduct of colonization. He traced the names used by the nation-state to designate minority groups and analyzed the politics in these semantic designations. He asserted that native populations were reduced to being in a lower degree of civilization and this perception became the justification of a policy for national integration in the nation-state as it was the basis for domination by the colonizers.

Mr. Prashanta Tripura of Bangladesh, in his paper “The quest for indigenous identity in Bangladesh: reflections on achievements and setbacks since 1993” examined the discourses and politics that surrounded the setbacks experienced by the indigenous peoples of Bangladesh in having their rights recognized beginning in 1993, which was declared as the International Year of the World’s Indigenous People. Mr. Tripura outlined the power shifts in government that both enabled and frustrated the indigenous peoples’ desire for self-determination. The author argued that there is a need to adjust the discourse of indigenous identity in Bangladesh through greater engagement with democratic processes, initiatives for decolonization and cooperation with international IP movements.

The papers of Dr. Priscilla Settee and Dr. Asta Mitkija Balto of Canada and Norway, respectively, both presented experiences in the establishment of higher learning institutions by and for indigenous peoples. Settee described the brief history of Canadian Indigenous Education and Indigenous Studies Development and in this presentation, she illustrated that Saskatchewan has been successful in its indigenous educational initiatives in Canada. Balto, on the other hand, showed in her paper the struggle of the Sami in Norway in achieving a positive development for their community through education amidst the presence of the larger Norwegian mainstream population and government structures. She highlighted the contributions of the World Indigenous Higher Education Consortium (WINHEC) in these efforts to reform the educational system and make it more sensitive and specific to the Sami people.
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Myrna Cunningham
CADPI, Nicaragua

Dr. Cunningham, former Chair of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII), began the ISWIS with a talk on the Latin American experience in addressing education for indigenous peoples. She stressed the importance of maintaining a sense of community while striving to transmit traditional knowledge to the new generation. She also enumerated potential strategies for that have been used by higher education institutions to integrate indigenous studies in their curriculum. To conclude, she emphasized the necessary paradigm shift indigenous knowledge would bring about in the academy, especially in shattering the appearances of “distance” and “objectivity.”
The papers in this panel were about initiatives, movements and innovations undertaken in the interest of finding alternative ways to understand the facets of indigenous cultures.

**Dr. Tirso Gonzales** of Canada, in his paper “Indigenous Studies in the context of Abya Yala (the Americas): two experiences of indigenous higher education and/or community-based education,” described his work as part of the Indigenous studies faculty and program of the University of British Columbia, Okanagan, Canada and the 26-year old community-based experience in the Peruvian Andes through the Andean-Amazonian Peasant Technologies. He observed that indigenous studies does not evolve in a vacuum. Therefore scholars should know how to account for the factors that condition the production of knowledge in indigenous communities. He showed that western concepts cannot adequately capture the nuances of indigenous world views therefore research should be informed by concepts that are derived internally from these cultures.

**Mr. Wikuki Kingi** of New Zealand, whose paper was titled “Whare Hape: the ancient Pacific indigenous university of hearing: creative arts and culture as a vehicle for community transformation,” talked about the cultural symbols conceived and constructed by the Maori of New Zealand. He described the intricacies of the designs and the process of their production, but more than the aesthetic value of these art works, he discussed the participation of these symbols in the dissemination and maintenance of indigenous knowledge in Maori communities and even among outsiders.

**Dr. Raymundo Rovillos** and **Ms. Paula Pamintuan-Riva**, in their paper “The indigenous in the Cordillera studies at the University of the Philippines Baguio,” identified and analyzed the indigenous dimension of the Cordillera Studies Center, the research center of the University of the Philippines Baguio. They discussed the categories that were used in Center-published research to refer to the objects of inquiry in the Cordillera. In their discursive analysis, they examined the choices of terms UPB faculty members used. They observed that the faculty members did not seem to necessarily have a conscious use of “indigenous people” as an advocacy label associated with political movements. They recommended that the research to be produced by the Center should engage in more rigorous examinations of the concepts used in referring to indigenous people, especially as the scholarship produced by the Center is often cited by local scholars.
Papers in Session 2 demonstrated the capacity of indigenous peoples to reinterpret their cultural and spiritual practices in response to external pressures and changes in their situation.

In her paper “Spirituality and the (re)constructions of Indigenous religious traditions,” Dr. Leah Abayao characterized shifts in spirituality and problematized the reconstructions of three interrelated indigenous religious traditions in Northern Philippines. These traditions are: ancestor worship, ritual life and cosmology. She illustrated that indigenous spirituality has taken on competing forms following various contemporary economic and social forces that resulted to altered cosmological configurations and fragmented indigenous communities.

“Ecological spirituality, culture and development: approaches and methodologies in doing research” by Fr. Edwin Gariguez presented his understanding of what he called “creative spiritual energy” inherent to the indigenous communities of Mangyan-Alangans in Mindoro, Philippines. Fr. Gariguez presented the wisdom of the Manyan-Alangans’s culture in their pursuit of sustainable practices derived from their relationship with the earth. This scenario of collective harmony and peaceful co-existence, according to Fr. Gariguez, defines the experience of ecological spirituality among indigenous people. Based on his studies and experiences, he looks forward to articulating a framework that respects well-being and the inter-connectedness not only of the human community but of the earth community as a whole.

“We Strive for the well-being of our society: the indigenous discourse of women in Manipur” by Dr. Vijaylakshmi Brara discussed the roles of Manipuri women as maibis (traditional priestesses), Meira-Paibis (torch-bearing women) and Imas in Ima Keithel (women vendors) to illustrate the indigenous, creative and unique spaces inhabited by Manipuri women in the religious, socio-political and economic spheres in India. Her paper highlighted the primary roles of women in transmitting and creating culture and such roles, she said, can protect and enhance women’s status within their families and communities which are traditionally patriarchal.
WAYS OF KNOWING:
INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE

The International Seminar-Workshop was an opportunity to present studies on the wealth of indigenous knowledge (IK) throughout the world’s nations. It also opened discussion on how the academe and indigenous peoples’ communities can collaborate to advance IK production. The panel on “Ways of Knowing: Indigenous Knowledge” was led by Dr. Hussein Isaack of the Kivulini Trust with a keynote speech on “Perpetuating Indigenous Knowledge through participatory research, validation and value addition.” Through a narration of the symbiotic relationship between the Loimusi People and the honeyguide birds in Kenya, Dr. Isaack articulated the importance of upholding a cultural economy in restoring and promoting IK.

Mr. Janus Cabazares, an instructor in the University of the Philippines Mindanao, presented the findings of his and Ms. Sheila Tampos’ work entitled, “Umu: Exploring Bagobo Ethnotaxonomy.” Also known as the Manuvu, the Bagobo people have long developed a method of classification for natural beings, placing emphasis on the category of life or umo. Mr. Cabazares also discussed the importance of integrating ethnotaxonomy in mainstream curriculums and in “environmental discourse advocacy and pedagogy.”

Mr. Schedar Jocson of UP Diliman then followed with his paper on “Inclusive education among the Mangyan of Occidental Mindoro: alternative learning systems through Indigenous Peoples’ core curriculum,” recounting challenges and possible solutions toward the development of inclusive education in the province.

Dr. Zhao Fuwei of the Nanjing Institute of Environmental Science in the Peoples’ Republic of China capped the panel off with a presentation of a group research on “The outline of traditional knowledge of ethnic groups in China,” describing the different facets of traditional knowledge (TK) and the problems encountered by Chinese ethnic groups with regard to the preservation of its practice.

The panel generated much interest in the role of academics and/or government agencies in the conservation of IK and TK. On one hand, there was an appreciation of the effort exerted by those in the academe to go back to their communities and to continue to learn about and value IK. Dr. Isaack spoke on the relationship between Western and indigenous knowledge where, while the former carries a tendency to dominate and devalue IK, it is useful in developing new tools through its methodologies. Whatever knowledge has been and will be produced by the communities should be properly acknowledged and respected. All the same, a point was raised for academics and those in the mainstream to remain ever vigilant against top-down strategies, especially on issues of education.
WAYS OF KNOWING: METHODOLOGIES

An irrevocable part of the relation between academe and indigenous communities would be the relationship between academic perspectives and indigenous methodologies. This panel was put together to examine how indigenous worldviews and concerns have permeated academia and what challenges may lie ahead for those in these fields. Dr. Stuart Kirsch of the University of Michigan began the panel with a thought-provoking paper on multi-naturalism, entitled “Shifting perspectives: Rethinking Indigenous Knowledge and Politics.” In his talk, Dr. Kirsch suggested the importance of looking at indigenous knowledge from a pluralist perspective and its possible political implications. Mr. Raymundo Pavo of the University of the Philippines Mindanao followed this with a paper on “Objectivity in ethnographic narratives.” Referring to his work with the Manobos (or Manuvus) of Agusan del Sur, he identified the notions of symbolic, mitigated and reconstituted objectivity in ethnographic studies that may aid in the future articulation of ethnophilosophy. Dr. Elenita Mendoza-Strobel, a Filipina academic based in Sonoma State University, presented a paper on “Ethnoautobiography: on decolonizing modern/colonial thinking through the uses of Indigenization paradigms,” in which she detailed her use of ethnoautobiography in her classes to enable her students to search, reflect on and reconnect with their ancestral/indigenous roots, as well as to reconcile with the issues of whiteness and white privilege. Finally, Mr. Angelo Tubac from the Cristal e-College in Bohol, Philippines presented a linguistic work entitled “Lexical Retrieval in L1, L2, L3 and L4 of the Bilingual Eskayan Tribe in Taytay, Duero, Bohol.” Based on his work with the Eskayan Tribe, he recounted the predominant use of Bisaya, a major language in the Visayan Islands, and the diminishing practice of the local Eskaya language. Moderator Dr. Wilfredo Alangui of UP Baguio synthesized the papers in the panel by identifying four imperatives that emerged: to review and to reconstitute our worldviews; reconnect with each other, IP and non-IP alike; and to recover our Knowledge Systems and our language.
THE ROLE OF INTELLECTUALS

The role of both indigenous and non-indigenous intellectuals in the rise and development of the indigenous peoples’ (IP) movement may be illustrated in the following ways: (1) the introduction of analytical tools and knowledge systems; (2) the translation of indigenous peoples’ aspirations into the language of International Law and in the norm-creation of human rights; (3) the creation of studies in higher educational institutions; (4) the transformation of epistemological understandings from a human-centered worldview to a kin-centric one; (5) the promotion of better understanding and respect for indigenous people’s ways of knowing that, in many cases, have sustained natural resources and ecological processes over centuries and millennia; (6) an increasing understanding of Native science by Western scientists and universities through the address of epistemological and ontological differences and similarities; (7) and, through an outline of the ethical space needed to facilitate dialogue between Native and Western scientific paradigms.

These roles were discussed by a panel led by Prof. Elsa Stamatopoulou of Columbia University with her paper on “The role of research and academia in Indigenous Peoples’ issues: interculturality in the making” where she detailed the process undertaken by Columbia to integrate IP issues into the University’s programs. Prof. Melissa Nelson of the San Francisco State University followed suit with her presentation entitled, “Entering a Native American learning lodge: forging critical spaces for native sciences in Indigenous studies and mainstream institutions,” recounting indigenous peoples’ experiences in the United States educational system and the alternative presented by the creation of Learning Lodges. Mr. Leo Mar Edralin of the University of the Philippines Diliman gave a review of literature related to Kankanaey mining practices and gender in his paper entitled, “Changes in gender relationships and age deference in the practice of gold-sharing.”

During the open forum, points were raised on the accessibility of institutions like universities and the United Nations for indigenous peoples. Prof. Nelson responded by saying that work in mainstream universities needs to have solid support and consistent action from communities to create spaces of and for indigenous peoples. Prof. Stamatopoulou, as former Chairperson of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII), cited historical movements when “IPs and elders where describing governance” to institutions like the UN and how these have created inroads in strengthening the indigenous voice.
The second day of the ISW was concluded by a panel on cultural studies in the Cordillera region. Not merely the study of culture, cultural studies endeavor to dissect and make sense of meaning-making as it relates to cultural signs. The panel was put together to examine how contemporary signs in the Philippine Cordilleran milieu have related or will continue to relate to the people and their rich cultural tradition.

Prof. Ruth Tindaan of the University of the Philippines Baguio opened the session with a paper on “Indigenous knowledge production in literature,” which sought to examine how contemporary writers of Igorot descent have articulated Cordillera life and culture. Prof. Tindaan discussed the potential of literature as historical text, especially in giving voice to the Igorot writer whose voice has been excluded from most mainstream historical accounts. She also described how literary work on the Cordillera has exposed the crises Cordillera writers face in relation to spiritual and cultural identity.

Mr. Io Jularbal of UP Baguio followed suit with “Studying the Discourse of Colonial Travel Writings on the Cordilleras Through Rhetorical Analysis” where he examined the process of power as it has been preserved by the writing done by the colonizer. In this respect, travel writing has been used to perpetuate Orientalist stereotypes that have helped justify the colonial project. Another scholar from UP Baguio, Mr. Scott Saboy delivered a study on the Living Anitos, a contemporary band from Kalinga, that employs both foreign and traditional instruments in music production. Entitled “Voicing ethnicity: traditional referentiality and the Kalinga ethnopop artist,” Mr. Saboy’s study examined the concept of hybridity and its implications, both political and cultural, for indigenous youth.

Mr. Kervin Calabias, an undergraduate student from UP Baguio, then presented a part of his ongoing thesis work in the paper, “Selected songs of the Salidummay cultural group: an initial Marxist-ecocritical assessment,” which discussed the relation between environmental and political concerns as articulated in the group’s songs. The panel’s final speaker was Ms. Dazzelyn Zapata, a PhD student from the National University of Singapore, who delivered a part of her ongoing dissertation on the use of technology by indigenous peoples in the Cordillera. Her paper, “Mobile phones and the Igorot: a culture-centered study of mobile phone use in/by an indigenous community in the Philippines,” described the permeation of technology into indigenous communities and, in turn, how these communities have used technology for their purposes.
INDIGENOUS STUDIES AS A DEVELOPMENT CONCERN

An important insight gleaned from the ISWIS was the importance of redefining mainstream categories from the perspective of indigenous peoples. Not the least of these categories would be the concepts of development and progress. Mr. Yosef Beco Dubi of the Addis Ababa University in Ethiopia began the presentations with his paper on “Indigenous Knowledge in Oral Narratives of Oromo Society and its significance to Sustainable Development.” Mr. Dubi talked about the fertile ground that oral narratives have provided in preserving the Indigenous Knowledge of the Oromo people and its implications in present-day political, military, judicial, legislative and ritual life. Dr. Santos Jose Dacanay III of UP Baguio then delivered a report entitled, “Assessing the International Fund for Agricultural Development’s (IFAD) engagement with Indigenous Peoples in Southern Philippines,” in which he detailed the challenges, lessons and recommendations gathered from the IFAD project in Mindanao, Philippines. Mr. Jayson Ibañez of the Charles Darwin University in Australia followed with a presentation of a collaborative research on “Developing and testing an Indigenous planning framework: a case study from Mindanao, Philippines.” Mr. Ibañez presented the Indigenous Community-based Planning (ICP) framework as an alternative and more participative approach to development projects. Lastly, Mr. Jadder Lewis from CAPDI in Nicaragua discussed “Decentralization and devolution in Nicaragua: natural resources and indigenous peoples’ rights.” In his talk, Mr. Lewis described “three pillars” in the indigenous approach to development, namely: (1) Vision and an endogenous development paradigm, (2) Landscape dynamics (not only with regard to ecosystems but also economics and politics), and (3) Legal dynamics, policies and institutions.

Keynote
Joji Cariño
Forest Peoples Programme
Ms. Cariño began the third day by sharing some lessons and experiences gained from the participation of indigenous peoples as both social and political actors. She discussed the potential the ISWIS presents in the promotion of indigenous education and in carrying out self-determined development. Ms. Cariño talked about the global commitments made by states and international institutions with regard to indigenous peoples’ rights and knowledge. She ended her talk by encouraging the ISWIS participants to embrace interculturality and to work together toward their common goals.
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WORKSHOP
on Higher Education Institutions and Indigenous Studies

Leaders, educators and academics from higher education institutions with established or emerging indigenous studies programs gathered during the workshop to talk about their experiences and to contribute to the advancement of indigenous studies in the academe and beyond.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- Advance native science agenda in Indigenous Knowledge and technology
- Move for the accreditation of bodies like the World Indigenous Nations Higher Education Consortium (WINHEC) that certify Indigenous Knowledge
- Create broader links with other indigenous movements
- Develop greater linkages between indigenous studies and other departments
- Imagine new forms of institutions where traditional knowledge is recognized and validated all the way to the PhD level
- Document universities that bestow honorary degrees to Traditional Knowledge holders and elders (e.g. Stanford/Tiboli)
- Bring completed research back to indigenous communities
- Challenge the current structure of indigenous peoples studies
- Train and support Native administrators
- Improve training and support for younger scholars and researchers

- Hold universities accountable to their mission statements about diversity or indigenous peoples
- Disrupt oppressive curriculum and conduct curriculum reviews to make it responsive to indigenous knowledge and values
- Complement the autonomy of the university with indigenous intellectual sovereignty
- Participate in the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association (NAISA) and the WIPSE conference next year
- Develop funding and structural support for Indigenous studies that is not beholden to corporate funding
A contingent from the University of the Philippines, particularly from the Baguio and Mindanao campuses, collaborated on present and potential spaces for indigenous studies in the University. UP Baguio’s Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs were in attendance, as well as faculty and students from different disciplines.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

- Make use of the Faculty Conference to (1) assess current works, research and activities done by the UPB community for IP studies and (2) explore culturally responsive and sensitive methodologies.

- Establish a training center where scholars, local government officials, students, advocates and other individuals interested in indigenous studies, community service and other related interest can enroll in courses crafted specifically for the needs and skills in these areas.

- Develop a network of students, researchers and leaders who would like to further their work in the service of indigenous peoples.

- Create a partnership between UP Baguio and UP Mindanao linking indigenous studies in the Northern and Southern Philippines.

- Establish summer schools for Indigenous Studies.

**Present Work in the UPB Community:**

- Maintain the Cordillera Studies Center (CSC) as a research center in the region, that endeavors to undertake relevant and constructive research in the interest of indigenous peoples.

- Establish an Indigenous Studies Program under the CSC to complement and strengthen its existing programs on Governance and Public Policy, Climate Change, Biodiversity, Sustainability Science, Material Culture and Local Languages and Literature.

- Maintain the Program for Indigenous Cultures as a venue for the preservation and development of culture and identity for University students coming from indigenous communities.
Workshop on Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities

Composed of organizations and individuals working closely with indigenous communities, this workshop group worked closely together for ways to advance indigenous peoples rights in their respective areas and in the world as a whole.

Conclusions and Recommendations

- Promote community-based action research to deepen understanding about the problems faced by educational institutions and institutions of cultural transmissions
- Support and push for the establishment of research competencies and research protocol, e.g. FPIC (free prior informed consent), language competencies, ethics, intellectual property rights, etc.
- Develop of place-based curricula rooted and based on the educational cultures and institutions of the community
- Strengthen our own capacities through community-building, workshops, specific programs for the youth, cultural exchanges, and scholarships.
- Create a network of indigenous researchers
- Create a network of traditional knowledge holders
- For the universities: Support the inclusion of indigenous philosophy, customary law, medicine, international law, indigenous theory and research methodologies
- Organize similar workshops in our own institutions and communities
The 2013 ISWIS was well-attended by members of Institut Dayakologi, an organization composed of the Dayak People of Indonesia. In the workshop group, they discussed ways in which they would be able to advance indigenous studies and issues in their country.

**CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

- Affirm and establish a ‘University Of Dayakology’ with an indigenous perspective. Initial areas of interest may be: Faculty of Economics and Social Studies (Economic Development, Economic Anthropology, Social Economics), Faculty of Law, Faculty of Letters and Arts, Faculty of Technology, Faculty of Health Studies, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Humanities, etc. This is a long term dream. For now, we can start by establishing short courses. For instance, we can develop a six-month course on important aspects of Dayak indigenous knowledge and that of other indigenous peoples from Indonesia and around the world.

- Increase the exchange of knowledge among Dayaks and the rest of Indonesia and the world. We can make use of Ruai TV and KReview to reach Indonesian households through media. Ruai TV and KReview’s reach spans that of the entire country. This means that it can potentially reach 250 million people (current Indonesian population) as well as roughly 2,000 indigenous peoples’ groups, at a very small cost.

- Recommend for the establishment of awards or recognition for the holders of indigenous knowledge (IK). This may be given to individuals, institutions, and others involved in indigenous peoples’ advocacy. The creation of an institution like this will help acknowledge and increase respect for IK holders. In turn, as it grows and gains esteem, the institution will elevate indigenous peoples’ issues as well. The UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues may help in establishing these awards and in framing the criteria for selection.

- Strengthen and enrich the documentation of indigenous people’s knowledge (including the mapping of the kampong or small villages). This should be supported not only by Institut Dayakology but by other institutions within the Pancur Kasih Movement as well.

- Establish a museum of and for indigenous people, including their take on biodiversity (herbal medicine and shamanism, etc.), farming, hunting and fishing, instruments and other cultural products, languages, rituals, etc.

- Increase the active participation of the Pancur Kasih Movement and Dayakology in international conferences and events, especially in relation to the enhancement of indigenous people’s knowledge.

- Deepen both participatory and academic research as to ‘scientize and operationalize’ findings, according to indigenous knowledge and methodologies.
As a central institution for the promotion and protection of indigenous peoples’ rights, a group was formed to discuss ways in which the United Nations can further the cause of Indigenous Peoples around the world.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

- Support the World Council of Indigenous Peoples in ensuring that the UNDRIP is implemented by the UN System, its member states and other systems (World Bank, etc.)
- Bring in or identify people who can genuinely represent people from indigenous communities and who can assert indigenous peoples’ rights
- Build volunteer networks and tap international science or academic associations with members from indigenous groups
- Call for states to produce regular reports on how far they have come in promoting indigenous peoples’ rights and to make sure that these reports are truly implemented
- Create a primer on UN processes that will help individuals and organizations to understand how the UN works and how they can put these to their advantage
- Move for the adoption of specific indicators on the well-being of indigenous peoples in the Post-2015 Development Agenda marking the close of the Millennium Development Goals.
- Push for a disaggregated approach in the identification of indigenous peoples groups in order to particularize development for IPs
- Capacitate people on the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP)
- Create a position paper on what UN policies exist to create an overview of the situation.
SYNTHESIS

This report will review the discussions made during the three-day seminar-workshop, particularly those that dwell on key issues or questions identified in the concept paper, and on areas where concurrences were reached among participants. It also highlights major themes emerging from the discussions. The overall conference theme was “Reflections on Indigenous Studies and Research: Taking stock of lessons from the field.” As articulated in the concept paper, the seminar-workshop aimed to draw attention to, among other things, the nature of “indigenous studies” as a discipline; indigenous way(s) of knowing; worldview(s) and the appropriate research methodologies; the roles of intellectuals in advancing indigenous studies; and the way forward for indigenous studies. This synthesis highlights responses to these questions or issues.

Despite the absence of a conscious attempt during the seminar-workshop to arrive at a definition of “indigenous studies,” based on the paper presentations and discussions, there appears to be a consensus among the participants that it refers to the “field of inquiry which focuses on issues affecting people/s (and their descendants) who on account of colonization (and its consequences) have become historically differentiated and disadvantaged people/s, have suffered/are suffering injustice/s, have been prevented from determining their lives and future, and how their societies will develop.” Understood as such, the indigenous studies clearly possess a normative component - i.e., the desire to rectify injustices experienced by indigenous peoples.

Similarly, no conscious effort was made during the conference to discuss or to arrive at a generally-acceptable definition of “indigenous peoples” or an “indigenous person.” But unlike the concept of “indigenous studies” which appears to elicit general agreement as to its content or definition, the concept of “indigenous people” – i.e., who qualifies as indigenous people – tends to invite varying responses. One can identify at least three tendencies when it comes to defining “indigenous peoples”. There was the tendency to speak of indigenous identity as a product of biological inheritance, i.e., that it is inherited from one’s parents. Hence, a person whose parents are indigenous persons is consequently also an indigenous person. Another tendency among some participants was to regard indigenous identity as involving an indigenous mindset or worldview/cosmovision, marked by a deep sense of connectedness to the environment, to the community, and to all living things, both visible and invisible. The indigenous worldview is also characterized, among other things, by (a) a non-anthropocentric orientation where man is merely a small part of the order of things; (b) the primacy of collective goals over individual goals; (c) the “earth-rootedness” of human beings given their reliance on nature for their livelihood, subsistence, and survival; (d) an orientation towards environmental protection and responsibility instead of environmental exploitation; and, (e) an innate preference for harmony or balance among all living things. As will be discussed below, among the three tendencies, the third bears significant implications for research in indigenous studies.

Despite these seemingly “commonly-shared” features of the indigenous mindset, it would be wrong to assume that indigenous peoples share one culture. Anthropologists tell us that culture is place-specific and time-specific. Cultural practices are often products of years of experience, of adaptation, adjustment, and modification. Culture then must not be understood as a reified concept. Complexity, diversity, and evolution characterize the cultures of indigenous peoples.

Similarly, the movement for indigenous rights has evolved through time. For one, the discourse and language of indigenous rights has experienced significant changes in the last four to five decades. This can be seen in relation to the initial attempts of post-colonial states to assimilate indigenous and/or minority populations, and in the reactions of the indigenous rights activists to such and subsequent state actions. The movement for indigenous rights thus shifted, as Kymlicka (2002) notes, from arguing for communitarian or collectivist ideals versus individualistic goals in the 1970s and 1980s to asserting indigenous peoples’ rights within a liberal framework and clamoring for better arrangements indigenous peoples within the modern nation-state thereafter. In the context of the Philippines, the shift in usage from cultural minorities to indigenous peoples reflects the evolution of the indigenous rights discourse.

Acknowledging that indigenous identity is intimately linked to an indigenous worldview as discussed earlier raises the issue of the appropriate research methodology for scholars of indigenous studies. Inasmuch as epistemology, ontology, and methodology need to be compatible with each other, research in indigenous studies requires a methodology that is participatory in nature. Moreover, it requires a blurring of the dichotomy between the researcher and the object of research.

Reference:
Where the “object of research” is an indigenous community, research takes the form of “associated research” where the community is an associate of the researcher and an active participant in the research process. The conduct of research, apart from being community-based, is also community-sanctioned and community-sensitive. With respect to research ethics, the methodology of indigenous studies must also recognize community-ownership of research.

In a sense, research becomes “dialogic” – a process of conversation, consultation, and co-implementation between the scholar and the community. Indigenous studies is also “intercultural”, a term frequently mentioned during the seminar-workshop. That is, it unavoidably involves the interaction of at least two “cultures” – e.g., that of the indigenous community vis-à-vis the mainstream culture, or the academic culture of the scholar, etc. As will be reiterated below, the “dialogic” and “intercultural” nature of research in indigenous studies requires the adoption of a non-binary approach to indigenous issues.

Inasmuch as dialogues are not always cordial, the scholar must be open to the possibility of disagreement and conflict. In any case, research requires the scholar to be self-reflexive especially when attempting to use western theoretical frameworks in studying indigenous communities. As already mentioned, research must be conscious of the place-specific and time-specific characteristic of data on indigenous communities.

Three major themes emerged from the discussions. The first key theme involves the notion of binary categories. Scholars and advocates of indigenous studies often find themselves dealing with binary concepts - e.g., western positivist knowledge versus non-western indigenous knowledge; state versus indigenous peoples; top-down approaches versus bottom-up approaches; academia/university-based scholarship versus activist/advocacy work; neutrality (research for its own sake) versus positionality (change-oriented research).

Positing these binary categories or dualisms raised questions about the possibility of a middle ground and/or alternative formulations. Hence, one is led to ask: Is there a middle ground? Are there alternatives to the conventionally-accepted dualities? Is the original formulation of the dualities useful or meaningful in the first place?

With regard to the conduct of research in indigenous studies, as mentioned above, it has to be “intercultural” and “dialogical” – i.e., it allows the interaction of “rival” cultures instead of reinforcing their separation. A scholar must search for the balance between satisfying the norms of academia while being sensitive to the needs and interests of indigenous communities.

With respect to the dichotomy between academics and activists, the consensus among the participants was to foster engagement and forge alliances instead of creating and fueling tensions. As to the relationship between indigenous peoples and the state (and other state-based organizations or institutions like the United Nations), there was general agreement that engagement was the way forward for indigenous peoples. In short, the general sentiment among participants was to reject the traditionally-accepted binary positions and explore a middle ground or adopt an alternative stance.

The second major theme – and this is alluded to above – involves the tendency of the participants to see the advancement of indigenous studies as something similar to a struggle or a fight. Hence, there were references to “allies” or “friends”, “enemies”, “arenas of conflict or struggle,” “strategies”, etc. The third key theme emerging from the discussions was the commitment to go beyond theorizing and pursue action. Consistent with the second theme of advancing indigenous studies as a struggle is the idea that it requires concerted action. Apart from the calls for engagement with the state and state-based institutions, with universities and other sectors of society, there was the specific concern for promoting education among indigenous peoples and awareness among non-indigenous populations. The special concern for education has resulted in a variety of proposals – e.g., the creation of non-conventional schools for indigenous peoples, curricula for indigenous peoples and courses on indigenous studies in mainstream universities, accreditation of indigenous schools, the adoption of inter-culturality in universities, promoting the use of indigenous language or mother tongue in schools, etc.

An area of concern where action needs to be sustained is lobby work for advancing indigenous peoples rights. As mentioned above, indigenous peoples must pursue a stance of engagement with the state and inter-state organizations. In any event, there was the consensus that indigenous peoples must be made the central actors in advancing change. Consistent with the view that information about indigenous peoples must be seen as place-specific (and time-specific), development efforts need to be “localized” to take into account the peculiarities of particular communities.
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The total number of indigenous peoples, advocates and academics from 19 countries the world over participated in the 2013 International Seminar-Workshop on Indigenous Studies. There was an almost equal number of participants coming from academic or non-academic backgrounds.

Of the Philippine delegation were based abroad, while 64% were based in the Cordillera Administrative Region.
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