

DOMINATION CHRONICLES: 2026 – THE YEAR AHEAD

[Peter] (0:00 - 0:03)

Morning again, Steve, good to see you.

[Steve] (0:03 - 0:04)

Great seeing you, Peter.

[Peter] (0:05 - 1:50)

Yeah, so January 1st, we chose this day because, well, because it's a new year and because why not make a statement about a year ahead as we're thinking about where are we going, where we've been with this series of conversations. And it seems to me that maybe the easiest way to do this would be to just go through some of the things you and I have talked about since maybe listeners and viewers here don't realize that we have conversations basically every day. And so these ones that they hear are kind of a culmination of ongoing conversations that they don't get to hear.

So we've had talks about what are we going to be doing with Domination Chronicles in the year ahead. One of the things that we've talked about is having some guests. And the one name I want to mention right now because we have an agreement with them already is Russ Diabo, who's very active up in the Assembly of First Nations.

He's in the area claimed by the Dominion of Canada. He's been quite active recently pointing out the manipulations of the Canadian government to further deepen its domination of native nations by converting them into municipalities and the apparent agreement of many of these First Nations to just go along with that. So as a guest, my hunch is we'll have some interesting insights from Russ.

And there are some other people that we're thinking about having on as guests. I don't know if you have anybody you've reached out to that you want to mention now or not.

[Steve] (1:51 - 2:15)

Well, I have some ideas in mind as far as people that would be excellent to have on and to have really amazing conversations with. But right at the moment, I don't. Yeah, I don't have a name that comes to mind.

I mean, I have several I could mention, but yeah. I think I'll just leave that for the future.

[Peter] (2:16 - 7:09)

Yeah, well, so in terms of topics, you know, we started off some weeks ago with a piece on quantum physics, quantum leaps, understanding the entanglement and the uncertainty of life itself and of all systems. And in responding to systems of domination, which themselves are actually unstable. When you think about the history of domination systems, it's clear that they're constantly on the defensive against falling apart.

And so they become very aggressive and that the whole mode of operation, it seems to me, is something that we should not simply take for granted. Oh, look at that huge power. It's unstoppable, it's immovable.

Now we should see that the domination system itself is actually quite susceptible to crumbling. And if we look at the history of the development of it in so-called Western civilization, we see it's been a long history of internal struggles, internal wars, not just wars against the rest of the world, but the wars in the history of Christendom are amazing when you think about it. The struggles within the Catholic church, the struggles between the Catholic church and the Protestant churches, the rival versions of the Protestant churches and the wars that have gone all through that history, and which make it ironic that when Chief Justice Marshall and Johnson v.

McIntosh dismissed the native inhabitants, as he calls them, of this continent, saying that war was their chief preoccupation. Well, who's talking here? I'm thinking that just thinking about words and language as fields of information, rather than thinking of them as determined definitions, often, not often, always, it seems to me, domination works by defining and imposing definitions and attempting to squash discussion.

I mean, the COVID lockdown is a good example in the modern world, the very recent modern world of dominating in part by denying anybody a chance to talk about it. So as where we are now, past that period with a certain greater freedom of discussion available to people, we're able to present them with information about how domination works. And it reminds me of a quote, Carl Llewellyn, who was so-called legal realist, a very interesting, we've talked about him before, lawyer.

He did a study of how it is that these original peoples, he didn't call them original peoples, but the tribal peoples had systems of organization when the outside expert world says, oh, they don't even have any legal systems. That's an example of how primitive they are. So Llewellyn has a line in a series of lectures that he wrote about what is the process of studying legal documents?

Well, we could say, what's the process of studying any documents? And just a little kind of a single storyline here. There was a man in our town and he was wondrous wise.

He jumped into a bramble bush and scratched out both his eyes. And when he saw that he was blind, with all his might and mane, he jumped into another one and scratched them in again. And so I'm thinking we have material that we're working with, which many, many people are just blinded by.

They can't read these decisions and they read them and they get confused. And I'm not just talking about ordinary lay people, I'm talking about lawyers who, they look at the founding decisions, they look at these precedents, plenary power, the rest of it, and they get caught in it. They can't see their way out.

And I think that the method that you and I are putting forward is, well, the solution there is to jump back into it, jump back into the thorns, jump back into the difficult language and unpack it. And you do such a good job of going down to etymological roots in Latin, like let's dive into the paper ball. You got confused, you got blinded by it, you couldn't understand it.

Well, what's the solution? Let's dive back into it. So I'm thinking that that approach, I see us as maintaining that throughout the year, regardless of which particular cases we looked at.

Maybe you wanna say, and I think your domination translator should have at least a little note right now because it's a method of diving into the bramble bush to scratch your eyes back in.

[Steve] (7:14 - 10:49)

Well, in your reference to the claim of a right of domination, it seems to me that the, and the possibility of empires crumbling and such revolutionary upheavals and all the conflicts within political systems because really it's a struggle over power, right? Any political system. And so it comes down to who is claiming or who has the quote unquote right to claim the right of domination.

In other words, they're recognized as being in that official position of ultimate decision-making. And that's really what that struggle is about in my view. And the Klaus Mueller in his book, Politics of Communication is just extraordinary in that regard.

And he has a chapter on the status quo and it begins with the definition of domination. So very much that's what we're discussing. And a big part of that decision-making process has to do with how they use particular words in a given context.

And so who is controlling the text, who is controlling the production of text and the production of the words, what word choices are going to be prevailing, quote unquote. And that's really what we're discussing. I mean, that's what the Domination Chronicles is about as far as I'm concerned.

With regard to the Domination Translator for people that are not familiar with that, when we set the context for the Domination Translator, we do so by recognizing the original free existence of our nations and peoples, meaning native nations and peoples of Turtle Island, extending back to the beginning of time, contrasted with the system of domination brought by ship across the ocean and imposed on everyone and everything. Then you have the viewpoint of our ancestors looking toward the ships coming toward shore and the view from the ship looking toward our ancestors. And in order to help with the insight and understanding of what's going on with domination terminology, I devised a technique whereby if I use any of the main seven terms of domination, such as civilization, state, sovereignty, ascendancy, dominion, property, and empire, after any of those terms, I would put domination in brackets after that.

So property, domination, civilization, domination, ascendancy, but a state I might put of domination, the state of domination, to make clear that that's what's being referenced as the state, it could be a state of bliss, state of happiness, state of domination. It's a figure of speech, but it's a partiality. So the state is an abbreviation of the longer concept of the state of domination.

And I wanna make that clear for the reader. So once you do that, for example, I did that recently with footnote number one from City of Cheryl versus Oneida Indian

Nation of New York issued by Ruth Bader Ginsburg in 2005. And my goodness, it was amazing how many in this little brief amount of space of text, you have all these instances of domination popping out.

So we're taking what's in the background and placing that in the foreground by means of that technique.

[Peter] (10:50 - 14:30)

Yeah, I'm triggered by your talking about words and how words is involved in the idea that we start with the notion there's a claim of a right of domination. But as you pointed out, the battle among the would be dominators is who has the right to claim the right. And that, so there's a constant turmoil at that level.

And it seems to me that if people miss that, that's when they get the sense that there's a solidity, it's unchangeable, it's unquestionable, rather than seeing that among the dominators and would be dominators themselves, there's constantly indeterminacy and constantly struggle going on. I also wanted to say about words in relation to free existence. You do a really good job of referring to the free existence of original peoples.

And it seems to me, we've talked about this also before free existence is a human, it's a life thing. The free existence of beings, the buffalo had free existence, the trees have free existence, that sort of thing that ultimately, I find it helpful to think really taking a lesson from Taoist understandings that existence is beyond the power of words to define. But words is what we have as humans to grapple with that notion of what is the meaning of our lives, what's the meaning of existence.

And this has been an ongoing level of our conversation without necessarily being explicit about talking about Taoism, but what is existence? What is the nature of existence and free existence? And the reference to original peoples of Turtle Island echoes free existence of peoples who are in the so-called old world and what we now call Europe.

And there's a long history of the imposition of the state in Germany, what's now called Germany. And that process involved interacting with the original peoples there. And one of the techniques that was used by the architects of the state apparatus was to approach them and you can see echoes of this in the US approach is they would approach the communities that they were aiming to dominate, but they didn't say we're here to aim to dominate, you were here to coordinate or we're here to organize or whatever.

And they would engage in elaborate procedures and tell us about your customs. What do you do when X happens? What do you do when Y happens?

We wanna understand how you organize yourselves. And they would write all this down, just like we're gonna be taking notes for how you organize yourself so that that can be protected. And as time went on a decade or more and the state had insinuated itself and some conflict would arise and the local people would wanna handle it in a certain way, just like we talked about the Crow Dog case, the Lakota handling a particular case.

And the state apparatus would say, well, here's the rule for that. And people would say, no, no, that's not the way we wanna handle that case. They'd say, well, here's how we wrote it down.

This is what you told us. And so people become trapped by words when they are entering this, what they think of as a conversation and we're gonna arrive at some mutual understanding. They also have in mind, I think that there's gonna be an ongoing mutuality here.

There's gonna be an ongoing creation of meaning and understanding, but the system of domination is, oh no, that's been closed off now. We already arrived at that. We have a definition and we're gonna go by this written definition.

We don't have any space left for an open conversation here.

[Steve] (14:30 - 16:13)

Well, notice that when you said, we're gonna go with, that presumes the right of decision-making and the people that are saying that, right? In other words, it's not in the people themselves, it's in these other outsiders that are coming in representing the so-called state and of domination in brackets. And so, but most people don't have that awareness and we're explaining the techniques, right?

Architects, the arc and then the tech, it's all built into that, the architecture, it's the design, the way in which that whole system of ideas is designed to perpetuate the assertion or assumed right of domination. And one of the things I wanna mention is a concept called reification, which people can think of that as thingification, if they wanna, Martin Luther King Jr. used that term thingification, which I thought was quite brilliant. And what that is referring to is things that have human authorship, they were made by human beings, but over time, the authorship is lost sight of.

Who or what group happened to create that particular customary, whatever the heck it is, a custom, tradition, whatever it might be, an idea, an institution, the human authorship, we've lost sight of that. So it's very important to put that back into the mix to realize these are all aspects of what human beings are creating in their interactions with one another on an ongoing basis.

[Peter] (16:14 - 19:44)

Yeah, and having to struggle over. And you give me the segue, one of the themes that we will be talking about is a bizarre, I'm thinking it's bizarre, effort on the part of a couple of law review writers to use so-called artificial intelligence. I think that's one of the most bizarre concepts.

Anyway, a machine is not a mind. Minds can be intelligent, machines are not intelligent. And the mind is not a machine, that's the other side of that coin.

But the proposal has been made, and I don't wanna get into the detail until the session when we talk about it, to use AI to somehow reinforce or reconstruct or reaffirm traditional ways of being, traditional ways of indigenous peoples. And I can't understand how it is that anybody would even give that two seconds of thought. You're talking about words, for example, and who authored the words and so on and so forth.

And there are people that somehow have fallen for the notion that when you take a lot of words, which have been written by other people, articles, books, stories, cases, any collections of words, and you develop a model, it's called a large language model. That's what is behind an AI. It means you're, I think it's a form of plagiarism, actually, and there are some lawsuits going on by authors saying the same thing.

But a machine is fed text. It's called the training of the AI model. And then algorithms are written of how the machine is supposed to deal with these texts.

And behind all that, of course, are human actors and selections, choices being made, which texts, and how are the algorithms being written? So when we're looking at the effort to use so-called AI to recreate traditions, it seems to me we've reached a real point of absurdity that traditions, which are living ways of being among a given people, are somehow, as they've been quote-unquote lost because of the assimilation process and the domination process that's inherent in assimilation, that somehow this machine system is gonna solve that problem. So I'm thinking of this as a way in which our conversations explore stuff beyond what people usually think of as like, oh, that's a native issue.

AI is certainly far beyond a native issue, just like domination also. And so as I see it, our conversations standing on the ground of the understanding of an original free existence, we're using that standpoint to look at what exists now in the world, in all cultures and not just in one culture and in all countries, not just one country. So I see it as being, this is the promise really.

If there's something different that the invaders discovered in Turtle Island, and if that's something different, we have named original free existence, then if we can stand in that place, as you're saying, stand with a view from the shore, what do we see? We can look at the whole world. We're not stuck with just looking at what happened 500 years ago or 200 years ago.

We can look at what happened yesterday and we can begin to get a viewpoint and a perspective that is not the so-called normal perspective of thinking about what is the relevance of thinking about native peoples.

[Steve] (19:45 - 23:30)

Well, I think we're in even discussing a free existence or the possibility of a free existence or the remembrance of a free existence that we are already dealing with one of the most fundamentally crucial aspects of what's called a human life, right? Human existence. Because that struggle between those who want to dominate, the will to domination, and those who want to be free from any such efforts, that is where a big part of the struggle of quote-unquote human existence has taken place, right at that nexus, right?

And so that's the deep and meaningful conversation that I think we're trying to have and that we are having. And have been attempting to have these conversations for such a long time. That's where we have kind of a, we're far along in our efforts to engage in such reflections and discussions and so forth because we've been doing it for such a long time.

And not just in our interactions with one another, but in our preparations for such conversations. And I think that's what makes it very unique. If we were not, well, maybe I speak for myself, I never tried to become a specialist in one given area of knowledge.

I wanted to have a massive amount of information from many, many, many different disciplines and throw it all in the hopper and look for the patterns that would emerge. And once I began to see those patterns, particularly in the language and so forth, then I was able to realize at a certain point along the way that the one theme that kept reoccurring over and over and over again was the domination aspect. And I was fortunate enough, I don't know why exactly it was true for me, but the focus on the way in which our peoples were free and independent of anything that came across an ocean.

So you have to think back to that time and really deeply contemplate and reflect upon the existence, the way of life that all of our nations and peoples had before any ships ever showed up. And then once you have a really deep connection with that and that sense of liberty, if you wanna use a different term than free, but that deep sense of a right to maintain that free existence is really where I wanna place the focus because most people have forgotten that. There's a famous quote, I use it in one particular document that I created by Matthew King, an Oglala Lakota man, otherwise known as Noble Red Man.

And I think I'm saying it correctly when he said, the only thing worse than remembering you were once free is not remembering you were once free. That's one thing we Indians will never do. Well, that was stated probably back in the early 1970s, late 60s, early 70s, but I'm not so sure anymore because there aren't that many people anywhere really that are, well, that's an overstatement, but the crucial point is that that's where I want our focus to be, regardless of what anybody else is doing, that's what we're doing, so.

[Peter] (23:31 - 28:22)

Yeah, a couple of things I wanna say, first about your method of study, reading everything, et cetera. I want to emphasize how different that is from the standard academic approach. I mean, I was 30 plus years in the so-called academy and I always managed to avoid that.

I was always in a kind of a liminal zone, especially because I also was involved in litigation. So I wasn't really an academic and lawyers are often not considered really academics in any way, but that aside, what I wanna say is that the so-called academic approach is to dig further and further and further into some narrower and narrower range of inquiry. So you become an expert.

I'm an expert on the decisions of the Duke of Burgundy during his initial period of rule or whatever, blah, blah, blah. And somebody says, well, how does that relate to what Pope Francis said? And it's like, oh, I have no idea.

That's really beyond my competence. So you, on the other hand, could make those connections easily. And I think I'm not necessarily between the Duke of Burgundy and Pope Francis, but as an example.

And so I'm thinking that I wanna make that point, the breadth of the resources that are available that are behind our conversations and the effort to connect as many dots as possible, bring as much information out from as many different perspectives as possible and see patterns and so on and so forth. And that leads me to the second thing I wanna say based on that method is that we don't operate from conclusory opinions. I mean, anybody could say off the top of their head or even after a little bit of reading, they could say, yes, Western civilization is a very dominating civilization.

Okay, well, yes, we could say that, but what do you know about the system of dominate? How did it develop? What are its roots?

What are its many... Oh, I don't know. It's a system of domination.

So there's a difference between offering an opinion that's sort of like this is a conclusion versus digging into the whole mass of material and seeing what's there and then coming to that conclusion. And I think you and I, you said recently in a discussion outside this context that to say Western civilization system domination is a starting point, it's not a conclusion. So if you take it as a conclusion, then you're just dealing at the level of sort of surface appearances.

And even if the surface appearances have some relationship to what we would say as historical reality, they don't give you any information to allow you to go anywhere. They don't give you anything to work with to be able to see, oh, well, how is that related to Chinese civilization? How is that related to the Oglala nation?

Or how is that related to whatever? If you don't have all those raw materials, you have no way to get involved in that discussion. You just are capable of being at a cocktail party where somebody says something and you say something and you each have drinks and you go, yeah, we had a wonderful time.

Nothing really was discussed and dug into. So I wanna just say in terms of what you described as a method of work, that is also why our discussions are not happening at the surface level of froth. One of the things that we'll look at is the current resurgence of references to the US as a Christian nation.

And I read something last week, somebody sent me some columnist in LA Times talking about how, oh, nasty Trump, he's talking about nasty Vance, he's talking about Christian, et cetera. And I'm thinking, how silly to think that that's what's really, that this is just the current politician with some rhetoric being, when the whole structure goes back to a millennia at least. And every president, some of the presidents, we'll talk about this probably in the future, one of the darlings of the anti-Trumpists would be Obama, but Obama did something even more dastardly than making some comment about Christianity at Christmas time, when he disemboweled the document, the UN document that said indigenous nations have a right of consent.

Well, we'll talk about all that later when he redefined consent into being non-consent, talking about use of words and dominating uses of words. So again, the surface level conversation might be about something called Christianity. The depth is so much

more complicated than the surface politics of what politician or public figure just said that word.

[Steve] (28:23 - 29:34)

Yeah, well, I think the word tentative is very useful because we can have a tentative conclusion, meaning it's what we understand at this moment, at this point based upon everything we've been looking at, but that might change in five minutes or five days or five months or what have you. And because we're constantly grabbing new information and factoring in a lot of additional information, but also going even deeper into things that we already think that we understand. I mean, how many times have we read the Johnson versus McIntosh decision?

I mean, my goodness, I mean, it's ridiculous, right? But each time we pick it up and look at it or read it on the computer screen, we see something different. Maybe we see something we never ever noticed in all the times we've read it before.

So it's an ongoing process. And I think that's the crucial point is that we are engaged in an ongoing process of inquiry, meaning a process of curiosity, asking questions, being deeply passionate in our curiosity, wanting to know more and more and wanting to hurry up and know it, you know?

[Peter] (29:34 - 32:25)

Yeah, yeah, exactly. Deep curiosity, impulsive curiosity, impulse meaning just driving us. So another topic that involves words is a constant refrain to compassion, sympathy, sorrow around native issues.

And it's getting to the point where, well, the most recent example from last year was the so-called boarding school report that we'll talk about at some point in a near upcoming session where the Department of the Interior released this great document with all this information about number of children died in the boarding schools and the course of methods and so on. And it said in volume one anyway, there was two volumes. It said that the whole boarding school process was part of the land seizure process, all right?

But they never dig into the land seizure. All they talk about is how, oh, these people were so traumatized by having their languages beaten out of them and their cultures torn away from them. These are children.

How traumatic it was and it has lasting intergenerational consequences and so we wanna give them some money so they can do language reclamation and cultural programs. And I'm looking and looking and where does it say we wanna do something about the land base? Oh, nowhere, nowhere.

And so that trope of having sympathy while imposing domination, you referred to the 2005 decision by Ginsburg, Justice Ginsburg, where footnote one, she realized on the doctrine of discovery to deny the Oneida land title. And then later when I guess somebody said, Ruth, well, isn't that kind of weird? And she said, oh, I really regret that.

I guess what her statement was not that that decision should be reversed. Her statement was that the president ought to appoint a native woman to the Supreme Court. And I'm thinking, what?

I mean, bizarre. It's like completely irrelevant, has nothing to do with the Oneida land to have somebody who is supposedly an indigenous blooded person on the Supreme Court. It's that kind of stuff.

And the Teotihuacan decision, which we've talked about before, after saying that, after the Supreme Court said that the Tlingit did not own their own land and therefore didn't own the timber and therefore the US didn't owe them any money, the court said that the American people have compassion for these Indians who are deprived of their lands. Well, isn't that wonderful?

[Steve] (32:25 - 32:32)

There's no, it's just, it's such a good, that's a good form of compensation. Yeah. Compassion.

[Peter] (32:33 - 32:36)

Yeah. I feel so bad. Don't you feel good because I feel so bad?

[Steve] (32:37 - 32:37)

Yeah.

[Peter] (32:38 - 33:06)

You know? So, and there are many examples of those. And when we get to that topic about regrets, apologies, compassion, and it goes on now just last, no, unless it wasn't last week.

Last month, the Spanish government issued a statement saying it expresses regret over the injustice, in quotes, suffered by Mexico's indigenous peoples during the so-called conquest. Well, isn't that wonderful? Doesn't that make your heart warm?

[Steve] (33:08 - 33:29)

Well, and it's interesting that the word conquest, which is so common and it's been used for the longest time, it gives a sense of victory. So in Spanish, they say la conquista. Yeah.

The conquest. But what they're really saying is the victory.

[Peter] (33:29 - 33:30)

Yeah.

[Steve] (33:30 - 36:17)

So they're giving themselves kudos for having achieved the victory. And, but they sure regret having achieved the victory. Yeah.

But that's more of a political, it just, it's to appease people. It's sort of a reconciliation in Canada. That became a meme, a theme, a trajectory of a policy by the Canadian government, not based on any deep analysis of terminology and saying, out of all the possible words in English, what word is best serving our purpose here with what we're trying to accomplish?

Oh, I know, reconciliation. It wasn't that at all. It was something that Desmond Tutu had accomplished in South Africa in that context.

And then it became a very popularized idea. And so then it became useful in other contexts. But when you examine that word, the R-E, to do something again, and then conciliation, well, if you never had conciliatory relations to begin with, how are you putting those back together?

How are you reestablishing a type of relationship you never had to begin with? People don't seem to ask those types of questions for some reason, I'm not sure why. And so things just kind of almost end up being a robotic, mechanized type of habitual use of language and we need pattern interrupt, a process of pattern interrupt where we say something that makes people kind of, hang on a second, well, I never thought of that.

So for example, land back, we've discussed that a bit before, where, well, back from where? Are we talking about moving land back from somewhere that they took the land and moving it back physically to the original location that it was taken from? No, we're not.

Because the land is still exactly where it was the entire time. And so it's obvious that it's not a physical back that we're talking about. So then how is that word back being used?

Nobody asked those type of questions. And I'm not saying that in a way to be arrogant about it, I'm saying it as an encouragement for people to begin to engage in that kind of a more precise inquiry about how English trips us up and we think we're being actually effective in the use of English. And oftentimes it's the end of thought rather than the starting point of a thought process.

[Peter] (36:17 - 38:29)

Yeah, exactly. Just another example of how getting caught with the latest meme or theme or label is actually not only almost irrelevant, it becomes damaging. So land back, there's all kinds of people want to get on the land back movement and they don't even start with your question about land back.

I mean, the land's already been there. What do you mean by back? Because they presume that it means something and what they're presuming is that it means that, oh, the native peoples now have that land again.

Well, what does that mean they have that land? You mean, so you'd have to start taking that, oh, they have control over that land. Then if you say, well, now let's actually look at land back, we'll talk about this in an upcoming session.

Each of the so-called land back examples that have been done by the government or done by private organizations, every one of them I've seen does not actually recognize title except for a couple of very small private grants. One was a return of title to land. Most of them have simply been to recategorize the legal status of land as trust land being held by the United States.

Now, if we can set aside the private ones for a while, just take government land, say the government says land back. What does that mean? The government just changed the label.

Instead of saying, oh, this is federal land, it's like federal land in trust. Well, that's the whole trust doctrine. That's part of the domination system.

So land back is actually not a departure from the domination system, just exactly contrary to what people think of it when they just see a superficial newspaper story or some NGO story about we engineered this land back and say, well, what did you actually do? I think that it's just yet one more example of how the kind of careful taking apart of what is going on here, the taking apart of the words and actions is the only way to actually get any clarity and any standpoint from which to continue to understand what is our existence all about.

[Steve] (38:30 - 40:05)

Yeah, well, the way in which these terms focus our attention, I use a phrase or statement in my book where I say what you focus on determines what you miss. So if you're focused on this particular thing, quote unquote thing or process or whatever it might be, this subject, well, then all these other things are out of focus because you're so locked into that. So you're locked into land back, but does that take out of focus or maybe you never had the focus on the systemic nature of the analysis and the fact that you're not even acknowledging the claim of a right of domination is not even part of the land back analysis.

And maybe there isn't really a land back analysis. Maybe that's more of a thematic type of sloganizing that people locked into and say, yeah, land back. Okay, sure, we want to subscribe to some kind of a notion of returning or restoring the control that native nations and peoples have over their own lands and territories and so forth.

But how is that as a single focus enabling us to have that bigger comprehensive framework of analysis? And I think that's what people have not bothered to develop and they're not going to utilize something they never developed.

[Peter] (40:05 - 42:56)

Yeah, you know, so to add in, jump to yet another topic, the extent to which people's minds have been assimilated into a way of thinking that they're not actually aware of. And the example that we can look at is a voting rights case, which is now at the Supreme Court. I have not actually followed the most recent steps in the case, but Turtle Mountain versus Howe is the name of the case.

And they're arguing about, they need to have voting districts in the state of North Dakota so that they have more representation in the state legislature. And I'm thinking, wow, this is pretty amazing. It means that the whole boarding school effort, the Friends of the Indians, so-called in the Lake Mohawk conferences and the notorious Colonel Henry Pratt, who said we have to kill the Indian to save the man.

It seems to me there might actually, that might have been completely successful. If you find a native nation, rather than saying anything about its nationhood, its land, its actual control over land, any of that stuff, they're talking about they want to have voting rights so they can be included in the American nation and in the state government. And I think we're beset by that notion.

Yet another topic is to what extent the professoriate in this field is actually moving in that same direction, saying native people need to be included in the constitution. It's

just taking the nomination system as a solid given thing, no contest about that, it's just there, and we want a role in it. We want a piece in it.

It's a very troubling thing for anybody that's thinking that there might be some movement toward a free existence, when in fact, it's a movement toward further domination. And if I can throw in the other side of that coin, another case to look at is the Manuman case. It's the wild race case that the Red Lake Chippewa and the White Earth Ojibwe filed in their own court in which they said, we're asserting our ancestral traditional jurisdiction over the areas of wild race grows because wild race is part of our life.

We are related to the race, the race is related to us, and we're gonna assert our environmental control over that. And they won a decision in the low level court, and then their own appeals court overturned that and said, oh, we can't allow that to go forward because if we allowed it to go forward, the federal government would just reverse us. So running from an assertion of free existence.

[Steve] (42:57 - 45:04)

Yeah, well, I'm glad you brought that up because I think another part of what I'm getting at is that if you're going to have a free existence or even invoke the idea of ever having a free existence or remembering that your ancestors had that free existence, the number one thing that you wanna have at your disposal is a sharp mind that is able to think deeply about whatever the heck it is you're wanting to think about and the ability to discuss the findings that you have after you've analyzed and assessed what in the heck you're dealing with. And I think that is where the quote unquote educational process, if it's merely a conditioning process whereby the types of analysis that we're doing is totally out of focus because people never learned to make that kind of inquiry, never learned how to dive deep into all these intricacies.

I mean, it takes a lot of patience. It takes tremendous discipline, takes tremendous energy. You know, people say, well, I believe in action.

Okay, good, that's great. So they wanna be out on the street. They wanna be doing this, that and the other as far as direct action and those types of things.

That's great, there's a role for that. But read a thousand books and tell me whether you felt like you engaged in some activity or not. You know, to have the patience to actually go through the kind of information that we've been able to go through in the manner in which we've done that and have the insights and understandings to be able to have this kind of a conversation together, that's very, very challenging.

It's difficult to do. And it's very rare that you have people being able to engage in this kind of a conversation about the subject matter that we're discussing. At least that's my assessment of it.

[Peter] (45:04 - 46:29)

Yeah, and I think when you refer to so-called direct action how many times that seems to be completely futile because people don't really have any traction with the idea systems that they think they're opposing. And they either think they've won something and then find out, oh, it was just a mirage or they don't win and they think,

oh, there's no way to win, we've just given up. And then they can do things like get more violent.

They can throw bombs thinking, okay, we'll get rid of the domination that way. It's kind of like when Emma Goldman's boyfriend, what was his name? He went and assassinated the head of U.S. Steel. I think it was Frick. And it's like, wow, your Marxist theory told you that there was an elite group of capitalists that are controlling the system. And so at this very simplistic level, you think you're gonna solve the problem by killing a capitalist.

And no comprehension that there's a structure involved here and that the structure is manipulated and managed by real people, just like AI is managed by real people, but go kill those real people. Have you actually dismantled the system of technology and system of thinking about what human existence means that thinks that there is such a thing as artificial intelligence? No, you haven't even scratched the surface of it.

[Steve] (46:29 - 48:32)

Yeah, well, that reminds me of the, what we discussed one other time, artifice intelligence, the deception, the deceit, the way in which people's minds are being manipulated and controlled in ways that they don't even realize. And with regards to the boarding school, so-called boarding schools, the inculcation of patriotism in Indian schools was the title of one of the policy statements by an Indian commissioner back in the 1800s. And that idea of inculcation is to pound under with the hooves of a horse, right?

So it's to beat it into them. We're gonna beat this into you. And so the idea of not having that deeper analysis but direct action on a more superficial level toward one end, when they had that big, one of the big discussions about how to approach Standing Rock, the issue of Standing Rock and the DAPL, the Dakota Access Pipeline, and so forth.

There was an opportunity where a huge convening of attorneys came together and somebody broached the subject of doctrine of discovery in that meeting. And this is secondhand, of course, but it just went over like a lead balloon. Nobody wanted to touch it.

So nobody in that, all those attorneys in that room, however many there were, somehow didn't wanna touch any of this kind of analysis that we're talking about. These are very capable people. They're all attorneys and so forth, but are they also beholden to a system that they don't wanna pull the rug out from under their own feet?

Or who knows what the reason was, but it never got any traction whatsoever, which is kind of surprising to me.

[Peter] (48:32 - 50:17)

Well, yeah, and since we're getting near the end of this conversation, maybe it's a way to wrap up by pointing to the significance of words. We're constantly just dealing with word. Words are, to use in the imagery of quantum fields, we could say words are the quanta, and putting the words together in different combinations and that

they're constantly entangled with other words and that there's an uncertainty involved in the meaning of any combination of words.

And we're just diving into that. That's the bramble bush that I mentioned in the beginning. We're saying any combination of words, it can either scratch your eyes out or scratch them in, but it's gonna take jumping into them in order to have that effect.

And when they've confused you the first time, the only solution is jump back in another time and deal with the fact that you're in the midst of this entangled uncertainty. And when you see that conversation you just talked about, when you understand there was a conversation in which certain word formations, the doctrine of discovery were ignored, even though they were available. I mean, those people were either afraid, I'm gonna get blinded if I jump back into that, they're not gonna realize that actually their whole approach to the case might be awakened if they dived into that.

And so there we are just sort of in that, in terms of where the profession is, where the field is kind of stalled. And I think you and I are, we're constantly moving to kind of lubricate these discussions, open up the discussions, avoid coming down to a conclusion, capital C, a definition, capital D.

[Steve] (50:18 - 51:42)

Well, I wanna say one last thing about the idea of elections and citizenship and some of the themes that you mentioned a bit earlier. And it is interesting, the Voting Rights Act and so forth. It is interesting that with regard to native nations, there is less of a tendency to advocate on behalf of native nationhood than there is on behalf of something like the right to vote within their system and to be as a citizen participant.

Then you look at the United States versus Consolidated Wounded Knee Cases decision by Judge Erbom in 1975. And what does he use against the idea that the Sioux people, quote unquote, are still a fully sovereign nation? Oh, they're citizens now.

The individuals are citizens. So he's actually weaponizing that concept and using that to undermine their argument. But as I had stated previously, if the attorneys in that case had made the issue about whether the Sioux people are still a rightfully free nation and people, that's a completely different topic than whether they're a fully sovereign nation.

And those are the intricacies that we have to be able to recognize in order to pursue them.

[Peter] (51:43 - 52:04)

Yeah, and let's just leave it there. This is a preview of ongoing conversations and we'll try to touch all these bases more than once as we go through the year. And as I said in the beginning, we'll aim to have some guest people on.

Sounds great. Happy New Year. Yeah, you too.

Bye-bye for now.