

TRANSCRIPT: boarding school report

[Peter]

Good morning, Steve.

[Steve]

Good morning, Peter. How are you doing today?

[Peter]

Very well, thank you. So today we're going to tackle kind of a big cultural icon almost at this point, although given the way things work in politics, it's almost forgotten. It's two years old, the first volume was four years old.

I'm talking about the so-called Indian boarding school report that was authorized when Deb Haaland was Interior Secretary and the BIA undertook to do a study of the boarding schools. I'm not going to call it the BS report because that would be being too superficial with it, reminds me of when Vine, Vine Deloria Jr. referred to the Bering Strait theory as the BS theory after he had demolished it. But I think really in a very serious way, we want to look at what was this report all about?

What was it set up to do? What, if anything, has it done? So let's just start right at the top.

Just look at the first volume, volume one here. I'm looking at the wrong document. I want to just be sure.

So we have in April 2022, the opening cover letter to the Department of Interior from the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, which would be otherwise known as the Commission of Indian Affairs, introducing this report, saying that it was designed to investigate the federal Indian boarding school system, to examine the scope of the system with a focus on location of schools, various sites and identification of children.

So you can see right at the top, it's a kind of an after action report. If you want to think about the long history as kind of like a military action against the original peoples, this is an after action report of a significant piece of that war against the original peoples, the war to so-called assimilate them by so-called educating them. And the focus throughout both volumes is on what they're calling cultural assimilation.

But what's most interesting about volume one, which is not really repeated in volume two, which came out in 2024. In volume one, they indicate right at the top in this very same letter of introduction of the report, it says that the report confirms that the policy of cultural assimilation coincided with the policy of territorial dispossession, that there was a twin policy to assimilate. And I want to use that word in quotes, because you could think of it as brainwash, change identities.

I'm sure you'll come up with some other words of what assimilation really means, kill off the existing culture of these children. But in any case, throughout this volume one, the recognition is clear that the boarding schools were part of the land seizure process, that they were designed to accomplish land dispossession. And behind that is an acknowledgement that I guess we'd have to say it's a genocidal policy.

Even though the technical term genocide hadn't been coined yet at the time when the boarding schools were first started. In fact, at the beginning with the so-called Civilization Act, the 1819 Indian Civilization Act, the concept of genocide was not in general use. But in 2022 and 2024, with clear understanding that there is such a thing as genocide, it seemed to me that it would be an opportunity if this report wanted to really hit with a heavy hammer to say that the assimilation process, quote-unquote, of the boarding schools, quote-unquote, which were really prisons, that it was part of a land seizure process and that the totality of it was to eradicate the existence of the original peoples. So it seems to me, if we wanted to set it up, the boarding school report acknowledges that complicated interaction. It's really actually quite simple interaction, destruction of existing peoples as peoples and the seizure of their lands.

But it's complicated conceptually because people usually don't put those two things together. And it's intriguing that in volume two, there's really no acknowledgement that the assimilation was part of the land dispossession thing. That was only in volume one of the report.

And land is mentioned. I made a little note here before we went on. Dispossession of lands is mentioned 14 times in the 100 pages of this volume one.

And so you think, well, geez, if it's mentioned that many times, then they ought to do something with it. But in the end, there's no recommendation to do anything about that. The focus is entirely on trauma to individuals and families.

And the recommendations are to provide some money for cultural enhancement, including possibly revitalization of languages. Is that enough to get you?

[Steve]

Certainly. I mean, when you think about the... There's so many things to talk about here.

But when you think about the definition of genocide coined, a term coined by Raphael Lemkin right toward the end of World War II, which is the intention to destroy in whole or in part an entire people or nation, then you can see that this fits exactly that definition. A lot of people have been conditioned to believe that genocide is only happening when there's blood on the ground and there are people being slaughtered physically. And that's certainly within the scope of that definition, but also forcibly removing children from their families, from the people, and forcing them to be raised in the cultural context of the society, attempting to wipe them out, to end their existence as a distinct people, as a distinct nation.

That is the very definition of genocide. So this report does not touch on that. I think that it's using very euphemistic language, but I think it is very peculiar in one regard that this report evidently has been put together by Native people, but they're Native people who are working in their capacity as federal government employees and as part of the federal government apparatus called the Department of the Interior.

And so in one regard, you might think, well, that's good because they're coming to terms with a lot of these things. But there's a way in which the very context of that writing process, of the investigation process, the research process, and so forth, is somehow, it's

moderated in a way. It softens the way in which people would use language because there are expectations within those federal circles as to how language will be used.

Now, the other thing that's very fascinating along those same lines is the way in which you'll see the term our nation referring to the United States, which is what the goal of the assimilation process was, is to get people to identify with the United States as the national identity and not with their own nation or people as a national identity. And so I think that's very interesting, the use of pronouns that make people become identified and it explicitly states that, as I recall, that Native people are quote unquote citizens of the United States as a result of the Indian Citizenship Act of 1924. And but that's, once again, part of that overall assimilation process.

And you'll notice in court rulings that the courts have used that very idea of Indian citizenship to undermine certain kinds of assertions put forward by Native groups or litigants that are attempting to put forward claims and so forth, and particularly with regard to nationhood. And they say, well, they're citizens of the United States and the United States doesn't make treaties with its own citizens and things of that sort. So that's what I have to say initially.

[Peter]

Yeah. And I think that it's a very important point, that notion of citizenship being basically imposed on Native peoples. The 1924 Act was actually opposed by a lot of Native peoples precisely because they saw what it was as a wedge into extinguishing their existence as non-citizen independent peoples.

[Steve]

Yeah.

[Peter]

So that, and in today's terms, it really complicates any effort to stand up for what you might call Indian self-determination in a real sense. I'm not talking about the so-called federal program of self-determination. Indian sovereignty, if we want to use that word, is that simultaneously these people are citizens.

How can there be groups of citizens that are sovereign at the same time that they're citizens? So it's a real rat's nest and it's passed over again and again. And you're right about the tone of the report.

Here's a line out, two partial sentences out of the introductory letter to the report talking about our nation's relationship with Indigenous peoples. Well, wait a minute, whose nation relationship with whom? Then it says, tell the truth about our nation's history of operating federal Indian boarding schools.

And so there's an actually quite bizarre situation being imagined there that you say it's our nation and with the Indigenous peoples, but the whole idea of the whole program they're looking at was to extinguish the Indigenous peoples, make them part of our nation. So now a century or so later, these people who have been assimilated work in the government and they're referring to our nation. It's as if there's actually, maybe the report should be looked at as like a celebration of, well, the boarding schools were a real success.

Look at all the administrators they've trained who can work in the federal government and talk about our nation. It's really a schizophrenic kind of thing to get your head around.

[Steve]

Yeah. Well, and bringing it back to the theme of our podcast here, The Domination Chronicles, the theme of domination, what is more emblematic of domination than forcibly taking children from their loved ones, families, and peoples and forcing them into institutions where they can be subjected to sadistic behavior, as we see in many of the firsthand accounts of what took place in those institutions. And there's a photograph under executive summary of the first volume of report, section two, executive summary, and a photograph of a woman standing along with a whole bunch of children against a wall of one of the boarding schools.

And each child has a U.S. flag, and the children are probably in the area of, well, certainly elementary school. And so you've got, what is that, four, eight, 15 flags, basically. It's just amazing the amount of indoctrination going on.

And when you look at the statement by one of the Indian commissioners, commissioners of Indian affairs, about the inculcation of patriotism toward the United States in boarding schools as a policy, that term inculcation, which I've mentioned before, means to pound under the hooves of a horse. So to pound this kind of information and imagery into the minds of these children and to prevent any national identification of the children with their own nationhood. And as a result, all these years later, then we have native people in the federal government apparatus referring to our nation.

And it's very tangled, as you've already indicated, and very kind of a strange personality, not personality, but identity crisis, in a sense, or a conundrum maybe is the term to use. I'm not sure. So going back to the way in which I usually set the context, when we think of these institutions, I never like to call them boarding schools.

So I call them so-called boarding schools, because I think indoctrination centers with many of them with unmarked graves and so forth, doesn't really fit the definition of a school in the traditional sense. Pardon me, but think of the original free existence of all of these native nations that had children taken from them, or were made to put their children into these institutions, and the original free existence compared to that predicament right there, that you're not even able to spend each day with your own child and to raise your own child with your own language and culture and ceremonial traditions.

And it becomes so extraordinarily horrific in terms of the psychological damage and traumatic outcome of this type of situation. It's quite unbelievable, really.

[Peter]

You can add to that, that taking the children away from their communities and their parents, which was the major break, that the schools intentionally mixed children from different nations, so that if you had a group of children, let's say, who came from Navajo, they would not be placed together in the school. They would be mixed up with perhaps some Apache or some Comanche or some Lakota or whatever children were available. The

policy documents, some of which are referred to in the report, one of the virtues of the report is it does have a lot of footnotes that allows you to go into the source materials.

But it was considered good policy to mix up the children so that it would further deprive them of the ability to use their language, and that they would be forced to use English. That was very explicit in some of the directives that were issued about boarding school administration, that the language was to be not permitted at all, and that any method that would be taken to prevent the use of the language, not just to punish a child for using it, but to make it completely unusable. There's nobody that will understand that language, all right?

And I'm going to just back up one step, which is you talk about genocide doesn't necessarily mean you have blood on the ground, but there was, in fact, a tremendous amount of blood on the ground in this process. And the violence extended not just to the children who were in these prisons, but to their parents. If parents tried to resist the efforts of the authorities to take their children, physically forcibly take them, the parents could be incarcerated.

And there's one of the most famous examples when a whole group of Hopi fathers were locked up in Alcatraz for some period of time, a year, a couple of years, I can't remember exactly right now. So the violence was real. It was not just a kind of, well, psychological violence is real.

I don't mean to say that it's not, but there was physical and mental violence and emotional violence throughout the entire operation. And that's what makes it especially weird to go back into the conundrum, as you called it. It's particularly weird to, it's sort of eerie in a way that we have the voice behind this report, the tone of the report, the voice of the report is the voice of the captured, assimilated, dominated peoples, speaking about their capture and their domination and their assimilation as if like, well, now is this coming to a healing form?

Is this like, by confessing this, there's been a healing? Or is this some bizarre thing that, well, we've just kind of come through this and this is where we are. And yeah, look at all the bruises I've got, but you know, look at the good job I've got too here.

Or even if I don't want to minimize that, there's a lot of people who went through this. In fact, that's a major part of the report's oral history is the dysfunctions that persist to this day in the descendants.

[Steve]

Well, the, and of course, volume two begins with the Hopi. The example of the Hopi people that were the 19 Hopi leaders taken as prisoners of war. And that was 1894.

That was four years after the Wounded Knee Massacre. So there you have blood on the ground. You have a horrific example of people being wiped out unconscionably.

And so you have this example of how the Department of War was a key player within the overall context of what we're talking about here. And that deserves a lot of attention as well. There's a book that's very important for people to know about titled Massacre by Robert Gesner that was published, as I recall, in 1931.

And he was an extraordinary young man. He was only 24 years old when he published this book that was, it's over 400 pages long. And he went around Indian country and interviewed folks.

And he has a couple of sections in the book that are based upon testimony delivered to Congress in a congressional hearing regarding the horrific treatment of the children in the so-called boarding schools. And flogging children is the title of this chapter 10 here. And it's talking about a Ojibwe woman, as he calls her, a full-blooded Chippewa.

And he goes to visit her. And she's singing a lullaby. And she ceased singing.

I looked up from my pencil and saw her deep brown eyes, deep like dark ponds. He would have been as tall as you, she said quietly. But they sent him home in a box.

I was puzzled, but I remained silent. I saw her brown soft-faced animate, her eyes fire as she pointed to the distant hill. My brother's boy was also sent home in a box, she said angrily.

Then suddenly she was as calm as when she sang her lullabies. Her voice ran smoothly like a brook, but there was an undercurrent of heartbreaking grief. We have many wrong, she said.

We are losing our lands, our water rights, our personal freedom. We are being robbed, starved, even diseased at your hands. But we will forget all that for the present if we be granted only one thing, better treatment for our children in the government boarding schools.

As I listened to this passionate yet calm plea, I became aware of a race that places love for its children above all worldly gains or losses. Later on the Sioux Reservation, on the other reservations I visited, in numerous villages and hamlets, in the capital of the nation. In the thousands of miles I have traveled, I have heard one great plea.

We are starving, yes. We are being robbed and oppressed, yes. But first, save our children.

And this goes for pages and pages and pages. It's the most unbelievable account. It's of those lonely children, frightened, flogged, exhausted children, ever hungry children.

I have seen how they sleep in dormitories so crowded the beds touch each other and fill the aisles. They exist under so little protection from disease that epidemics sweep through entire schools as freely as winds. I have seen the stamp of overwork cruelly branded on their young but always tired faces.

I have heard of children so underfed they snatched a plate of bread like famished animals. I have seen the jails they are thrown into after being flogged for infringement of minor rules. And anyway, if we went further into this, I spent a whole, gosh, probably a good part of an hour reading from this book at KLND radio or on KLND radio and providing people with a lot of these accounts where the children were just horrifically and very sadistically treated in the most cruel manner.

So anyway, I wanted to add that into the mixture this morning so that people get a sense of the kind of sanitized version of these reports. I wish there had been more of this kind of information included.

[Peter]

Well, yeah, there are, they do include in the report, samples of some of the statements that were made in a kind of so-called healing journey after this report. And they're being collected as part of an oral history project. And so I'm thinking, what do you think all of this, so let's say that this is the report accomplishes bringing out certain details like this because some of the stories are just as graphic as what you were just reading.

And so we could say, well, this is really an education report for people who think they can refer to a boarding school and they're not really thinking of a prison. So maybe this is going to open their eyes. Is there some overriding value like that that you could say, oh, this is an educational document in American history and we should be happy this is out?

[Steve]

Well, I think that it's the evidence of the domination system. So we are hammering this theme of domination. Why are we doing that?

I mean, why bother even using that word? And why isn't oppression adequate? There are many things that we could ask about that.

But if we want to verify the reason, at least for me, the reason why I'm using that particular term is because it's a larger paradigm of understanding of both thought and behavior and the use of ideas and arguments against our nations and peoples to proclaim or claim, assert that somehow these people can come by ship across an ocean and suddenly they have the right to take the children away from their loved ones and their raise them up as they see fit and treat them horrifically and so forth.

I mean, if we use it in that manner, then I think it serves a real purpose. If we're simply putting it in a report or in a book or whatever, okay, it's there and it can inform people, but there must be an interpretation that we assign to that, in my view, and that would be of real consequence as far as how is it that the United States government to this day is still asserting and claiming a right of domination against our nations and peoples, and somehow a very important two-volume report such as this doesn't seem to indicate that whatsoever. So it's out of focus once again.

[Peter]

Yeah, well, you know, Philip Gere, Muscogee Creek medicine man that passed some years back, he referred to the need for a rightful education. He's talked about all the kids that are in school today, even in colleges that he encountered as he went around the country, and they didn't really understand. They had studied quote-unquote things, but they didn't really understand them.

There was no incorporation into their own consciousness of current reality. So he said what they need is a rightful education, and it seems to me rightful education, if we were going to say what would be a rightful education here, it would have to highlight the way in which all of this horrible situation that's being described in great detail was an apparatus of

domination, or at least attempted domination, but then in a sense successful domination. And then it would be rightful education, but it would open minds to far greater questions, such as why are children forced into going to school, whether they're Native or non-Native, forced into going to school, and there are battles going on across the country even now.

Do the parents have any say in what happens to their children once they go to school? We saw some horrific stuff happening during the lockdown and jab period, when parents were not even allowed to have any say about what happened medically to their children's bodies, and so on and so forth. People might ask too many questions if they connected too many dots.

I'm just sort of speculating about why domination would not be talked about, because then the phenomenon of domination is much bigger than this little piece here. It's a huge piece, but it's still, in terms of number of years and so on and so forth, it's still just a small piece of the overall project of the dominator. And I want to also add that since volume one is so clear that this whole boarding school prison process was part of land disposition, well, why is there nothing about that in the conclusion, nothing in terms of a recommendation?

The land dispossession is acknowledged many times, as I said, at least 14 times in 100 pages. And at the end, it just disappears. It goes away.

It's like, well, there's not really anything there. It doesn't exist. And to make the matters worse, what they do recommend as cultural funding and so on and so forth, they claim that this is an obligation of the United States trust responsibility.

And so that's bizarre. The trust responsibility was precisely the doctrine that was used to create the boarding schools. So having shown what a disaster all that was, what a huge effort at domination the so-called trust doctrine was, how can they now in the 21st century still say, oh, well, the trust doctrine is what we're going to rely on?

I mean, that's incoherent, it seems to me. Just let me finish this sentence and turn it back to you. But one of the footnotes, and I believe it's in volume two, actually quotes the U.S. v. Hickory case, this recent Supreme Court case, well, recent in the last few years, and several other cases saying that the so-called trust responsibility is really just a doctrine that allows the United States to do what it thinks is best. That's somebody else, that's the dominator making, this is what's best for you, this is for your best interest. And the people say, well, we don't think that's in our best interest.

Well, you're not the ones who make the decision. The U.S. does because it has a trust responsibility. So how is it that the 1898 Civilization Act, which is the beginning of this whole so-called civilization process as a legal statutory structure, how is it that that was promoted on the basis of the U.S. has a trust responsibility to civilize these people and bring them out of their wretched, savage existence? And in 200 years, no, let's say 200 years later, roughly 200 years later, the government is saying, oh, we have a trust responsibility to undo the damage that we did before with our trust responsibility.

[Steve]

Yeah, well, exactly correct. And I think that just to say that there are some very interesting, striking, positive things in here in terms of information that I didn't know. For example, in

volume two, reporting that the department estimates that the U.S. government made appropriations available of more than \$23.3 billion. That means adjusted for inflation and so forth by comparison. So between 1871 and 1969, the federal government paid out \$23.3 billion in today's monies for the federal Indian boarding school system, as well as other similar institutions and associated assimilation policies. I mean, that's a stunning figure, isn't it?

Yes.

[Peter]

Yeah, it's a major, it was a major event. It has major significance. And I'm afraid what's happening is it's just being put on the library shelf here.

And volume two, for example, which does not get into dealing with land dispossession, the entire focus is on intergenerational trauma and damage. And they go through, you know, it's like the data analysis of the vectors of transfer from generation to generation of certain diseases and disease predilections and so on. So it's mind boggling through if you're trying to read all that and your heart is ringing for these poor people.

You don't think of the peoples, you don't think of the land, you've been completely, your focus has been displaced by a kind of a fake compassion. It's not, you can have real compassion for people whose lives have been so traumatized. But if you have cut off the essential basis of it, of how these peoples were destroyed, and how their land bases were taken, etc.

Then you're left with just this volume of interesting statistics.

[Steve]

Well, if you think about that number, I mean, that's a staggering number, right? In my view. But then if you look at the massive amount by comparison of all of the land, all of the resources, all of the everything that was taken from our nations and peoples that the United States helped itself to, and calling it, quote unquote, dispossession, the 90 million some odd acres as a result of the General Allotment Act, and so forth.

That is just a minuscule little tiny droplet of money, by comparison, the trillions of dollars of value of all of the lands and resources, waters, and so forth that the United States society has benefited from, that's not in here. So I think that it's those types of subtleties, if you want to call that a subtlety, but those key points that seem to be lacking in here. And then this also strikes me in the introductory letter here addressed to Secretary of Interior, Deb Haaland, that it's saying, it is my hope that this report does not mark the end of the U.S. government's work to acknowledge, understand, and heal from the impacts of these boarding schools. And it's strange to say that the United States government has work to do to heal from the impact of the boarding schools. That's odd. Instead, our shared work should mark the beginning of a long effort to heal our nation.

Well, again, that's an odd thing to say when there's not enough of a framework of understanding to even know what that entails. And when you understand that there's an ongoing system of domination that is documented by the horrific actions within these

institutions toward children that couldn't defend themselves, it's just unbelievable. It's so lacking.

I want to add just a few more lines here from this book, if I could, Peter. Is that all right?

[Peter]

Yeah, yeah.

[Steve]

Mr. H. J. Russell, construction engineer of the Indian service at Layup, wrote of his observations, I have seen Indian boys chained to their beds at night for punishment.

I have seen them thrown in cellars under the building, which the superintendent called a jail. I have seen their shoes taken away from them, and they then forced to walk through the snow to the barn to help milk. I have seen them whipped with a hemp rope, also a water hose, forced to do servant's work for employees and superintendent without compensation under the guise of industrial employment and education.

And that's from a hearing before a subcommittee of the Committee on Indian Affairs pursuant to Senate Resolution 341, page 30. W. Carson Ryan, Jr., formerly a professor of education at Swarthmore College, as one of the Institute's investigators, describes the jail he found in his trip to Wahpeton, North Dakota, which made him wonder if Dakota is not the Siberia of the Indian service. The superintendent showed me a dungeon in the basement previously used for girls up to his coming two years ago. I never locked up any Indian child yet, and I don't intend to begin, he said. The dungeon is eight by eight, absolutely dark.

Girls told the superintendent of two or three of them sleeping there on mattresses and rats crawling over them at night. Their food was bread and water. Brick walls showed where the girls had worked holes through and escaped.

And there was a woman who is a descendant of Sitting Bull, Gertrude Bonnen, the president of the National Council of American Indians. I think it became the National Congress of American Indians, the first organization to fight the cause of the Indian against the bureau. And she had this account.

Conquering Bears, two boys were in Oglala Boarding School, and they ran away to Corn Creek, about 40 miles. Policemen Jumping Eagle and the disciplinarian went after them and brought them back and gave them a severe beating. They were about 12 and 14 years at the time.

Their heads were shaven, though it was winter. One of the boys had a ball and chain locked onto his leg and was locked to the bed at night. My informant saw this herself.

The boys were in the jail above her room. They were in a dirty, filthy place with a bucket to be used as a toilet. She said it hurt her to see all these things, such as this little boy carrying the ball when marching to meals that she could not eat.

The boy even went to school with the ball and chain on, and it bothered the other children. Many requests were made to the principal to have the disciplinarian take the chain off, but days went by before this was actually done. And it just goes on and on here.

So to me, when I see this kind of horrific information, and I think of all the things that were done to children in those institutions, it's very outrageous. And knowing that my grandpa, Bush Newcomb, and his dad, Solomon Newcomb, ended up at Haskell, and not knowing what they went through. When my grandpa, Bush, came out of Haskell, he ran away from there at the age of 15, and then managed to join the army.

I think he told a lie about his age. But the first day of boot camp, the drill sergeant was challenging the young men to step forward if they could do such and such, and he went through a whole list of things. And my grandpa was there in front of him after that.

And then he challenged my grandpa, and he said, well, you said if I can do those things to step forward, so here I am. And he put him through all the paces. And my grandpa never made one mistake.

And he said, you're all right, kid, fall in. Now, that's pretty unusual for a drill sergeant. But so how much drilling and marching and all that did they have to go through for him to get to that point of proficiency with all that, right?

[Peter]

Yeah, well, yeah, the report has volumes, two particularly, they have an awful lot of testimony that fits exactly what you're talking about. So it seems to me we could say, well, okay, in part, what this report does is save people reading a 300 and some page book called Massacre, because they can just skim through 100 page and only 20 of those pages they have to read to get this kind of information. So what is that actually?

What is that information? What do we do with that information? It seems to me that so what is so the question becomes, what does the report do with it?

What does the government now that you've already pointed out the government says this is going to heal the government? Well, wait a minute here. We got a problem because the government itself doesn't need to have that healing the government itself is the perpetrator of the damage.

So what is it's trying to soothe its own conscience or something of that sort. And so I come down, there's two last things I want to say, just to reiterate what I've touched on before. One is that the land issue is completely neglected.

And if we look at Oak Flat, Thacker Pass, so-called San Francisco Peaks, Standing Rock, we can look at the western Shoshone, all around the US. There are examples where nowadays in the present time, the government is still claiming that it owns the lands. And much of the lands are still held as federal lands.

Some of them have been transferred to private ownership. But that is just invisible in this report. It's pointed out at the, oh, this had something to do with land, but that's still going on today.

The government may have closed down the atrocities that have been documented with the boarding school, but it hasn't closed down the land dispossession operation. That's still going on. That's number point number one.

Secondly, what tools are being suggested to deal with the trauma that has now been acknowledged? Okay, the tool is the so-called trust doctrine. And we have a comment that was quoted.

Actually, I want to add in, there's a recent bill in Congress, but the proposer of the bill in Congress, Representative Ms. Davids of Kansas, she's quoting, let's see, where is it here? She's quoting, she says that Secretary of Interior Holland stated, quote, the assimilationist policies of the past are contrary to the doctrine of trust responsibility, under which the federal government must promote tribal self-governance and cultural integrity. Well, now, first of all, how can it be contrary to the doctrine of trust responsibility when trust responsibility was the doctrine which was used to create the schools?

And then how convenient that the trust responsibility is so rubbery that it can now be said to promote self-government and cultural integrity when, in fact, if we go back to that 1819 Civilization Act, the committee that promoted that or proposed this act, I'm just going to read one sentence of the report, is that this bill will affect the humane and benevolent purposes of Congress. All right. So back in the beginning, the U.S. was saying we are being benevolent and humane by creating the boarding schools. Now, two centuries later, the government is saying, oh, well, we were very inhumane then, but we still have an obligation to be humane. So, in other words, what's happening here is the dominators doctrine of trust doctrine is still being used. So that preserves the position of the dominator in relation to the native peoples.

That domination structure, all it's been had, it's got a new coat of paint and they refurbished some of the rooms. So now it looks like, oh, we've got 21st century views instead of 19th century views, but it's still us running the show saying what it is that is supposed to happen here. And if I could do one last thing, that quote, the bill, it's House Resolution, it's proposed anyway, it's been introduced in the House, House Resolution 794.

After reciting all this stuff that we've been talking about, doesn't recite it in detail, but refers to the boarding schools, et cetera, here's what is being resolved. The resolve would be that the U.S. government should propose the week of September 30th as National Orange Shirt Week or National Week of Remembrance. And you say, oh my golly, this is what's going to heal people, is we're going to have people wear orange shirts and everything will be hunky dory.

[Steve]

It's very strange. Return number five, I guess in recommendations, return former federal Indian boarding school sites. So this is a reference to land.

The department should conduct reviews upon request of tribes of property and title documents for former Indian boarding school sites, including land patents provided to religious institutions and organizations or states, including during territorial status. When required by patent deed statute or other law, including revisionary clause activation, the department should work to facilitate the return of those Indian boarding school sites to U.S. government or tribal ownership. To U.S. government ownership.

[Peter]

And that's it for land. I mean, I neglected to mention that, but that's like, there's a couple of crumbs here that, oh yeah, there's a few acres. Yeah.

Let's talk about that. But even then, well, what we're going to talk about is it might be the U.S. And well, that's another topic we've touched on. We'll get into it again and again, I'm sure, the so-called trust land.

[Steve]

Yeah. And I guess, you know, one of the reasons why I wanted to read some of those passages from that book is because the people listening to this recording are not going to know, probably, those accounts or if they do, they're the unusual person that's actually investigated this sort of thing. But I think it's important for people to know what the children actually went through, at least get a little inkling of that.

And the ones that did pass away in those schools, they died without loved ones, without family, without anyone there to comfort them, most likely. And, you know, just kind of, I just have a really emotional reaction to that, to think about that, you know.

[Peter]

Yeah. Well, I'm going to, there'll be some links below this video that includes links to volume one and two. So people, and to the book Massacre, there'll be some resources provided for people that want to dig in and do a little education, get a rightful education.

[Steve]

Yeah.

[Peter]

There you go.

[Steve]

All right. Maybe we'll leave it there then, huh?

[Peter]

Sounds good, Steve.

[Steve]

All right. Thanks, Peter.

[Peter]

I appreciate it. Yeah. Bye.

[Steve]

Until next time.

[Peter]

Yep.