

E007: A Quantum View of "Free Existence" as Entangled Indeterminacy

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

So, good afternoon, Steve.

[Steve] (0:05 - 0:06)

How are you doing?

[Peter] (0:06 - 0:07)

Good, buenas tardes.

[Steve] (0:10 - 0:12)

So, that's right, you're living in New Mexico, I've heard.

[Peter] (0:12 - 0:13)

That's right, a lot of Spain.

[Steve] (0:13 - 0:14)

I shouldn't blow the whistle on that.

[Peter] (0:14 - 16:07)

Yeah. Anyway, so, I want to start today, if I can, with some thoughts. I was just looking at a piece, it's a video interview with Federico Faggin, he's an Italian physicist, he invented the CPU, the touchscreen, you know, serious guy in classical physics.

And a couple of years ago, I don't know exactly when, maybe more than a couple of years ago, had a personal experience with understanding consciousness in a different way that is non-physical, I guess. I mean, how else do we talk about consciousness non-physical, but that it's consciousness is beyond the body. He's a quantum physicist.

I'm certainly no expert in quantum physics, but I've been curious about it for a few years now. And something gelled as I listened to him talk with this Dutch philosopher in the video, and I'll put a link in the notes below about the video, the phrase, well, two words, entanglement and indeterminacy. These are key.

These go back at the very earliest days when physicists began understanding that classical physics, the whole deterministic model, mechanical model, the idea that electron was just a particle going around the proton, all of that began to disintegrate under the insights that were being developed by physicists who understood that something else was going on here, that indeterminacy was necessary to understand because the electron was not actually a particle.

In fact, as the scientists looked at the structure of the atom, so-called, they began to understand that the electron was everywhere at once in its circling around the proton, and you couldn't tell exactly where it was. And when you figured out if you could use a machine, investigate where it was, you suddenly lost all the other information about the electron. So indeterminacy, where is the electron?

And then entanglement was the next concept to be developed, that all the particles, all the atomic structures are entangled with each other. And Einstein was upset by this, among other physicists, because how could things be entangled with each other rather than discrete, separated from each other? So with that really superficial explanation of what intrigues me about this, I put the two words together, entangled indeterminacy.

And it dawned on me that this is a way in which you and I can develop what we might even brag about as a quantum understanding of original free existence, or let's just say of what free existence is. And you have emphasized over and over again that our starting point in our thinking about all of the issues that we talk about, but particularly the issues of domination of original peoples through the so-called federal Indian law, which we understand is federal anti-Indian law, that the structure of domination was encountering something that it didn't understand. And what didn't it understand?

It didn't understand free existence. What is free existence? The existence of a people not subject to an external domination, and the existence of a people who freely determine by whatever mechanisms that they have, modalities that they have, they determine the nature of their existence on an ongoing basis.

And the colonial apparatus of domination was baffled by that, actually, and was certainly intent on controlling it, subjugating it, or even eradicating it. And so we have at the very beginning of this invasion process that, as you've described, the domination system, which was a system of domination in place in what we could call Europe today, but which was then Christendom. It was an organization among Christian monarchies, subject to the Pope.

And then even when Henry VIII broke with the Pope in England, it was he kept everything else that made that domination system work. The idea that there's a sovereign head wearing a crown that determined what was going to go on, what was permitted belief, and how things were going to be organized. That's a structure of domination.

And the free existences of various peoples within Christendom that Christendom had attacked, people in what later became known as Germany, or France, the long history from the time of Constantine in the fourth century, all the way to the 15th and 16th centuries, that we have followed the papal bulls, all of that kind of stuff. That structure of domination, which was developed and expanded in that part of the world, was then brought to this part of the world, Turtle Island, and was forcibly imposed. And so when we're talking about this business of the original free existence, I think it's important that people understand that when you talk about original free existence, you're talking about a way of life.

You're not simply talking about, oh, well, the people lived in longhouses or teepees, and they wore moccasins, and they hunted deer and buffalo. Those are particular practices that existed among many peoples. But we're not talking about those particular practices.

We're talking about the way of life that the people lived, no matter how they organized themselves at a practical level. And so when the invaders came over, they're trying to sort out, who are we dealing with here? And their domination mentality said, when they encountered these people, like, who's your chief?

Who's your leader? Who's your king? They started asking that kind of question.

They understood that the physical circumstances were different in terms of type of housing and so on and so forth. But they were concerned primarily with how to get a handle on the way of life. Some of this has been memorialized when Ben Franklin, for example, who was close to the treaty negotiations with the Iroquois Confederacy, talked about how these savages could create a system, a confederacy that would last for thousands of years.

And why couldn't the civilized colonists do something similar? So he was trying to figure out this structure again. And even though he was interested in learning about it, he was blinded, in a sense, by his own preconception that there must be a system of domination here.

We just have to figure it out. He missed, for example, the role of women in the whole structure, because he wasn't paying attention to that. The women in the system of domination he was coming from were simply a kind of an attachment to the domination system, like the queen was an attachment to the king.

The king was the sovereign. Now, there could be a queen who was a sovereign, so we could see that within that domination system, it didn't really matter whether it was a male or female, even though the overwhelming 99.9% was that it was a male-led system of domination. But nevertheless, system of domination is what he was looking for.

How did the Iroquois dominate themselves so efficiently? And couldn't something be learned from this? So where you and I start is that there was no domination system there.

Then this is where when we bring it up to the 21st century, and we're talking about things like criticizing plenary power, criticizing the so-called trust doctrine, criticizing the Johnson v. McIntosh claim of title to land, we're criticizing forms of domination which still exist today, which travel all the way back to those earliest days where the presumption of the people who were imposing the domination was that domination was necessary. Now, with a quantum understanding of reality, a lot of this is now subject to serious question, because that system of domination was based very much on a kind of mechanical model of life, and with this rule structured, and the rules were imposed, and so on and so forth.

And they were imposed not just in a physical way in terms of this is your role in a particular place in the kingdom, but in a mental way. And if you had wrong ideas, heretical ideas, you could be burned at the stake. This is also an old practice, goes back to the earliest days when Constantine took the Roman church under his wing and militarized it, and the church seemed to be happy to be militarized.

It took on powers of its own about belief, about what was permitted belief. And if you didn't have permitted belief, then you were a heretic, and you could be burned, and

thousands of people were burned. And so when we read the ancient documents about the Pope saying to the king and queen of Spain that you can go to the new world, and you own it, and you can take the people prisoner, you can turn them into slaves.

That was all emerging out of that same framework, that there was an assumption that there was a single ruler of the world, and that that ruler could then pass on to a lower ruler, like a king and queen, that power of domination. And that it was aimed at the people who were not believers, approved believers, in what was the approved understanding of Christian thinking. And so the infidels, the people who were unfaithful, the heathens, the people who were pagans, who didn't have any belief in a superior god of domination, these were targets for the Inquisition.

And by the time we come up back to formation of the United States out of these colonies, we see a similar structure, that there's an approved way of doing things. And that that extends to basically the whole social system, the economic system. And I was just thinking as I thought about that, and I think when all of that is destabilized by saying there isn't anything really physically permanent, that the whole subatomic world, the whole quantum world is a field of probabilities, that upsets the idea that there's going to be a single coordinating orientation and organization of life.

So that was all going on in my head as I was thinking about what this Federico Fagín and Hans Bester were talking about. And I wanted to bring it because it'd be interesting for us to say that when we talk about original free existence, we're not asking people to think, well, would you think back now to the date on which the first ships from England arrived? Would you think back to the day when Jefferson signed the Louisiana Purchase?

Would you think back to such and such a time when a treaty was written? We're not asking people to somehow transpose themselves into thinking, oh, yes, all of that, we can revive all that. What we're asking is an awareness of what continues to exist actually is more fundamental than the domination system, and which is achievable in the present by understanding that if the domination is removed, let's say, from native peoples, and if those peoples continue to exist, which is a big question in itself, because they've been subject to domination for so long, that many of them have essentially the way of life has disintegrated. We know this by the tribal council system, which has nothing to do with the original free existence. So, when we think about free existence, we're talking about self-determination of peoples.

So, all of that seems to me wrapped up. And if I can add one more thing, I know I'm getting a long lecture here, but I was trying to think of practical examples of it. And so, practical example, how about time?

We think about time, people like time, not time. Does time actually exist? What is time?

What is time in space? And we can maybe come to an understanding, oh yeah, well, the earth turns and the sun is okay, when the sun is straight up, that's the middle of the day. But we don't actually, we have that, that still exists.

That's free existence is to pay attention to where the sun is and where the moon is. But we live in an organized economy and government, which has time zones. And if you think about the history of time zones, these go back, not very far actually, go back to about the late 1880s, just about three or four years before the Supreme Court declared that a corporation is a person, there was the imposition by the railroads who were the first, they were the subject of that case.

A railroad corporation was the one that was determined to be a person. The railroads instituted time zones so they could have efficient operation of their machinery. So we live in a machine environment.

And today you can, you have, in fact, many people, probably most people have little machines strapped to them that tell them where they are in the machine system of time. And so people have thought, well, time is, yes, I have this machine here that tells me the time and that's connected to all these other machines and so everything is coordinated. And the most extreme form is in China, where in 1949 Mao Zedong declared that in the interest of national unity, the entirety of China was going to be one time zone, 5,000 miles, which in the current time zone system would be five time zones at least, was one time zone.

Everything was going to work one time zone. And so you think that's the most extreme form of imposition of a mechanical understanding of time. Now, where's the original free existence?

How about the farmer that's raising a cow? And the clock says, oh, it's 10 in the morning, but the farmer looks out and says, geez, it looks more like the middle of the night to me. And the cows, I mean, what do the cows do?

They don't have Apple watches to ding and tell them, you better start making milk. So there are realities which must operate by free existence. And yet those are subordinated in terms of the actual political, economic, social organization to the system of domination of a single time zone.

So all these ideas started working around in my head. And I thought if we play with them, maybe we could come up with a way of understanding what are we talking about when we talk about free existence? So what does that spark off with your thinking?

Because you're the one that really insisted originally in our conversations that we start with understanding our context as original free existence.

[Steve] (16:08 - 26:44)

Well, thanks for bringing it back to that. I think that, and of course, that context, as I always like to mention, is that original free existence contrasted with a system of domination brought by ship across the ocean and imposed on everyone and everything. Then the view or perspective of our ancestors from the shoreline looking toward those ships coming into their territory.

And then the viewpoint from the deck of the ship with the documents that they have as a frame of reference for the authorization that they have for their journey and so forth. And the intention of what they're supposed to do once they come upon an area of land that they had no knowledge of previously. And so within those documents,

you see these patterns of domination, the assumption that they are going to go forward and take possession, meaning claim a right of domination across the land and across everything, all existence.

But with that context in mind and the things that you're talking about with regard to all of the bits and pieces that you just expressed there, I think what we're really talking about is how do we struggle and strive to gain a correct understanding of the nature of existence itself? So what is the whole area of physics and quantum physics? Isn't it an attempt to understand the nature of the universe in some regard?

And with all of these types of fields of study and so forth, whatever they might be, they're laid out in such a way that sometimes we lose sight of the fact that they are a form of storytelling. That no matter what is going on in terms of science and law and politics and these big words, these very weighty terms, that it's storytelling going on in each and every one of those professions or fields of expertise and so forth. And when we bring it back to that very basic level, how is it that the creation story, the understanding that an original nation or people have of how life came into existence and how the people came into existence, the animals and plants and everything, how is it that that is discounted but the stories of the people from across the ocean are supposed to be 100% true, even though they'll burn each other and kill each other over who's expressing the correct story, the right story, this sort of thing. So it's a deadly conflict in some regard with regard to whose story is going to prevail, quote-unquote, which is a term of domination, right?

And I'm always fascinated to think about the book by Roger Jones, getting into physics again, bringing it back to that. He was a physicist who wrote a wonderful book called *Physics as Metaphor*, and he makes it very, even though it's a profound book and it's just extraordinary to read it because of the insights you gain, but he is explaining that space, time, matter, and number are the four cardinal concepts of physics, and they are also metaphors. And what he means by metaphor, he explains that that's an act of consciousness, bringing that word into the mix, that borders on the very creation of things.

So with regard to space and time and matter and number, people are using those concepts in their storytelling, and they're also using those concepts as reference points for their entire life. And so, really, when you think about it, those ships are sailing across an ocean, which is a vast amount of space across that ocean. They have a starting point, and they're going on a particular trajectory and have an ending point wherever they end up.

And they're dealing with time, they're dealing with numbers, the calculations that they're using to be able to sail their vessels and so forth. All of those types of very basic concepts are being used for the way of life of people across the planet, everywhere you go. But for those peoples in Christendom and in those monarchies and other systems of hierarchy, they're using those four basic concepts of physics as a weapon system, perhaps.

They're utilizing it to be able to establish domination in a given place and then obtain riches and wealth and power to benefit from how they're able to weaponize those basic concepts. And so the people on the receiving end of all of that, there's also the factor of a language gap. In other words, the impossibility of people on a shoreline

comprehending the language system of people that came across the ocean by ship, and they're speaking a completely unintelligible tongue.

They have no idea what these people are saying or what they believe or how they conduct themselves. And so there's that whole challenge as well. And so now that we're able to converse in this language and be able to go through the record in the way that we have to try to sort out these things, the types of information that someone like Roger Jones puts forward or the physicists that you're referencing or whoever it is, we're attempting to put all of that information together in a manner that makes sense.

And what is our real struggle? It's the effort to comprehend the true nature of what it means to be alive on this earth and the history of that across the planet for massive numbers of people over countless generations, thousands of years. And why are we bothering to do that?

Why even try? Why make the effort? Well, in my way of thinking, at least for those of us that are descendants of original nations and peoples, I believe that we need to be able to comprehend all that in order to advocate on behalf of our peoples to say, hey, if you have something that demonstrates tremendous destruction and it has been deadly and horrific in terms of its impact on our nations and peoples and it continues to exist as a claim of a right of domination, then we better understand that in the best, most effective way possible to be able to respond to it. So the adaptation is not just to meekly submit to it, but the adaptation is to comprehend it so completely, so thoroughly, in some regard that we have the ability to respond to it with advanced ideas and arguments that we have developed over a tremendous period of time.

And some of that involves getting into these other fields of study. How do you do that without understanding politics and law and religion or theology and the Bible and on and on? I mean, the list is immense of the massive amount of information that we have to gather and go through in order to comprehend in a way that enables us to put forward a very deep and meaningful response, but that also has significance for the way in which human beings live on this planet, that homo sapiens live on this planet.

Is our future, is the true nature of what it means to be quote-unquote human, to live in some kind of a dystopian universe that where every single second of every single day for every single year is completely mapped and surveilled and maintained as data points within a system and controlled by algorithms and on and on so that we are actually thinking that we're self-determining and I have free will, but that free will is actually shaped and determined by people in positions of power that are able to use the notions of mathematics and space-time matter and number to put us into that kind of a dystopian system. Is that really what it's all about?

And if that's the case, what happened to our traditional systems that were in place for such a long period of time that benefited our peoples that didn't result in the devastation and destruction of life, but actually understood life in terms of relationships and beneficial relationships? So how do we maintain and sustain life forever, not as a system of domination, but as a system of beautiful nurturing relationships that can be beneficial for all life? So that to me is the real, I mean I'm being a bit vague in general to some extent, but I think that's how I always view our

conversations and our efforts to make sense of the morass of federal anti-Indian law and the ideas and arguments that have been put together by truly ingenious, although devious people, to orchestrate a whole system of domination over generations and use that to the benefit of the United States and other empires and powers, but to the detriment of the people and of all life. I don't see that as being a meaningful or a productive way to conduct ourselves.

[Peter] (26:45 - 29:38)

Well, yeah, and I really appreciate the way you're phrasing all this, because it's just distinguishing how our conversations proceed. What's our starting point? When you say the starting point is original free existence, so existence is our starting point.

Our starting point is not some kind of law book that has some words in it, words in a language that is built around subject, verb, object, that has certain structural components that are able to be manipulated like devices, so that if we start that way, that's where it seems to me people that are not being very productive right now, but think they're being productive because they're doing a lot of writing within the framework of federal Indian law.

They're starting with, well, let's start with Johnson v. McIntosh. Well, you and I are saying, well, that Johnson v.

McIntosh is certainly the start of an imposition of a system of domination, but the larger context in which that decision was reached, the idea of the court, of a Supreme Court, of a chief justice, of a constitutional structure which was trying to reach outside itself, really, because it didn't know how else to go about it. And since it was baffled by how to go outside itself, it went backwards. It went back to the monarchy that it had come from, and it adopted the monarchical ideas, the idea of title and property and so on.

And if somebody's just starting inside that, this is like where they are. They're all completely confused. They don't see what's going on.

But if you back out far enough and you say, wow, this is a pretty intense, millennia-long story here. And it has such detail. And the notion of quantum means that there are fields of information.

And by field, I don't mean like psychology, sociology. Those are fields of intellectual definitions. But there are fields of energy.

And if we're starting with our understanding of fields of energy, then we're starting with what is life? What is existence? And then from that position, we're saying, from our point of thinking of being alive as a being, we see certain strange things, because these strange things don't seem to be part of a kind of an original free existence.

They seem to be impositions. And that's why I was intrigued by thinking about time zones, is that the standardization of time, you think about, well, time, first of all, what is time? That's already a huge question just to ponder.

Who's going to start with? Let's think about the nature of time before we start thinking about John Marshall and what he wrote in Johnson v. McIntosh.

But who's doing it? Maybe you and I are the only two people in the continent.

[Steve] (29:39 - 31:48)

I think Charles Wilkinson, just to jump in for a second, Charles Wilkinson, I forget the name of that one book, but he put a great, and may he rest in peace. I mean, he passed recently, last year, I believe. But he wrote that one book on, I think it was American Indians, Time and the Law, or something like that.

So he had a great focus on time, but he seemed to be a bit oblivious to the fact that the time reference that he's using is metaphorical. And so I think that's the other thing too, with regard to what you just said, well, what is existence and so forth? But I think a more basic question is, what is our story of existence?

And how do we determine what that story is? And if we have that as a way of approaching it, it's a bit different than getting into the idea that something is what it absolutely is this way. Okay, it's that way from the perspective and within the framework that you're using language to express it in that manner, but does that mean it isn't this other thing that may express it in a different way?

And maybe they could both be right in different manners, but like that idea about the elephant and whether you're handling the leg or the trunk or the ear or whatever, it's going to appear different to a blind person. And so I'm not sure that's a good analogy, but the idea of stories and the way in which we put the stories together about existence is pretty important, because then we can also become very cognizant and have a heightened awareness of the terms that are being used, the words that are being used, and how those words are creating and sustaining a reality or sense of reality over time. And I think that's crucial to what we're engaged in as well.

[Peter] (31:48 - 32:23)

Yes, yeah, I agree. When I'm talking about existence as if we can have anything but a story about it, so the free existence would be the openness to having stories that are created in the life of a given people, which are not going to be the same as the stories or they're going to be similar or however they're different from other people's stories. And the notion of civilization is to destroy all that and say there's really only one story.

[Steve] (32:24 - 32:26)

Universal. Exactly.

[Peter] (32:27 - 36:51)

And so, in fact, universal means the word Catholic, the Roman Catholic, the universal church, it was referred to throughout Christendom as the universal church. And that was what justified them killing the people who disputed that. And so we bring all of that, that's a story which has been imposed, rather than a story that has been, what, created freely by acts of free will by peoples.

And I want to just go back to time again, it's time zones. It's not coincidental that the imposition of railroad time as the first in the US standardization of time was within three years of the legal creation of the railroad as a corporate person. So we have a machine entity, kind of like something that Dr. Frankenstein might have wanted to

create, a machine entity that is declared legally to be the same as a person, except that it's immortal. This is what's even more bizarre. Not only is a corporation equivalent to a person, but it's more than a person can ever be because it's immortal. Now, where does that immortality exist?

It only exists inside the social legal economic system that has decreed that domination. And so it's also no accident that war, it was by 1918, I think it was, that the countries of the world adopted standardized time. Well, that was the end of World War I.

So we have mechanized, and anybody who studies World War I understands the watershed that marked by the industrialization of war, the mechanization of war. And so it's no accident then that the stories of time, the official story of time, and the official time, like what time is it, is connected to war, industrialization, the creation of an abstract entity that is supposedly an immortal person, and all of that woven together back hundreds of years, centuries, into the idea that there is a true domination god, and if you disagree with that, you should be eliminated. All of these things are woven together. And if we're going to talk about Johnson v.

McIntosh, we're going to talk about some 20th century case, Tihetan, we're going to talk about some 21st century case, Hickory Apache, and we're trying to figure out what is going on here in this field called law, federal Indian law. I have a sense what you and I have created in our discussions, the only way to really get a handle on that from the perspective of what does it mean to be alive on the planet Earth, is to include all that larger history. And of course, playing with the word history, we have his story, the story of his history, and the idea that there's an approved history.

And even number, you talk about number, one of the things that quantum theory has done is to upset the possibility of number. I copied a quote here, this is from an article about quantum fields, it says the notion of measurement is utterly mysterious in quantum mechanics, as are the notions of truth and probability. So we're in a situation where the fundamentals of being able to think and talk and have conversations like this are in play.

And if we try to have a conversation in which we're not paying any attention to the whole foundation, the whole structure, the whole set of presumptions, we're going to ignore all that and still try to have a conversation, you can see the futility of that. And you can see why that the people who think that that's what we need to talk about, why there's really no, there's nothing creative coming out there. It's like the effort, the most contemporary effort today around so-called indigenous peoples is how to incorporate them into the constitutional system of domination of the United States.

That's considered to be a great advance. How can we incorporate indigenous peoples into the US system of domination?

[Steve] (36:52 - 40:31)

Well, look at the connection between corporation and incorporation to incorporate the peoples into the body politic of the state to use a phrase expressed by Walter Echo Hawk in his book on the UN declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples. I think it's entitled in the light of justice. And he's making the assertion that indigenous peoples being incorporated into the body politic, he cuts it off there, but of the state is

the completion of the thought is the actual road map that the indigenous peoples declaration is expressing.

And which is just bizarre because I don't know of any indigenous peoples representatives that went into the international arena with that objective in mind. Pounding on the door of the state, we need to be incorporated into the body politic of the state. I mean, that's just ludicrous, right?

But coming back to the business of space, time, matter, number, and with regard to time, we can back way up and go to the Gregorian calendar. And everyone's under the control of the Gregorian calendar. I don't know of any people that doesn't go by that in some regard, right?

That's one of the ways in which things are universalized, a universal understanding of time. But it's also a control of the idea of time and the control of space, the control of time, the control, well, even the idea of matter, right? The notion of matter.

And we say, well, that doesn't really matter. Well, isn't that an double entendre, a play with meanings and words that we try to go a whole day without using space, time, matter, and number ever in your whole day. You couldn't go through a day without that.

You just couldn't. You would be compelled to use one of those terms. And with regard to the idea objectivity and subjectivity, a big contestation within the realm of science, right?

You have to get objective knowledge. You have to achieve objective knowledge. But given that knowledge is acquired by means of metaphors and metaphors are a function of subjectivity, how do you end up with an objective outcome for subjective processes of the human mind and the human apparatus that we all work on the basis of?

And so I think that's really interesting. Roger Jones goes into great detail to say that there is no part of measurement that can escape subjectivity. It's all based on some kind of subjectivity.

If I measure a table, well, I could cut it off here, I could cut it off there. It could be to the eighth, to the three quarters, whatever. But if you're going to get into subatomic types of measurements, how do you do that?

And if you're going to try to measure the exact location of an atom, well, how in the heck are you going to do that? And so they're just really wild, the things that he helps you to understand in his investigation and discussion of all these types of issues.

[Peter] (40:32 - 47:38)

So when you put that together with something you said a minute ago about once upon a time, it's all stories. And so Johnson v. McIntosh, let's just use that again.

It's like a touchstone for people's understanding of this system of law. So the case begins by saying it has a date on 1609, such and such, King James I issued a royal charter to, you know, etc. All right?

So that all sounds like, well, that's history. That's all definite. There's some documents there, aren't there?

He's referring to a documented history. It must be real. Until you back up and you say, well, wait a minute, what is a king anyway?

What are you talking about a king? You know, a king who can put some words on a piece of paper and give it to a duke and say, well, now anything you find over there, that's yours. What is, that's a kind of a bizarre understanding of reality, isn't it?

And so maybe Johnson would have been better, well, not better from the point of law, but better from the point of reality to say once upon a time there was a king and then you know you're in a fairy tale. Oh yes, I've heard of kings, but they weren't real, were they? You mean there were actually people who had, were considered to be connected to God and they could just decide what was going to happen to you and to land and to life?

That's a very strange notion. And another piece of Johnson v. Mackinac, it always sticks when I read by it.

He talks about the native peoples whose chief occupation was war. And I really, I'm puzzled by that. If you think back in the world of the monarchies that he's looking back to, to adopt their rule of property, it's nothing but war, centuries of wars, wars brought down Christendom and fragmented Christendom.

It's all war. The wars of the Inquisitions and the wars of the Crusades, it's all wars. The whole history is war.

And you look at what are the actual documented instances of wars among native peoples, they were quite different. It's more like a few guys get together and they go raid some other place and maybe a few people get killed. One of the colonists was kind of dismissing, joking about, oh, this is what the natives, you know, they were thinking about the battles that they were going to have, the invaders having with the native peoples.

And he said, they call it war. He said, in seven years, maybe seven people get killed. They don't even know how to have wars.

So the idea of what is war needs to be opened up. And when we do open these openings up, as you said a few minutes ago, we're opening up, we're having to bring in more and more and more material. And so from the point of view of a standard law review article, the same way, I think he's lost the thread here of the precedent.

He's unpacking this one case to show the intense complexity of the presumptions that are made. And yet, it seems to me that's the only way forward. I want to come back to another simple example of what we're talking about.

And you again, talking about time, you said, can you go through the day without, you know, using the idea of matter or using the idea of time, that kind of thing. We're socialized into this framework of domination in such a way, it's a very common thing when you ask somebody, well, let's go have a cup of coffee. Well, okay, I can do that when I'm off.

What do you mean off? I'm off work. You mean, so you're on life.

So why don't you say, well, I'll do that when I'm on. But the common phrase is I'll do it when I'm off. I have an off day.

That means I'm not going to be in my cubicle with my box around me. Is that when I'm on? No, I don't really think so.

From a human point of view, that's when you're off. That's why people want to have a vacation. What do they want to vacate?

They want to vacate that whole system. They want to go up in the mountains or go to the beach. They want to lie in the sun.

They want to get up when they feel like getting up. They want to take a walk when they feel like getting up and taking a walk. That's free existence.

That's being on rather than off. But our common understanding doesn't allow us to see that. Even though we're feeling it, even though we're living it, we don't have the words, the concepts to educate us and say, wait a minute, I'm really stuck here.

It's like you're, when you were saying, is this really the way we want to live? I think as human beings, we're seeing it over and over again. It's like dancing.

I remember in high school, I'm old enough that they used to teach dancing in high school. It was part of gym. The best part was I could go, some girl that I liked, I could hold onto her.

I didn't really ever remember the footsteps. I learned the waltz and the foxtrot and all that. But luckily by the time that I got old enough to be on my own out of high school, rock and roll had happened.

All you had to do was move around however the music made you feel. Even that, there were efforts at standardizing. This is a boogaloo and this is a whatever.

You had different steps you were supposed to. That always seemed to me to get in the way of dancing. It's like, where are we actually in our bodies?

Where are we in our minds? Where is our consciousness? Where is our existence?

It's not just some big question. It is that, but it's also a day-to-day question in very practical terms. If you and I want to go out and throw a ball around, can we just throw the ball around or do we have to say, no, wait a minute, Steve, you should stand over there.

There's a mark on the ground. Stand on that mark and don't throw the ball until you're on that mark. Okay, if we decide we want to do that, fine.

Maybe we have a reason for doing that. But that's not the only way to throw the ball. It's the way of a defined game and if you want to play that game.

I think one of the reasons that people like to watch sports, I was never much of watching sports on TV or professional sports, but I'm puzzled about it. I think it's because unless the game is fixed, there's a certain freedom, an indeterminacy, an entanglement, an entangled indeterminacy. You have however many number of players moving.

If it's soccer, they're moving all the time. If it's football, will they stop every little bit and stop and plot and decide what they're going to do for their next play? But nevertheless, there's all that interaction, which as I say, unless it's fixed, it's indeterminate how it's going to come out and it's entangled because all the players are playing simultaneously.

So I'm thinking people see that even though they don't have a theory. I don't think that people sit and watch the Super Bowl and they say, you know, I'm thinking about, Joe, I'm thinking about quantum mechanics here while I'm watching this quarterback at work. I'd probably very few people have that conversation, but the reality is that's what's going on.

There's an entangled indeterminacy and they feel it as life, as excitement, as unknown, as mystery, that is something they like to do.

[Steve] (47:39 - 50:33)

And we can also say, pardon me, that we can think of it in those terms. Yeah. So there again, choosing the type of storytelling that we want to use to frame any given situation, and that's kind of an indeterminacy as well, right?

You can't predetermine how somebody is going to frame something or describe it or what type of words they're going to use. Could be anything. It could be something that makes a lot of sense and sometimes not so much.

But I wanted to come back to, you made me think of something with regard to our ancestors and our traditional lands and the immense amount of land that we had within our traditional territories, such as Lenapehoking and our traditional Lenape homeland. And we had the pristine waters and creeks and springs and aquifers and mountains and trees and plants of all varieties and the plants that we worked with for foodstuffs and the medicines. And we had a whole spiritual way of life, a way of ceremonially appreciating the place that we had as a homeland at that time.

And you think of all of that. Now, the fascinating idea that you have to, getting rid of that framework for a moment and going to the typical mainstream framework of a younger person, at least how it used to be, you need to get this education, get this degree, ideally, get this career, ideally, and then work for a certain number of years for a corporation or a big company or whatever and get your pension and do all those things.

And eventually, you're going to be able to retire and you're going to be able to do all those things that our ancestors already did. So the hunting and the fishing and having luxury time and kicking back and not having to slave in front of a computer or whatever, whatever it might've been, various types of occupations. But it's just kind of wild to think about that.

So they wanted to destroy all that and say, well, we really need to get you to get into this system so that you can go through those steps to get what we already had. Like, why in the hell do we want to do all that to achieve what our ancestors already had? It's just bizarre.

And so most people, I think, have not really considered that. And I think that's really wild.

[Peter] (50:34 - 50:48)

I think we ought to leave it here for today, Steve. And we'll come back again very soon with other topics. We have a bunch of things on our minds that we'll be able to talk about, but this is wonderful.

Thank you very much.

[Steve] (50:48 - 50:50)

Thanks very much. Take care.