


Summer 7-15-2019

# Jack D. Forbes and the Search for a Decolonizing Philosophy of Education

Joshua T. Frank

*University of New Mexico - Main Campus*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/educ\\_llss\\_etds](https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/educ_llss_etds)

 Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), and the [Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Frank, Joshua T.. "Jack D. Forbes and the Search for a Decolonizing Philosophy of Education." (2019).  
[https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/educ\\_llss\\_etds/112](https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/educ_llss_etds/112)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Education ETDs at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Language, Literacy, and Sociocultural Studies ETDs by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [amywinter@unm.edu](mailto:amywinter@unm.edu).

Joshua T. Frank  
Candidate

---

Language, Literacy & Sociocultural Studies  
Department

---

This dissertation is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

*Approved by the Dissertation Committee:*

, Chairperson Dr. Greg Cajete (Professor, LLSS)

---

Dr. Glenabah Martinez (Associate Professor, LLSS)

---

Dr. Vincent Werito (Associate Professor, LLSS)

---

Dr. Irene Vasquez (Professor, American Studies)

---

Dr. Jennifer Denetdale (Associate Professor, American Studies)

---

---

---

---

---

**JACK D. FORBES AND THE SEARCH FOR A DECOLONIZING  
PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION**

**by**

**JOSHUA T. FRANK**

B.A., American Indian Studies & History, University of California,  
Los Angeles, 2009  
M.A., Language, Literacy & Sociocultural Studies, University of New  
Mexico, 2012

**DISSERTATION**

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy**

**Language, Literacy & Sociocultural Studies**

The University of New Mexico  
Albuquerque, New Mexico

**July 2019**

## Dedication

This work is dedicated to the legacy and memory of my mother and grandparents. Also to the memory of Dr. Melissa Meyer, Dr. Ann Massmann, Crystal Alvarez and Nikolai Nez.

To all my brothers and sisters, aunties, uncles, grandparents and relatives who made the journey so far, but didn't live to see this work. First off, I dedicate this work to my family. Especially to my father who has helped me in every way possible, always. His love of history sparked my own. I dedicate this work also to my mom "Joanie" who was my rock, staunchest advocate and guiding force for the first 18 years of my life. You taught me selfless sacrifice, to share my last dollar, to feed the hungry, and to be respectful above all else, even of one's enemies. This is dedicated to my grandpa "Bill", an Onkwehonwe (Mohawk raised of Seneca descent) from Six Nations at Grand River, of Brantford and Buffalo, who was the most adamant of my supporters and who was of the few who would remind me where we came from and what responsibilities we carry. This is dedicated to my grandma "Dot", whose stinging and replete narratives filled with pure detail still fills my ears. To my grandpa "Jack", who was my constant rival and companion. He forever shared his happiness with all and was always seamlessly smiling, playing and working. To my recently deceased *ooma* "Anita", she was my best friend through thick and thin. She always treated my like a special person, acknowledged and supported my adventurousness and giftedness, and told me above all else, "always beat to your own drum". Nia:wen to two of my academic mentors Melissa Meyers and Ann Massmann, two strong Native women who shared their love for the histories of the forgotten people through the archives with strength and compassion, yet tragically, died too soon. I also dedicate this work to my friends, relatives and students who never lived out their full lives, who I never got to share what I have come to cherish in mine, I name you in honor: Mike, Koubie, Bobby, Manuel, Nikolai, Nick, Albie, Uncle Jerry, Aunt Elsie, Uncle Francis, Tio Menito, and Sandra, we miss you all so much. Lastly, I want to recognize our dearest Crystal Alvarez. You showed us the way, and you were a treasured older sister to us. I wouldn't be here if it wasn't for your lead. Chicana Power.

## Acknowledgements

I want to first acknowledge the dedication and support of my dissertation committee. Thank you Greg for seeing my vision through and pushing me to the end of the road. You have been a guiding mentor my entire graduate school journey and an outspoken leader I have had the honor to watch and learn from. Thank you Glenie for being my academic auntie at UNM. Your honest advice, critique, compassion and scholarship has been deeply humbling and graciously given. I could not have made it without your support from beginning to end. Thank you Vincent for being my doctoral advisor and go-to person in our department. Thank you Irene for jumping on this ship and enjoying the ride. Thank you Jennifer for providing a source of inspiration and a critical view that shook my whole experience up from the beginning.

This work was supported by a number of grants during my doctoral program including a Council for Library and Information Resources-Recordings at Risk grant, an Office of Graduate Studies Graduate Student Excellence Award, a few GPSA funded Student Research Grants, a Graduate Student Success Scholarship, a Roberta V. and William B. Castetter Fellowship and the Clinton P. Anderson Fellowship.

To everyone from UNM. Thank you Dr. Leola Tsinnajinnie, I owe you a great debt of gratitude. You supported my own brand of genius every step of the way and have been a sparkling example of how to walk the fine line of academia, to fight hard for what you believe in, and to be there for all our peoples. Also a big shout out to my GPSA, PNMGC, AISS, Kiva Club, SNAGS, NASIRG, NAS, LLSS and other UNM family: especially I give thanks to Dr. Geneva Becenti, Dr. Vangee Nez, Kevin Brown, Glenda Lewis, Dr. Stephanie Sanchez, Leoyla Cowboy, Rebecca Izzo, Dr. Virginia Necochea, Mary Whitehair, Mañpíya Black Elk, Zonnie Gorman, Jose-Luis Ortiz, Dina Barajas, Chris Geherin, Paulita Aguilar, Mary Alice Tsosie, Pam Agoyo, Donavon Barney, Catherine Montoya, Brittany Tabor, Rod Lansing, Cindy Mason, Jake Foreman, Lloyd Lee, Tiffany Lee, Daphne Littlebear, John Chavez, Jodi Burshia, Neritza Diaz, Dr. Jorge Garcia, Dr. Lawrence Roybal, Dr. Yolanda Teran and Curi Teran, Dr. Robin Minthorn, Dr. Penny Pence, Dr. Rick Meyer, Dr. Tryphenia Peele-Eady, Dr. Ruth Trinidad Galvan, Dr. Christine Sims, Dr. Aeron Haynie, and of course Debra Schaffer and Delia Halona, secretary extraordinaires.

To everyone from SIPI, especially all of my students throughout the years, you are supreme inspiration. Also big shout outs to Jolene Manus, Dr. Danielle Lansing, Lisa Towery, and Teresa Gomez for your support and camaraderie in making every day special, impactful and a supportive nest for all our students.

To everyone from NACA and GENAC, especially Kara Bobroff, Duta Flying Earth, Joshua Krause, Zane Rosette, Al Nair, Ruben Chinana, Chris Jackson, Pablo, Karen Ann, Adesbah

Foguth, Max Early and all the students who made me rethink everything I knew about teaching, exposing my flaws, and making me that much stronger of a person.

To everyone from my Kalpulli, especially my fearless Maestra CC. You embody the magnanimous all-loving and embracing, but stern and assertive mother. You have helped raise me up to the father, maestro and curandero that I hadn't imagined prior. Also, thanks to D'Santi for being an amazingly humble and beautiful virtuoso that continually inspires me to dedicate a little time each day to honing my crafts in hopes of learning the wisdom of practice, patience and persistence.

To all of my medicine friends, maestros, tio's, and tia's: from the doorway in to the doorway out. Aho.

To everyone from UCLA, namely DeAnna Rivera, Liz Fasthorse, Nora Pulskamp, Virginia Hedrick, Caleb and Jared Dunlap, and all those unnamed but not unnoticed, I give you such love and thanks.

To everyone from UC Davis special collections, including John Skarsgard, Dr. Kevin Miller, Christine Cheng, Sarah Gunasekara, Jenny Hodge and the rest of the special collections crew, thank you for your help and support.

To everyone from Native American Studies of UCD, especially Dr. Beth Rose Middleton, Dr. Inés Hernández-Avila, Dr. Steven Crum and Stella Mancillas. To all of the NAS grad students I have been honored to break fry bread with and who have inspired this work through their own, including Colton Brandau, Wendah Alvarez, Danny Cornejo, Sarah Dilley, Jessa Rae Growing Thunder, Kaitlyn Reed, Vanessa Esquivado, and Mike Mortimor. Your friendship and support has made this journey unexpectedly prized. Jack would be proud all of you.

To all the family, friends and students of Jack, especially Carolyn Forbes, Richard "Dick" Livingston, Barbara Risling, Marguerite Murray, Hartmut Lutz, Dr. Brooke Colley, Dr. Lorena Marquez, Dr. Jane Haladay, Dr. Phoebe Farris, Dr. Lisa Woodward, and Dr. Bradley Shreeve. Your support of Jack's legacy has inspired this work innumerably.

To LaNysha Adams, for all your support that was, unwavering, critical, compassionate and crucial. Your insight and ideas made this into something real and tangible. Thank you.

To the Rooted, Flying, Crawling, Walking Peoples of Paradise, CA and those affected by the "Camp Fire" of 2018. Remember the stones survive any fire, families stick together, and the Village of Otinka will one day, someday soon, be reborn anew.

To my dear friends, you know who you are. I have so many, too many to name, and it's an amazing thing to travel through this world amongst such beautiful people.

Lastly, I must praise and thank my wife Janyce. She has suffered and sacrificed for me, for us, in so many ways, each and every day, always trusting in me and in us. I thank you for keeping us a strong family during the most trying of times. Thank you for giving me so much to look forward to, our trove of boys, and the adventures that makes life magic. You have my heart, you have my presence, you have my respect.

**JACK D. FORBES AND THE SEARCH FOR A DECOLONIZING PHILOSOPHY  
OF EDUCATION**

**By Joshua T. Frank-Cárdenas**

**B.A., American Indian Studies & History, University of California, Los Angeles, 2009**

**M.A., Language, Literacy & Sociocultural Studies, University of New Mexico, 2012**

**Ph. D., Language, Literacy & Sociocultural Studies, University of New Mexico, 2019**

**Abstract**

This study seeks to explicate and advance contemporary deimperial and decolonial philosophies of education through a reflexive archival inquiry and comparative textual analysis of the corpus of California Indian educational leader (Renape/Lenape) Jack Douglas Forbes (Jan. 7, 1934-Feb. 23, 2011). This study looks across Forbes lifetime at the development of his conception of education and peoplehood-nationhood, his critique of imperialism and colonialism, and finally his development and advocacy for decolonizing-deimperializing forms of education. I will describe his growth as an Indigenous scholar-warrior reading and writing across diverse types of data sources, or as I name all throughout this study as “texts”. This study synthesizes and critiques Forbes critical textual voice through comparative analysis of 25 collected speeches and interviews, as well as 75 core education focused texts among his more than 555 published works and thousands of records held in over 260 boxes at UC Davis Special Collections. Forbes contributions to the above themes are found in nearly all of the texts studied, and who provides a rich analysis and nuanced philosophy of education to meet the needs of Native Nations while combating a growing globalizing, imperial condition.



## Table of Contents

<b>Ch. 1: Introduction to Study</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Definitions.....	7
Introduction: Who am I? Who is Forbes?.....	15
Statement of Problem: What is the overriding problem?.....	30
Where is the problem found?.....	38
Research Question(s).....	44
Background to Study.....	46
<b>Ch. 2: A Review of the Literature and Theoretical Frameworks</b> .....	<b>52</b>
On Peoplehood and Nationhood.....	53
Native Science, Philosophy and Territory.....	58
Deimperial and Decolonial Theories in Education.....	63
<b>Ch. 3: Methodologies &amp; Methods</b> .....	<b>81</b>
Orientations and the Role of the Indigenous Researcher.....	81
Archival Research.....	83
Critical Place Inquiry.....	88
Methods of Archival Research.....	89
Participants, Sources of Data, Instruments and Procedures.....	93
Archival Methods of Data Collection.....	99
Data Analysis Methods.....	103
Writing as Inquiry, Method, Analysis and Synthesis.....	105
Thematic Analysis and Coding Data.....	109
Methodological Issues: Trustworthiness, Limitations, Delimitations.....	113

Conclusion.....	116
<b>Ch. 4: Forbes General Philosophy of Education.....</b>	<b>122</b>
Introduction.....	122
Forbes Influences and Education.....	131
Forbes General Philosophy of Education.....	150
What is the purpose of Education?.....	162
A Spiritual Education.....	171
A Liberatory Education.....	175
Native Science: Education for Knowledge, Skills and Technique.....	186
Education for Wisdom and Democracy.....	194
Education to Make Good People.....	203
<b>Ch. 5: On Personhood-Peoplehood and Nationhood.....</b>	<b>211</b>
Locating Forbes within a Matrix of Peoplehood and Coloniality.....	211
The Struggle of Personhood.....	214
Identity.....	217
Heart, Face and Foundation: Core Values, Gifts and Relationships.....	221
Boundaries of Peoplehood-Community: Culture and Together-Doing.....	226
Territory.....	236
Kin and Clan Relations.....	241
Ceremonialism, Spirituality, Religion and Cosmology.....	251
Oral Tradition, Language, History, and Myth.....	259
Language, Literacy and Literature.....	266
In Summary.....	273

Captive and New Nations: Native Americans, Americanism and Pan-Indianism....	276
Are whites a people, a caste, a state, or perhaps vampires incarnate?.....	293
The Chicano Connection.....	315
On Statehood.....	348
On “Indian Tribes”.....	362
On Peoples Sovereignty and Self-Determination.....	373
<b>Ch. 6: (anti)Colonialism, (anti)Imperialism and Indigenous Resistance.....</b>	<b>379</b>
Introduction.....	380
Imperialism and Colonialism 101.....	382
Internal-imperialism and colonialism .....	390
Mental Decolonization and Anti-Imperial Thought.....	398
The Fiction of Democracy and the Empire of Liberty.....	404
The Doctrine of Discovery and Imperial Sovereignities.....	422
The Empire Strikes Back at D-Q University.....	427
Mother Tongues and the Language of Imperialism.....	438
Forbes and the Development of Wetikoism and Machiavellianism.....	462
Imperialism, Colonialism, Cannibalism, and the Wétiko Disease.....	471
On Cannibalism and Settler-Colonialism: Misnomers?.....	476
Stories of Becoming a People Eater.....	491
Anthropological, Historical and Cultural Studies of the Wétiko Psychosis.....	505
Forbes Stretching of the Truth and Its Consequences.....	507
Consumption as Psychosis or Spiritual Sickness.....	520
<b>Ch. 7: Forbes Decolonizing Philosophy of Education.....</b>	<b>532</b>

Fighting for Community Based Education.....	533
Creative Control and Deimperialization.....	539
A Decolonizing Philosophy of Education Begins with Decolonizing the Mind.....	545
The Development of an Indigenous Intelligentsia.....	563
Decolonizing Higher Education: A Short Story of D-QU and NAS UC Davis.....	575
A Decolonizing Pedagogy is a A Pedagogy of Love.....	591
Deimperialization and the Need for Wise Leaders.....	605
“We Can Have New Visions”.....	616
Education for Healing.....	649
Nation Re-Building, Decolonizing the University and Universe.....	659
Decolonization as a Path-Way.....	671
Education as a Peaceful Vehicle Towards Decolonization.....	685
The Teacher as Parent as Teacher.....	699
Forbes Ultimate Goals for Decolonization and Deimperialization.....	707
On Democracy and Real Red Power.....	711
Education, Socialization and “Public” Schooling.....	723
Colleges, Universities and “Higher” or “Advanced” Education.....	730
<b>Ch. 8: Concluding Thoughts and Future Research.....</b>	<b>751</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>771</b>

## Ch. 1: Introduction to the Study

This archival study of native American educational leader Jack D. Forbes' relies upon the multi-textual and layered voice of my subject, as recorded and interned primarily at UC Davis Special Collections Library. Of special significance for my objective, that of critically engaging his anti-imperialist and decolonizing philosophy of education, was to engage the records which locate Forbes respective of the movements and efforts at reenvisioning Indigenous education that have taken place since the 1960's.

We are seeing the rise of tribally controlled and crafted schools, colleges and districts. We are seeing the rise of a large Indigenous<sup>1</sup> intelligentsia armed with tradition, critical thought, scholarship and experiences in struggle. But is it enough? Are we dealing with our old adversary, the imperialist, the colonizer, white men, the multi-national corporation and their ilk, and grappling with a kind of "shape-shifting colonialism" which has adapted and learned how to survive our best efforts at resistance and revitalization, like a stubborn bacterial strain to the same old batch of penicillin (Alfred 2014; Forbes 2008a)? With a declared decolonization of the physical European empires of the past by the UN since the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which was adopted as General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December

---

<sup>1</sup> First I will mention my sources as People that claim them *and* those they claim, which I will complicate and critique. I will use the terms "native American" predominantly to refer to people of descent as it is difficult to discern every single person's specific status every time, this is also Forbes preferred term, which will receive more attention. I use "U.S. Indians" when talking about specific federally recognized groups; or pertinent state recognized groups following Barker (2011); or "First Nations" in the Canadian colonial framework. Otherwise I use autonyms/endonyms, or names people use for themselves rather than xenonyms/exonyms which are names used by others. Lastly, I use the term Indigenous as a catch all, just like People and Nation, a term Lyons (1995) first combined into people-nations. This is in line with my use of the Peoplehood Matrix (Holm, Pearson & Chavis 2003) and the unequivocal dispelling of any notion of race to be anything other than groupness, a choice, as opposed to colonial conceptions of Christian, European, and White superiority which suggest otherwise, used for all "others, degraded and downcast peoples.

1960, how do they continue concurrently as “nation-states” as “metaphysical empires”, hidden in plain sight yet just as damaging and potent (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2018)? Can our educational institutions and practices be a midwife, or vehicle of our anti-imperial (deimperial) and decolonial struggle, especially in the U.S. and Turtle Island where currently only the Virgin Islands, Guam and Samoa are designated as non-self-governing territories? Do our efforts to nurture, heal, revitalize and transform community through education become for naught if the students cannot survive without vital economic power, while competing allegiances draw them away from community, and when every imaginable temptation including wealth, power, prestige, privileges, drugs, media, a plethora of religions, sciences, beliefs, identities and even higher education can easily corrupt young and old alike? In total, can we assertively answer the question, are we preparing persons or peoples? Citizens of Onkwehonwe Nations or citizens of the U.S., Canadian, Mexican or other “states”? And I think paramount today, can “schools” do education if separated from the land and community life, if primarily learning in artificial environments (classrooms), reading and writing text, and continually being tested on and in foreign languages, subjects, sciences and knowledge traditions with imperial roots?

Renape/Lenape educator, author and leader Jack D. Forbes (1934-2011) worked towards answering these questions his whole life and laid part of the foundation we reap from today in the form of Native American and other Ethnic Studies, Tribal Colleges and Universities, a critical scholarly tradition, and a potent and rich critique of imperialism and colonialism. Yet he still insisted there was much work to be done. He left a massive textual corpus recording nearly the whole of his life efforts and ideas through pen, through typewriter and computer, and through speaking to large and small crowds with a

stern, roaring and passionate tone. I turn this question to Forbes and ask what can I do as an educator to challenge the “colonial problem” as Du-Bois (1945) and Fanon (1967) have put it? Or as Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013) has framed the major hurdle of the deimperial and decolonial movements of the 20th century, who have not fully triumphed while still “subjected to [the] surveillance of global imperial designs and colonial matrices of power” (p. 331). Finding Forbes textual corpus extant with over 555+ published works, hundreds of letters, 260 boxes of archived materials, and upwards of 75-100 audio or video recordings, I set out to perform an archival based study of Jack D. Forbes with the intention of highlighting Indigenous presences in the archives as well as to draw uniquely from his entire corpus of published and unpublished works to describe both his unique educational thought as well as the socio-political struggles he engaged in his lifetime, especially with regards to his critique of colonialism and advocacy of decolonization for “captive nations” of Anowarakowa (The Great Turtle [Island]). As a historian, poet, educator and leader, Forbes provides a critical window like Du Bois and Fanon of “empire-building” from an Indigenous perspective accompanied by responsive actions and ideas, especially educationally (Forbes 2008a, p. xvii; Forbes 1992a).

This study purposely focuses upon Forbes specific legacy rather than the institutions he took part in as a whole, as he helped lay the groundwork for UC Davis NAS and D-QU as examples, but like any institution or school, they are perpetuated by people other than the founders. For example, D-QU’s groundwork, mission and approach to education was guided heavily by Forbes early work, but after it was founded, he served on the Board of Trustees only for a short while, preferring to teach instead and to play a supportive role on the National Advisory committee while remaining a steadfast advocate

for TCU's and D-QU. This is, from my suspicions, in part because it detoured from its original goals and became a tribal college rather than a Ph.D. granting university particularly early in its founding. For example, after 1978, there were no Chicano Board of Trustees members, as they "voluntarily" stepped down after years of financial struggles and the recent passage of the Tribal Community College Assistance Act of 1978 which allowed the college to receive federal funds under the criteria that this was an "Indian controlled college" and primarily based on "U.S. Indian" student enrollment, that is per federal criterions such as being from a federally recognized tribe and having requisite blood quantum (Lutz 1980, p. 29; PL 95-471, 92 Stat. 1325). Further, the stipulations of the act challenged D-QU's fundamental premises to be a unified institution rather than one based upon either/or majoritarian dilemmas described in the act itself which declared outright that any institution funded will adhere to the following standards:

- (1) is governed by a board of directors or board of trustees a majority of which are Indians;
- (2) demonstrates adherence to stated goals, a philosophy, or a plan of operation which is directed to meet the needs of Indians; and
- (3) if in operation for more than one year, has students a majority of whom are Indians (p. 2).

Further, the act states that the grants will be disbursed based upon, "each tribally controlled community college having an application approved by him, an amount equal to \$4,000 for each full-time equivalent Indian student in attendance at such college during such academic year" which effectively discounted the nature of D-QU to serve Chicanos equally as U.S. Indians, but also working people, part-time students, or those who otherwise cannot attend "full-time". Because Chicanos do not contribute to the institution as grant recipients, they are undervalued, and in effect, derecognized as Indian peoples



once again, and as separate peoples rather than as a minority, as the newly invented term “Hispanics” or as a hyphenated immigrant such as Mexican-Americans. It is unclear why the board didn’t move to simply add one Indian and subtract one Chicano from the board to create an Indian majority that fit the needs of the TCCA. Forbes (1995) highlights the issue in his famous short story, “Only Approved Indians Can Play Made in USA” which discusses the indigeneity of Mexican and other Indians south of the U.S. border compared to a team of “U.S. Indians” they play against at an Arizona basketball tournament. TCU’s are now facing this issue in other ways, such that within Montana’s seven colleges, there is often up to 25% of the student population who is non-Indian and primarily White, and in effect, not contributing federal funds in the way Indian students do. Every Chicano University for example that was founded in the 1960’s and 70’s has closed its doors, and no new Black Universities have opened since the late 1800’s not counting the Highlander Folk School, Hampton Institute, and other federal and religious institutes not founded by the constituents themselves. Forbes hemispheric centrality, his Americanist or Anowarakowa Neha (Turtle Island Way), his dedication to pluralism, respect and Indigenous democratic traditions provide a key to understanding what ways these values are pathetically undermined at the imperial, federal and local levels of power.

Forbes activity as an organizer of Indian and Chicano peoples politically and educationally (that is, non-militant) over a substantial time period offers us today key insights into how we can learn from his legacy (successes and failures) towards our own engagements with our status as Forbes (1975a) frequently referred to the sociopolitical context of peoples of color, especially Indians and Chicanos, who he regarded as “captive

nations”, given their subordinate status within a imperial-colonial, capitalist-oriented, patriarchal and racist web of social relations. Key to his engagements are three paradigms which become apparent and foundational in his work and from which this study focuses on through creating a synthetic backstrap to carry the weight of his critique and legacy homeward. These include, Education, and in particular his unique philosophy of life, also Personhood-Peoplehood or Nationhood, or essentially his conception of “the people” and lastly, Imperialism-Colonialism or as problematic, deimperialization and decolonization. These three themes were central to what he advocated, what he taught, and how he helped engage and organize among similar and like-minded people. For example, the California Indian Education Association was formed in 1967 out of the work of Indian educators who like Forbes and Dave Risling Jr. among a great many others centralized the unique needs and desires of Indian people living in the occupied territories of the colony of California, an organization which soon endorsed American Indian Studies and an American Indian University for California Native and newly relocated Indian and Chicano peoples (see the *Early American* (CIEA) newsletter from 1967 through the 1980’s). This organization still performs the work Forbes and Risling began, yet, after all these years, the colonial problem still persists, and the great visions of decolonization imagined by the founders are becoming marred by disingenuous and symbolic rhetoric which are unable to challenge the machinations of the bureaucrats, corporations, white supremacist groups, whole cities and school boards who dictate state, political and educational policies and practices. Since the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1966, the federal system has gone through numerous transformations, all of which have yet to tackle the prime issues

mentioned above, and namely, that we live in one of the most entrenched empires the world has ever known. What would Forbes say and do in 2019 if given a chance to look back and all around at the situation we are in today? This is the challenge of this study I attempt to take up as it seems imperative that we face the problem head on, especially in the dark days of land, water, air and bio-desecration and destruction of which all life is imperiled, and especially Native communities. Educational arenas are believed to be at the center of these struggles.

### *Definitions*

First and foremost, the archival record reveals in a unique way, that Forbes was both quite alone in his ideas and visions but also worked tirelessly with California, Eastern, Southern and International Peoples in a concerted, unifying praxis of Peoplehood and anti-imperial resistance. One of his most pronounced avenues was as an advocate, broker, scholar, poet, leader and teacher via educational pathways of learning and becoming. This study demonstrates that the major findings are well corroborated in the record and are of the “tap-roots” of Forbes thought and action. These can be summarized by four major findings: a Spiritual Life and Healthy Relations are the basic principles of education; Everything is People or the concept of Peoplehood, and is synonymous with Nationhood; Imperialism is a shape-shifting Psychosis which is ancient and contemporary and is the major enemy of Life; Education, or the context for learning to become People must be Life-centric, People-centric, and Anti-imperialist. The debris leftover which makes up the archival record was purposely groomed and curated by

Forbes throughout his lifetime, revealing a purposeful, performative and accessible record of activity and silence upon these aspects of social life.

Forbes provides the definitions of his theorizing and actions, for theory is nothing more than precipitant and reflective activities, otherwise it is based on unfounded claims, hunches and hypothesis without testing, without experience, and without counter-evidence. Research in this context is defined as “the search”, and the process of “searching again”, and whose evidence is not merely what one sees as the archival record reveals itself to be simply “debris”, minute pieces of a greater story. The most basic definitions required to read Forbesian thought include: his view of Life, and Education, Spirit and spiritual Relations, and finally, his view of the “Great Creative Power” or a powerful, spiritual universe. Forbes derives his most basic definitions through a Lenape framework and descriptive language, but also draws heavily from local and akin people’s conceptions such as from California Indian, Mexican and Mbya views and practices. Life in his view is discerned to be within a great ecological matrix of relationships, where a multitude forms of life are always present and influence each other, always. Basically, spirit is the foundational premise for life while ceremonialism, religionism or science represent the totality of constructive efforts to perpetuate life. Within this frame, Life is judged by its actions rather than by belief, by its manifestations rather than by its hypothesis. All life, or the *Wemi-Tali* (Lenape for “All-Where”), everything imbued with life, is the playground of the Great Spiritual forces of the universe, *Kishemelong* or *Kitche-manito* in Lenape, or what he calls the Great Creative Powers, elsewhere the Great Spirit. Spiritual relationships form the backbone of any persons or people’s life, which are present at creation and defined locally by a people’s origin and migration stories,

stories which provide the impetus for living as a people of a place. Everything, all life, is bound to specific reciprocal relations in order to perpetuate life, and which requires other forms of life for sustenance, teachings, and traditions.

From these simple beginnings, Forbes leads us into his framework behind Peoplehood, which is the basis of any conception of a People's education. Essentially, everything is People. Respect is the foundational value for this expansive view of life. In this way, small or large peoples are equative with the highest forms of life, that of nationhood. Likewise, since everything is peoples, places, the central sources of any people, of life and community are equal partners, and are the contexts for interdependence rather than separate life. Viewing life as a sea of influence, Peoples are identified by themselves and others, who in turn constantly influence each other. Peoplehood or Nationhood development is ongoing, there is no static people, and people are always in the process of becoming. New peoples are just as prevalent as ancient peoples and require the same basic "tap-roots" each generation in order to survive as healthy and sustainable groups. People are conjoined by the Ways they communicate, relate to and share language, stories, ceremony, and territory, and possibly many or few other things, whose limits are defined and redefined as time goes on.

Education is defined variously by the groups themselves as they prepare youth and community for the task of peoplehood or nationhood and is perceived as an unending pathway that stretches across a person's life and relations, is an intergenerational process, and an integrated aspect of other ways of living that involves all life and relations. Education at its most humble foundation is a spiritual process of becoming a person and a people of a place with the gradual development of the dependent youth towards their

potentiality as mature adults able to sustain life and contribute healthily to the family and community. Education is framed only as a discussant aspect from which life perpetuates itself and socializes relatives into relationships of meaning and value. Education is not a separate sphere of social life and relations and cannot be conceived beyond a people's particular engagement with living a good life, together. Thus, any demonstration of education beyond a particular people's must be regarded as an international kind of learning approach, what is commonly called "multicultural" today.

After having gleaned Forbes terms for discussing Life, People, and Education, he also attempts to refinish a contemporary Indigenous definition of Imperialism, and Colonialism, what he calls *Wetikoism*. Imperialism is uniquely framed as the dominant ideology and way of life of European imperialists, neo-European nation-states, and "decolonial" "third world" states. It is defined primarily by its actions and relationships to other forms of life-people, which is the act of consumption and exploitation for its own purposes. Framed as a psychosis, or spiritual sickness, its toxic effects permeate all levels and areas of a person's peoplehood and their relations subtly as learned behavior and inherited relations. In total, it is a way of life which knows no boundaries and respects no life other than its own perpetrators, which are many, it is a selfish, desacralized consumption. The epitome of imperialism is of Columbus' ilk, the invader, usurper, enslaver, exploiter, thief and killer. Within a Lenape framework, an original storied figure, the *wétiko*, a people-eater, is the closest identifiable character, and is a person who succumbs to a sickness similar to but different from its original conception in that the ultimate people-eaters today are of the imperial persuasion. This new ideology, *Wetikoism*, he says, "knows no bounds", and should be treated as a shape-shifting

sickness, one which travels and infects by air, water, land and through interactions with those already infected (Forbes 2008a). The new wétiko is epitomized by the White Man, a new people invented precisely to wield the new empires (U.S.) power over all life. Within this framework, colonialism, or the planting of peoples is often viewed as the bastion of destruction, and like racism, it is seen as a tool of imperialism, as is education, rather than the way of life itself, which is Wetikoism. If we are to deal with the imperial present and past, we must name the scourge before us, which he does. Forbes advises that we must face-up to the fact that we are dealing with a selfish, avarice, arrogant value system whose supremacist ideology places whites above all others, places “states” above all nations or peoples, places men above queens, and “humans” above others kinds of life. Capitalism, racism, colonialism, patriarchy, scientific and Christian religious traditions, the English language, etc., are all tools of an overarching imperial system, one which has been passed on to the global masses via violence, religious and missionary groups and now, predominantly through the powerful arm of compulsory schooling. Traditional notions of peoplehood are consistently attacked while imperial forms based on exploitation predominate the educational landscape. This is an insidious problem which begins at the heart of our community relations, namely our relationships with the land and other forms of creation, also our core familial and national relatives, and finally, our relationship to the imperial system as a whole, which has become globalized (the globalization of imperial consumption).

Lastly, his approach to education and life involves the resolution of the imperial matrix of relations or the “colonial problem” through a thoughtful deimperial or decolonial approach to learning. This is based upon the realization that education created

and performed by outsiders and others upon and for another people is in fact the norm in imperial America. Federal segregated education of Indians, Mexicans and non-whites has been replaced with a public, common school education which teaches the tap-roots of whiteness and imperialism, or essentially, Forbes *Wetikoism*. Forbes approach to education in the imperial context is undergirded by the basic notion that each people must perform its own kind of education as it seeks and supports life within an integrated, interdependent universe of relationships which are ancient and ongoing. Forbes longtime advocacy for people's education is clearly articulated in his fight for Indian control of Indian education, Chicano nationalism and education, Ethnic Studies and in particular Native/American Indian Studies, higher education institutions and specifically American Indian Universities, curriculum reform at all levels, the fight against English-Only policies and for affirmative action, and many other battlegrounds. Forbes view was that for education to be relevant and valuable, it must rely upon people's original instructions and ancient traditions but also it must deal with the monster, the wétiko in our midst, which has infected not only the original wétiko or imperialists, but also most traditional or ancient as well as new peoples, clouding and corrupting our conceptions of life, peoplehood and education. Because we live in a permeable world where we influence each other all the time, we can tackle the issue of imperialism-wetikoism as well as other aspects of the sickness and psychosis through individual and group efforts, such as education which is the learning process formed out of and to reproduce the community and perpetuate life. By focusing upon on its spiritual-mental development and structures, as well as through socio-political, economic and other basic activities of peoples which disrupt and challenge the unequal relationships it is founded upon, an integrated



indigenizing education is possible. Education provides one avenue from which many peoples always utilize as a way to perpetuate their sense of self and other, us, and is a focused approach of learning to become a people of place, real Americans.

At the root of education is always found, a People, and their instructive way of living in relation. Yet, while the imperial relationships grow and consume more life, our chances at survival become fewer. The major efforts after World War II to transform Indigenous communities from captive nations into self-determining, sovereign (respected), and powerful peoples has been stymied since the mid-1970's in the U.S. when legislative acts codified the new imperial relationship with a veneer of support to Native Nations, “minorities” and other downcast groups. In Canada, the rhetoric of reconciliation has persisted since the 1982 Constitution Act opening the door for new treaties and relationships, while in Mexico, we find the Zapatista movement under the EZLN banner has forced the issue of land and other reforms since 1994, and who in 2016 along with the *Congreso Nacional Indígena* (CNI) or the National Indigenous Congress supported the presidential candidacy of “Marichuy” María de Jesús Patricio Martínez, a Nahua curandera and leader. Notably, reform and reconciliation are the predominant discourses engaged at the federal-imperial levels, following on the heels of an era of rhetorical “self-determination” and “sovereignty”. After the passage of the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) in 2005, a new global treatise was created in order to reposition Indigenous Peoples within the global imperial matrix, yet, the non-binding declaration has failed to challenge “state sovereignty”, eliding Indigenous Nations from the opportunity to participate as equals among the members of the United Nations and instead clearly articulates a subordinate

status (Corntassel 2003; Corntassel & Primeau 1995). Every people have a unique relationship with their local and related empires (states), yet is it time that we leveled the playing field by forcing the empire to deal with a united international indigenous front rather than continue to play each other off as pawns in a classic divide and conquer pattern? The educational frameworks and support structures found within the imperial system which for indigenous communities continue to navigate the narrow pathways of becoming citizen-workers for the state rather than truly representing the national desires of native American Nations.

By traversing the stories Forbes tells us about himself and his world, I traverse my own story, and find the common ground we call home to be contested, a known, and beyond knowing universe struggling to survive the ever-growing empire. For myself and Forbes, this is the colony of *(Alta) California*, the 35th territory to become part of the United States, and the battleground for much of Forbes work and my own. Imperialism in the region begins in the 1530's visit by Hernan Cortes, but colonization efforts do not seriously take hold until the 18th century, and it remained the largest free Indigenous stronghold until the invasive gold sickness took hold of the imperialized populace by 1846. I must begin where we begin our lives, but also remind our readers that we are soon to be ancestors, moving back and forth across the spiritual universe as much as we are territorial adventurers and that our stay is allayed by a whole string of ancestors and relatives who are often unnamed and unknown. Omissions of Forbes biography are present throughout as his story is largely the one that he tells us, so without assumptions, the collected evidence will speak for itself, as it has yet to be discerned in total beyond the archives what kinds of other stories people have told and continue to tell about

Forbes. Not present to defend his name, I acquiesce the point that Forbes has somehow masticated the truth of his life beyond recognition and that the archival record beyond his own productive capacities and could not furnish anything near a complete perspective of his personal life, let alone his family, people and ancestors lives from the saved records alone. They are not the central actors of that which is glorified in European history of the Americas and the world and their meager contributions to building the empire are merely subsurface relics buried in their mother earth's scaly layers rather than the great libraries of the world. Forbes language of critique and analysis provide the basis for this synthesis and discussion, and the above definitions represent some of the "common knowledge" he traversed the world with. Who is Forbes? Who am I? Where can the archives of Forbes take us towards having a richer understanding of his unique philosophy of education?

*Introduction: Who is Forbes? Who am I? Where are we going?*

Forbes grew up not far away from myself, 55 miles as the Raven flies. He was of my grandparents generation born January 7, 1934 at *Bahia de los Alamitos* near the Tongva Nations sacred creation site of *Puvungna* in Long Beach and was raised in El Monté (del sur), California until the age of 9, which bears a resemblance as "a rural Mexicano-Okie-poor White area" to my own barrio which had begun to look more like this by the 1990's (Forbes 1987, p. 113). His mother was Lenape, German, Swiss and "maybe Irish" while his father was Renape (he often says Powhatan), Saponi and Irish (Forbes & Crozier-Hogle 1997; Forbes 1987; Forbes 1978a). In 1942, his family moved to Eagle Rock, where he harkens back that "I would have psychologically perished had it not been for a range of hills that came up to our back yard" due to the overwhelming

whiteness, suburban destruction and political conservatism of the area in northwest Los Angeles (Forbes 1987, p. 116). Despite growing up in Los Angeles, he found himself surrounded by Indian-descendants, by an Indian-rich landscape, and even by fellow Lenape and Renape persons such as M.R. Harrington of the Southwest Museum (Forbes 2001a; Forbes 1987a). Forbes (1987a) explains his indigenous awareness this way:

Being a mixed-blood myself, and also a mixture of many tribes, I had long been aware of the significance of being a “half-breed”. Back on the east coast, however, I became increasingly aware that those of us who looked European and Indian had a hell of an advantage over people who looked Indian and African. I thought that that differential treatment was so much white racist bullshit, and I still do (pps. 120-121).

While Forbes (1978a) admits he has Scottish, Alsatian, Swiss, English, Hungarian and other relatives, he continuously emphasizes his American roots, and throughout his work, draws upon European history and ideas only to verify his native American thought and context. While many “radical” authors frequently find Marx, Forbes finds Tecumseh and Powhatan, Deganawidah and Quetzalcoatl to be his points of inspiration and relation. He says he grew up in a “non-reservation setting”, “at the edge of the city”, “out in the country” and it was because of these supportive contexts of family, of learning amongst other Indian people, of special places, gardens, an Eagle Rock and mother oak tree, of traveling, hitchhiking, walking, running and learning everywhere he went “looking for the wise”, he was able to survive as an Indian person, fighting the good fight (Hogle 1997; Forbes 1987a; Forbes 1978a). Indeed, the many “fights” he had throughout his life gave him experience dealing with imperialism, education, white supremacy,

industrialization, pollution and the psychotic conditions he found himself enveloped within.

I was born in the occupied territories of the Tongva Nation and grew up not far away in the valley of Pááyaxchi Nivé'wuna<sup>2</sup> or “place where the water gathers” in Payómkawichum (Western Peoples)/Luiseño territory, whom the Spanish and later Mexicans called *Laguna Grande* or simply *Laguna* which was only recently incorporated in 1888, first as Elsinore, and renamed in 1972 as Lake Elsinore. I was born to cholo parents, of the Kanien'kehá:ka<sup>3</sup> (Mohawk) and Onöndowa'ga:' (Seneca) Nations, two of the original five nations which formed the Kännensionwe or Rotinonshonni confederacy (called the Iroquois by the French), as well as being of Dutch Mennonite, Hungarian, Irish, Scottish, English and German Palatine background. The latter whom were typical famished farmers that immigrated under the colonial auspices as described by Queen Anne in 1709 who were to be “useful to this kingdom, particularly in the production of naval stores, and as a frontier against the French and their Indians” (as quoted in Knittle & Fox 1937, p. 38). In my own family history, descendants of my Rotinonshonni ancestors captured and killed those who had recently immigrated and were colonizing their lands; however, it was definitely the colonizers who have come to benefit from ongoing imperialism and the war for Anowarakowa. In the U.S., the Naturalization Act of 1790 and preceding acts allowed only “free white persons” to immigrate, and when this was augmented, the rights of citizenship were altered, setting the standard for what kind of a colonial empire that would be created, specifically a white empire. I was raised

---

<sup>2</sup> Cham'teela/Luiseno from Rincon orthography follows Elliot and Hyde 1994.

<sup>3</sup> Kanien'keha/Mohawk orthography follows Western dialects (Ohswé:ken and Kenhté:ke), as in Maracle 1993.

within arm's length of my mother's father who was reared near the current capital of the Six Nations (after admitting the Skarare (Tuscarora) in 1794 who are represented in council by the Cayugas) at *O:se Kenhionhata:tie* or Grand River close to Brantford, and then in Buffalo and surrounds on lands claimed by Rotinonshonni and earlier Atirhagenrat (Neutrals) such as the Chonnonton and Onguiaahra, who were allied with Aondironon, Wenrehronon, and Ongniaahraronon Nations. The lands were "given" by the fleeing British (1784) after the United Colonies, turned States revolted and defeated them and their Allies including Kanien'keha and Onöndowa'ga:' which were led by Thayendanegea (Joseph Brant) to the reserved lands at Grand River. A majority of the reserve was subsequently stolen and encroached upon by colonizers in what was formerly part of the 12 miles long and 1 mile wide Grand River Reserve of the Six Nations, Ontario, Canada not unlike relatives reserves across the sacred Niagara falls such as the formerly treated for Buffalo Creek Reservation, which was stolen/sold off in the 1840's ((Hill 2017; McCarthy 2016; Simpson 2014). Oneida comedian Charlie Hill (2012) calls this part of our saga, our "real estate problem", a joke possibly gleaned from Don Rickles rendition of the Jewish captivity, slavery and exodus story which he described during the Friars Club Roast of Frank Sinatra in 1978 simply as "a few bum breaks, I must admit that, the red sea trick" (Hill 2006; Rickles 1978).

By the 1960's my barrio, was a largely Black neighborhood so much that it was renamed "the Yarborough" after Thomas Yarborough, of the first Black mayors anywhere in the state when elected in 1966. The barrio again transformed so that by the mid-1980's, Mexicanos and other Americanos were the majority, as well as gaining refugees from the wars of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Thailand, as well as new immigrants

from Poland and “Okies” from Oklahoma. Childish jokes of the period were told from and about every single group mentioned without a clue of the racist undertones behind them. I learned after I left my barrio that I passed as white (my grandmother always said we were speckled or sun-kissed), not realizing quite fully until an adult the nexus of complicity, privileges and relationships whiteness entailed (Adams 1975/1989; Dei, Karumanchary, & Karumanchary-Luik 2004; Bonilla-Silva, Goar & Embrick 2006). I grew up speaking a valley creole something akin to Englatino (as Forbes calls it) at home and in my community whereas I learned Mexicano Spanish from a mixed Chicano-Indio population that now is the largest group in the valley while only gleaning smatterings of familial knowledge and traditions from my grandparents. I often fought for my life against white power skinheads and just plain racist white people throughout high school, so it was a shock to me that I would be perceived this way by strangers beyond my barrio as my parents assumed U.S. citizenship was color-blind, which it is not. My grandpa told and showed us what he knew of our Onkwehonwe relatives and ways and my other recently immigrated family had no history in the colony of Alta California (as it is called still in Mexico today), so I had to learn from everyone and everything around me how to live in this place. Raised in a mixed ethnic working-class barrio I searched near and far for inspiration and to engage these struggles, finding family, new relatives and some important texts along the way. Somehow in the middle of my coming of age, I found Forbes, or maybe he found me.

My first reading of Forbes was his polemical *Columbus and Other Cannibals* (1992) while in high school circa 1996, originally published in a much smaller form as *A World Ruled by Cannibals* (1979), in a mimeograph as *The Wétiko Psychosis of*

*Cannibalism* (1976), and also was submitted and not accepted as a journal article around that time as well (see D-046. B. 204, F. “Wetiko Psychosis”). It was then finally revised not long before his passing in 2008. I have carried in some way, his words and wisdom with me for more than half my life and felt the need to engage Forbes deeper and with the insight of growing with his ideas over time. He was one of the few people who not only told the brutal truth, but he tried to explain the madness as a historical malady, “I call it *cannibalism*, and I shall try to explain why. But whatever we call it, this disease, this *wétiko* (cannibal) psychosis, is the greatest epidemic sickness known to man” (Forbes 2008a, p. xvi). And elsewhere he characterized our age as the “most brutal epoch in history” which struck a chord with me growing up seeing violence and brutality on the streets and on the land, yet being fed a neo-liberal paradigm that we were the most free in the world, that “progress” had been made, that life today was superior to how our ancestors had lived (ibid, p. xix).

Forbes exhibited sophisticated approaches to dealing with the colonial problem via organizational and educational efforts over an expansive sixty-year career that began at the tender age of 25 when he received his doctorate from the University of Southern California in 1959. Prior to graduating from the University for example, he had already been active in democratic and educational spaces of organization and engagement, volunteering to perform outreach for John F. Kennedy as a Senator then later in his run for President in his hopes that he would put an end to the Wars against Indochina and enable the United Nations to carry out its heavy handed decolonization process which was stanchied by an anti-communist and pro-militarist regime to what became the “Third World” (“Letter to John F. Kennedy, May 3, 1959, in Jack D. Forbes Collection (D-046)



B.2, F. "Correspondence 1953-1957"; hereafter D-046). Forbes tells his audience during one of his many "Greatness of the Native/Indian Mind" talks at the Southwest Museum of Los Angeles in 1997 that he worked his way through college, substitute teaching at local schools after working at a local dairy and creamery, and a De Kaamps Bakery with his family, but really had been working since he was a child, when he began selling U-C salve door-to-door and helping out the family when and where they needed while still in El Monte in the early 1940's (Forbes and Crozier-Hogle 1997; Forbes 1992b, p. 10, 27-28; "Get the Word Out #54"). By the time Forbes had graduated and began to teach first at Citrus College in Fall of 1959 and Ventura College in Spring 1960, he was soon awarded a full time Assistant Professor position in History at San Fernando Valley State College (now California State University at Northridge) for the Fall of 1960. It was during this time for example, as a fresh University professor that he began a lifelong friendship and collaboration with the humble artist and veteran Diné code talker Carl Gorman and his wife Mary. Together they formed the American Indian College Committee in 1961 and Forbes also submitted a proposal to his own college for a degree in American Indian Studies, which they turned down (D-046, B. 3; Greenberg 1996, p. 139; Forbes 1985a). This proposal was 8 years before the first programs opened up at UC Berkeley and UCLA in 1968, and as many years before he would join Native American Studies at UC Davis in 1969 as its first professor in Native American Studies. It was during this time for example that Forbes explains, he and Gorman had really conceived of the idea for an American Indian University, and from which the Gorman's helped him publish a short treatise in the *Navajo Times* which was antedated by the drafted version called "For the Indian's Future - An American Indian University", the first of many

proposals (Forbes 1961; Forbes 1966c). This was 7 years before Navajo Community College opened in 1968 and 10 years before D-QU would start classes in 1971. Forbes was one of the contemporary rebirthers for People or ethnic studies and tribal colleges and universities in the 20th century as one peaceful avenue for bringing about a deimperialized world, one where all peoples were free to conceive of and procure their destinies as distinct peoples. Education as a process of learning how to live as peoples, Forbes was transfixed upon this socio-political arena of activity.

By 2005, I had learned even more how true his words were, and how intuitive was his analysis and was drawn to learn from him. I attempted to attend D-Q University in 2005 but it had recently closed and I would only meet and talk with him a few times before he passed in 2011. The legacy of D-QU barely survives today, and after a few legal battles and some attempts at reviving the college, it remains non-operational and unaccredited yet volunteers have maintained the minimum requirements of the deed and its non-profit status, and most importantly, control of the land. I have worked like so many others to reform the ailing university but it has yet to return. D-QU was of the 5 convening Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCU) to form the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC) and the second of four to close including Inupiat University of the Arctic (1975-1980), College of Ganado (1970-1987) and most recently Comanche Nation College (2002-2017). This out of 33 TCU's in the U.S. who service an estimate 30,000 students of which Forbes was a leading and original advocate in the 20th century (AIHEC 2017; Stein 2003, p. 35; Reyhner and Eder 2017, p. 305; Crum 1989; Crum 2007; Champagne & Stauss 2002).

I became acutely aware of Forbes influence while an undergraduate majoring in American Indian Studies and History at UCLA, finding him present throughout the history, discourse and archives I engaged as a young scholar and active student leader in the American Indian Student Association and our many student-initiated projects such as American Indian Recruitment, Supporting Undergraduate Natives and Retention of American Indians Now who serve the largest urban Native population in the U.S.. These projects were all formed in the wake of the founding of American Indian Studies in 1968 and the occupation of Alcatraz in November of 1969 (which lasted until April of 1971), from which many UCLA students took part in (Castillo 1994; Johnson 2008). However, I found his work, life and legacy to both be not dutifully studied or shared, and his perspectives to often stand quite alone, as rarely are his views challenged or critiqued in great depth, nor were they developed in any way in the literature although there are records of his clashing of ideas (for examples see Dunbar-Ortiz 2005, p. 256; also see the *Wicazo Sa Review* Spring 1996 issue; also Warrior 1992, p. 9). The wealth of his scholarly, pedagogical, and leadership record relative to the field of education has never been critically interpreted outside of the intellectual and community circles he lived within, if at all. In imperial or colonial histories and theories of education Forbes may have an encyclopedic entry yet more common is a near absence of his Indigenous intelligence (Phillips 2014; Johansen 2013; Chambliss 1996).

Forbes was recognized many times for his leadership and perspective as an incredible and moving lecturer, public speaker and poet for hundreds of Native-centered events, classes, and occasions. He was awarded many times in his life including as a: Social Science Research Council Research Training Fellow in 1957-8, where he travelled

to Spain to perform research for his dissertation study; also he was a John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation Fellow from 1963-4; he also held a Fulbright-Hays Visiting Professorship at the University of Warwick (England) in 1981-2; was the Tinbergen Chair in Native American Studies at Erasmus Universiteit (Netherlands) during the 1983-4 academic year; and then was a Visiting Scholar at Oxford University Institute of Social Anthropology as well as a Visiting Senior Member at Linacre College during the 1986-7 school year; and, a Visiting Professor at the University of Essex in Spring of 1993 on an award from the UC Education Abroad Program. As he became older and wiser, he was honored as Educator of the Year by the California Indian Education Association in 1993 a year before his retirement from UC Davis, and inducted into the International Educators Hall of Fame in 1996, as well as being awarded the Vivian Hailstone Community Service Award by D-Q University in June 7, 1996. He was also awarded the American Book Award for Lifetime Achievement on June 1, 1997 by the Before Columbus Foundation, and the Wordcraft Circle: Writer of the Year (Prose - Non-Fiction) award in 1999 and finally near the end of his life, the Lifetime Achievement Award by the Native Writers' Circle of the Americas in 2009. His prowess and power were recognized by all who knew him, with his colleagues and students recalling him as a "walking library" (Hernández-Avila 2011). His contemporaries such as Barbara Risling, wife of David Risling Jr., and "Mama" Adalberta Cobb recalled that he was multilingual, noted for beginning and ending his speeches in Lenape, for his Mexicano Spanish fluency, and his work on Indigenous languages in general (see *Revisiting Aztecas Del Norte with Spirit*).

The skeptical view I am taking is that Forbes intellectual and scholarly, political and educational positions were not always accepted by Indian scholars, such as his advocacy of the term native American over Indian (see the debate in *Akwesasne Notes* 1972 and prior publishing of this idea in 1967) who in Forbes' logic was necessary in part because of the overwhelming number of "Asian Indian" people from the Indian peninsula of AfroEurAsia who outnumber American Indians with more than 4 million people (U.S. Census 2010; Pew Research Center 2015). Thus, the people Columbus assumed he discovered in 1492 now are more often found in the Americas than the people he erroneously called *los yndios* which are the Onkwehonwe (real, original) American Native Nations. Forbes (1973a) advocacy that Chicanos "compose the largest single tribe or nation of Anishinabeg (Indians) found in the United States", is often embraced by Chicanos themselves, however, it was a proposition basically ignored by American Indian scholars minus the likes of Ines Hernandez-Avila and those who are U.S. and Mexican Indians (p. 13; Anzaldua 1999, p. 23; Chavez 1984, p. 4; Contreras 2009, p. 30; Vigil 1980). Forbes is remembered as a "Native American writer, scholar and political activist" by local historians of Eagle Rock, CA where he graduated from high school, attending six years as it served grades 6-12 (Warren & Parrello, 2014, p. 7). Lindsay (2012) considered Forbes to be one of the preeminent historians and a "pioneering researcher" of colonial SW and California Native history (p. 3). While Chavers (1980) notes assertively that Forbes,

in many ways could be said to be the founder of the Indian Studies movement because of his extensive research and writing on Indian history and Anthropology,

and because of his advocacy, envisioned a College which would be thoroughly grounded in the Indian cultures and history of the U.S. and North America (p. 11).

In Bradley Shreve's (2011) study on the National Indian Youth Council he reminisced that in the Bay Area in the 1960's Forbes was "an elder of sorts" despite being a young scholar in his early thirties (p. 23). Colleague Inés Hernández-Avila (2011), who succeeded Forbes as Chair of the department of Native American Studies at UC Davis after his passing in 2011 shared this personal perspective of him:

Jack was a man of magnificent vision, with a poet's heart. He devoted his life's work, passionately, brilliantly, as a true great spirit, with all the power of his words and actions, to finding indigenous peoples, recognizing them, and celebrating their faces and hearts in all their colors (para 7, as quoted in Bailey (2011)).

Considered an "ideas man" by many Forbes vision was expansive (Casper-Denman 2013, p. 64). "Forbes specialized in paradigm shifts between disciplines" writes Bruce Johansen (2013) in eulogizing the recently departed scholar (p. 136). C. Matthew Snipp (2012) remarked that "Forbes was one of the first scholars in Native America[n] studies to draw attention to the common interests of indigenous peoples of the Western hemisphere and argued that these interests transcend the nation-state boundaries imposed by colonial powers" (p. 1604).

He was not loved by all however. Wilcomb Washburn (1987) wrote a stinging critique of Forbes analysis of the Nixon administration effects on the Native/American Indian Movement and dubbed him as "a redoubtable warrior of the radical left", echoing Forbes relegated status of the white press to a "radical" rather than as a critical scholar (p.

57; see Forbes 1978, p. iii). Deloria's (1998) lop-sided retort to Forbes article in *Wicazo Sa Review* went so far as to say, "I honestly fail to see how Forbes's program [at D-QU] would produce a generation of Indian intellectuals" (p. 28) and that his view on intellectual sovereignty and self-determination "is not fruitful" (p. 31). This critique discounts, for example, his plethora of related work such as the formation and development of Native American Studies at UC Davis over the course of thirty years. Forbes was considered by Adam "Fortunate Eagle" Nordwall (Anishinaabe from Red Lake) a leader at the occupation of Alcatraz and longtime Bay area organizer, as one of the "cautious academics" that didn't leave his job to take over the Rock at Alcatraz in 1969 (Fortunate Eagle & Findley 2002, p. 190). Forbes (1994e) however praised the work of Nordwall and other organizers of the Bay Area in making Alcatraz happen (p. 128). I see the potential of his vast archives untapped and as an educator, leader and prolific writer he remains largely unstudied especially in the field of education. The few authors that do engage Forbes leave his educational experiences and perspectives largely ignored and focus upon his works on race (especially mixed-race studies and red-black relations), identity, colonialism, and history (Spivak 1998, p. 35; Alfred 2005, p. 102; Cornassel 2001; Coleman 2013; Miles & Holland 2006; Barker 2005, p. 150; YellowBird 1999; Crum 1989; Waziyatawin 2012, p. 70). He is not generally considered to be an educator or leader, except in relation to Native American Studies and Tribal Colleges.

As an educator and author for more than 50 years, as one who lived and struggled during the many movements and moments from the 1950's until his passing in 2011 for Indigenous National resurgence and decolonization, he laid a hefty path for new

educational leadership and scholars to draw from. The majority of his life was spent living and working on behalf of all *Americans* as he often called Indigenous Peoples of Turtle Island (Forbes 1979b; Dunbar-Ortiz 2005; Dunbar-Ortiz 2016, p. 23). Forbes tackled every major issue of his time, and spoke on every subject imaginable from environmental destruction to education, to democracy and decolonization to racism and patriarchy. He was defiantly original and outspoken. Forbes advanced for example we adopt the Mayan calendar rather than live in 2017 AD, and as such taught in his Native American Studies courses that we are in the Fifth Sun (according to Mexica astronomers), and a new baktun cycle (13th), according to Mayan cosmographers, and had the calendar implemented in the early years as the standard timekeeping system for the board of trustees of D-QU, which they eventually dropped (Forbes, Risling & Martin 1972). Indigenous knowledge and education are part of a continuum that predates the invasion and which continues to nurture community, but also one that begins to view resistance and survivance to colonialism via forced or coerced social change to borrow from Duane Champagne (2007), as a key factor in this continuum (Vizenor 1999). Do our community rooted philosophies match the institutional philosophies we work within? Forbes says, “we can have new visions”, but do we want them (Forbes 1997a, p. 253)? The institutionalization of education by religious sects, corporations, state and federal governments of the Americas and Northern America in particular has forced Native and newly-arrived people of color into subordinate brainwashing and assimilative schools and institutions, effectively proletarianizing once independent and autonomously educated groups (Adams 1966; Banks 2005; Child 1998; Forbes 1967d; Fortunate Eagle 2012; Hoxie 2001; Lomawaima 1999; Lomawaima 2000; Miller 1996; Reyhner & Eder 2017).



Forbes consistently fought at the international, federal, state and local levels for the decolonization of education, arguing that the “real revolution that has to take place” includes a total paradigm shift in which we are working towards “changing the way people think about other people” (Forbes 1975a, p. 5). This is not militarization or change by force or by fear, but as Joy Harjo (1992) has advocated, a “real revolution of love” one that gets to the heart of people’s identities, ideologies and institutions which perpetuate the imperial and colonial problem, our unequal and deadly relationship. Revolutions happen every day in the eternal sense of the cyclical solar, lunar and seasonal rounds but not in the exact historical or Marxian sense, for we can and will never return to the exact place we were at physically or traditionally. Revolution then is a figure of speech, rhetoric and metaphor for the seemingly impossible task of decolonization, of healing, of becoming something akin to the greatness of our ancestors and our own potentialities. The return for Forbes (1979a) as a “revolutionary democrat” and democratic educator, was one which embodied the idea of “people power” in Indian education, for he was not aligned with neo-liberal tokenism or band aids for the deep wounds of more than 500 years of imperialism in Turtle Island. Looking to Native educational leaders like Laura C. Kellogg, Bea Medicine, and Forbes who took their heed from elders and tradition-bearers, do we frame our struggles in congruence with what Deloria (1970) related was behind the occupation of Alcatraz (and later the occupation of the Army Telecommunications Center that became the future D-Q site in 1971), which he argued was peoples hope for “a return to basic Indian philosophy” and traditional community life (p. 161)? Is this revolutionary thinking or as I’ve heard countless times, “backwards” because “we can’t go back”? Revolution for example meant originally a “roll back” or a

return such as before 1492 or a current condition, rather than a political or military change (as popular usage in the 1700's) or earlier an orbiting cycle (from the 1660's), whose roots lie in Latin *re* "back/again" and *volvere* "turn, roll" as in contemporary Spanish *volver* "to turn". The "first American revolution" for example was heralded by Heemish (Jemez Pueblo) scholar Joe Sando (1998) to have occurred with the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 rather than in 1776 by the new American empire, or Jefferson's "empire of liberty". The "revolutionary war" is framed as a war for independence, and the "great experiment" of democratic republicanism, yet we find rather that this was the dawn of a new empire, rooted in white supremacy, patriarchy, Indigenous dispossession and genocide, and red and black servitude. Many today say that "slavery has been gone for more than 100 years, get over it" or "we are never giving Indians their land back" thus negating any kind of a territorial return or economic reparations. Perhaps though these are the last words of an empire way of life whose time has come to an end. This call is echoed by Greg Cajete (2016) who offered the paradigm that instead of an essentialist or static return to some former state, a deliberate decolonial approach to Indigenous resurgence involves "coming back to our power", totalizing our efforts to include all aspects of Indigenous community education models and potentialities. Forbes would agree with Rage Against the Machine (1992), that we must "take the power back" from the "evil empire".

*Statement of Problem: What is the overriding problem?*

The problem I have studied is the insidious nature of imperialism-colonialism found throughout nearly all educational programming, curriculum, relationships,

structures, pedagogy, leadership, organization, funding and important for this study, the foundational philosophies of schools, leaders, teachers and communities. In Forbes (1997d) first and only novel *Red Blood* (which is loosely based on his life) he describes his understanding of the education system developed by colonial Whites through the voice of one of his main characters Jesse Rainwater, a young Oklahoman Delaware. Jesse has an epiphanic moment and concludes to himself “I see now that education is warfare. What the blancos call education is ideological aggression. It isn’t just racist, or bad, or lousy, or misguided. It is conscious unadulterated cultural and class warfare” (p. 185). Finding passages such as this had me looking deeper into the question of colonialism and its insidiousness in my educational experiences growing up and in the educational institutions and efforts, I have been a part of since. Where else and what else does Forbes have to say about this? Is this only a literary voice or does he speak directly to people this way such as in meetings, speeches, lectures and in casual or intimate conversations? Education of course is performed at first, at home, by parents and family, and thus this study must take into account that “schools” and their ilk are merely institutional extensions of “everyday education”, performed at home, on the streets, in the land, at work, and even, in our sleep. Education is an ancient, integrated approach to socialization, learning, and inter-generational tradition transference.

However, what did “Father of Indian Education” in the 20th century David Risling Jr. proclaim to Indian parents and other audience members in Fresno in 1975 that the “school is the enemy” and had been the enemy as the first experiences he and others had with non-Indian people on a daily basis was in non-Indian run Christian, federal and public created schools (D-334, B. 101). Is the federal government, or any non-Indian run

institutions qualified to do Indian education? How are public schools' products of the people and communities of its students directly and daily or are they by far and large, majoritarian institutions where a single group guides the educational qualities and parameters of an otherwise diverse student and community body? In the schools of my barrio, and the schools I have attended elsewhere, coupled with my own teaching and community education work, I have found an insidious imperial paradigm welded to nearly every relationship within the curriculum, structure and framework of the public education system. The TCU's, NAS and AIS programs, the immersion schools, language nests and bilingual schools, the survival schools and others I've visited stand out clearly, for they are truly outliers in the sea of mono-lingual English, imperial science or religious-based, and white forms of education. Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) also truly stand out alongside Ethnic Studies programs which clearly articulate and represent specific communities of people and challenge an otherwise Christian, imperial and colonial mission which only included non-white's when in a non-threatening, seduced form of segregated or immersed assimilative kinds of education. Forbes, as an all-out advocate for all people's education, provides an interesting pane during this important 20th century of indigenous educational revitalization and nation-rebuilding efforts. The problem was clear: Native Nations, like every people, are families united and as such are devoted to each other and to the raising of new generations through bounded inter-generational ways of living and learning which respects the potential of the community learners as individuals and as members. But again, the problem arises, are we able to perform education our own way, and is this enough if are focused narrowly upon "cultural values distinct from the majority" as

Deloria (1981, p. 26) suggests, or as “cultural nationalism” as opposed to political nationalism, as Adams 1994 frames the dilemma? How do these institutions live up to our grandest visions, our “highest thoughts” as Cajete (2000) names it? Forbes is amongst many other founders and visionaries such as Stanley Red Bird, Gerald Mohatt and Lionel Bordeaux of Sinte Gleska University (1969), and the Roessels, Dillon Platero, and Raymond Nakai of Diné University (originally Navajo Community College) which was the first institution of its kind to open in 1968. The majority of U.S. TCU’s are community colleges rather than universities and while on the one hand we need both, we also need institutions that will seriously critique and challenge the federal, corporate, imperial relationships which have stanchied the Tribal College Movement after 1970. Funding has not been forthcoming and has been incredibly long fought for, at times withheld or representing pennies on the dollars promised, and not enough for development and growth let alone upkeep and maintenance. Accreditation remains to be in the hands of imperial gatekeepers who offer nothing in comparison academically. While Native American and American Indian Studies programs within imperial institutions of higher education have become solidified, many also have reached plateaus set by the conservative status quo. John Mohawk (2008) once chided that his approach to Native American Studies was that it would critique the imperial or “western society” as he framed it. Does NAS or Ethnic Studies really challenge these institutions, or the larger imperial matrices of power and relations? Tom Holm (2005) reflected on the state of American Indian Studies after 30 years and noted that nothing has really changed in academia, among whites and imperial society, and more readily apparent, among Indian communities (Cook-Lynn, Holm, Red Horse & Riding In 2005).

My search began as *every* educational point of contact seemed “tainted” by the various features of colonial schooling including racist, patriarchal, homophobic, classist and other key foundations of colonial paradigms. A friend of mine once asked me when I was developing my thoughts about a research question in the context of Native American Studies students, “is decolonization relevant [to us Natives]?” I have thought long and hard about this and decided that colonialism (internal or neo or otherwise) and imperialism (empire-building) is *the* problem (capitalism is the colonial rationalization of exploitive relations and the profit (greed) principle) in its myriad forms. Therefore, decolonization is not only relevant, but it requires an imperative *response*. I share the call of Eve Tuck (2012) who has pointed out that “decolonization is not a metaphor”, it’s a stance and a struggle away from imperialism and colonialism. What does this imply specifically could not be reduced to a short list of major problems as they only represented strands of a larger fabricated and intricately layered and woven system of exploitation and discrimination which draws from relationships developed over time and as such cannot be understood at first glance or without prolonged exposure and experience.

In the summers of 2013 and 2014 I conducted a pilot study in which I located, catalogued and analyzed all “de/colonial” and “education” minded works from and about Forbes especially those housed within Forbes self-produced archives located in the UC Davis Shields Library special collections department. I had recently completed a yearlong fellowship in UNM’s Center for Southwest Research, the primary special collections archives on campus and after scouring our local archives I realized the dearth of relevant material, such as a few gems found in the Kay Cole Papers. During the summer of 2013

at UC Davis it was found that materials related to “decolonization” are located throughout the archives including in letters, personal notes, teaching materials, speeches, published works and more and are complemented by his published and out of print works. I found that Forbes is of the most heartily published of persons I have been honored to study yet I did not find a collective educational treatise akin to Vine Deloria’s (1991a) *Indian Education in America* and his joint publication with Daniel Wildcat (2001) *Power and Place: Indian Education in America* which share particular philosophical and critical perspectives in an in depth and dialogical way. Other important works of this nature include Santa Clara Pueblo educational scholar Greg Cajete’s (1994) *Look to the Mountain*, his Native Science paradigm expressed in *Igniting the Sparkle* (1999) and his follow up work *Native Science* (2000), also Marie Battiste’s (2013) *Decolonizing Education: Nourishing the Learning Spirit*, Stephen May’s (1999) *Indigenous Community-Based Education*, Linda Miller Cleary and Thomas Peacock’s (1999) *Collected wisdom: American Indian education*, and Beverly Klug’s (2012) *Standing Together: American Indian Education as Culturally Responsive Pedagogy* all discussed the broad and fine details from their own and many other Indigenous beliefs, practices and approaches to education and whose work represents a discussant framework from which to teach with and through traditional Indigenous community. I found a majority of Indigenous educational treatise are focused on History, such as *American Indian Education: A History* (2017) by Jeanne Eder and Jon Reyhner, *Education and the American Indian* (1999) by Margaret C. Szasz, *Tribally controlled Indian colleges* (1990) by Norman Oppelt, *Education for Extinction* (1995) by David W. Adams, *Boarding School Blues* (2006) by Clifford E Trafzer, Jean A Keller, and Lorene Sisquoc and *To*

*Remain an Indian* (2006) by K. Tsianina Lomawaima and Theresa McCarthy. Further, none of these focus on a single specific educator, except in comparative such as Robert Allen Warriors (1994) *Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions* who looked at Vine Deloria Jr. and John Joseph Matthews intellectual offerings but not their views on education. You have to look outside of Indigenous education at studies upon or by bell hooks, W.E.B. Du Bois, Paulo Freire, Francisco Ferrer, Lev Vygotsky, Horace Mann, Myles Horton, Maria Montessori, Rudolf Steiner or John Dewey for a portrait of an educator's struggle through time, as well as a synthesis of their philosophy. The diverse and important views expressed in the *In Our Mother's Voice* collections (2000) and (2008) for example represent key practitioner perspectives in dialogue upon current and enterprising indigenous education efforts, however there is no mention of Native American/American Indian Studies or Tribal Colleges or discussions of "advanced education". This begs the question: Why are there so few Indigenous educational philosophers? I see Forbes in this light and so I chose to focus upon this problem in the field.

I rely strongly upon Cajete (1994) and Deloria's (2001) ecological education frameworks in order to discuss the differences in Forbes thought. Cajete for example was considered by Deloria (1994) to be the "pioneer of the next generation of American Indians in education" (p. 14). And Forbes? He worked in education all his life and wrote frequently upon it in the form of curriculum, research studies, policy, stories, popular works, readers, in academic journals, pedagogy as well as Native education program and institutional development. Yet what is missing is a concise and coherent synthesis of all his best educational ideas, critiques, stories and experiences. I seek to procure a semi-



replete perspective through his vast archives and with a focus upon his text and voice which is recorded in mass over a fifty-year period. Further, a serious critique of the key ingredient of decolonial thought has not been attempted through or with Forbes insight front and centered. Without a complete discourse on education, researchers of Forbes are left to comb through his entire corpus for perspectives. Thus, I hoped to take on the task of drawing upon all possible “texts” or creative works towards a new composition which takes the form of a weaving of gathered materials. It is the hope that once a substantial reading and critique of his textualized story through the archives will reveal future gaps and impetus for other kinds of research, such as oral history and biography, as well as philosophical, historical, and educational related studies. Further, the concept of philosophy has been divorced from community action, thus I seek to place Forbes philosophical (*philo* “love” and *sophi* “wisdom”) or “love of wisdom” kind of thinking back into its proper context, as community knowledge able to nurture resurgent consciousness.

Further, Native education has been incredibly perverse and underfunded in its sordid imperial historical experiments so much that despite the incredible development of Native American, First Nations, Aboriginal and American Indian Studies, as well as Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCU) since 1968 across Anowarakowa (Turtle island), they remain a stalwart institutional efforts that distinctly attempt to embody their diverse constituencies, representatives of Native Nations. Of the many sites to have come and gone, among those that survive today, 14 offer bachelor's degrees while 5 of these offer degrees at the masters level, and two of these, Sinte Gleska University and Oglala Lakota College, both of South Dakota, went the path of a University from the beginning outside

of D-Q University which did not survive, closing its doors in 2005. Significant is that while D-QU has floundered, Native American Studies at UC Davis continues to thrive, both of which were representative projects of Forbes work and influence, with the hearty caveat, of course and as always, that he worked amongst equally talented community and peoples in all his endeavors, and in some significant part, in his writing.

*Where is the problem found?*

There is a lack of discourse between community based culturally relevant education and the nature of colonization especially neocolonialism, internal colonialism (what Thomas calls “hidden colonialism”) and settler-colonialism (Thomas 1969; Mohawk 1982; Mohawk 2004; Forbes 1979; Almaguer 1975; Adams 1989; Adams 1995; Tuck, McKenzie, and McCoy 2014; Munroe, Border, Orr, Toney and Meader 2013). bell hooks (2009) calls the entire construct “Imperialist White-Supremacist Capitalist Patriarchy” for they are bound together (p. 8). Fanon’s (1961) view was colonialism was always a violent encounter, and in its long-term establishment, which is an unequal relationship, effectively denigrates one another while one, the imperialist-colonial lives well off the spoils and thefts, and to be exact, white power creates white privilege (Dei et al. 2004). In terms of education, Linda T. Smith (1999) points out that higher education institutions in the colonies reify “part of the historical processes of imperialism. They were established as an essential part of the colonizing process, a bastion of civilization and a sign that a colony and its settlers had ‘grown up’” into a full-fledged occupied territory, a new satellite, with all the basic tools of colonialism at its fingertips (p. 65). Most higher education institutions were either formed out of religious missions, army

forts, wealthy plantations and individuals, or federal military occupation via the “land-grant institutions” and represent the height of imposed imperialism and colonization through local institutional knowledge production. Traditional indigenous education was performed primarily in community settings and in social-familial networks and internal societies, however imperial and colonial imposed forms such as schools are now ever-present engineers in Native communities and lives. These institutions are in the main, European or U.S. white created centers, designed to reify the imperial order and further develop new agents of exploitation, socialization (education) and knowledge. Battiste (1994) described this relationship as such:

Education has not been benign or beneficial for Aboriginal peoples. Rather, through ill-conceived federal government policies Aboriginal peoples have been subjected to a combination of unquestionably powerful but profoundly debilitating forces of assimilation and colonization. Through various systems of boarding schools and educational institutions, the Aboriginal world views and the people who held them were attacked. Although instructed by Catholic and Protestant clerics in almost all of the boarding schools, Aboriginal children were subjected to persistent violence, powerlessness, exploitation, and cultural imperialism, only to become impoverished and devastated in the cognitive and physical aftermath of schooling. In short, the educational tragedy has been to Aboriginal world views, knowledge, languages, cultures, and the creation of widespread social and psychological upheaval in Aboriginal communities (p. 19).

Greg Cajete (2012) wrote of a need for “decolonizing Indigenous education” because he recognized that “over time, the emphasis on only modern educational methods and

Western-oriented curricula, by their nature, will erode an Indigenous way of life” (p. 146). Communities which have taken self-determined actions in recent times *and* developed education efforts demonstrate the most advanced and descriptive convergences such as found at the 33 tribal colleges, numerous language and cultural Immersion programs, hundreds of Native American Studies programs, departments, centers and pre-k-12 schools and a general rebirth of Indigenous thought and struggle that is displayed annually at AISA, NAISA and elsewhere.

Laenui (2000) describes the process of colonization to consist of five steps or stages, which may occur variously from group to group, as his experience reflects a Hawaiian perspective. These five stages include: 1) Denial and withdrawal, 2) Destruction and eradication, 3) Denigration, belittlement and insult, 4) Surface accommodation and tokenism, and 5) Transformation and exploitation (pp. 151-2). Gord Hill (2006) suggests perhaps there are four core stages which represent a militarized and violent approach that include: 1) Reconnaissance, 2) Invasion, 3) Occupation and 4) Assimilation (p. 2). A 1983 report from the new Canadian parliament on “The Government of Aboriginal Peoples” suggested that there were five stages to colonization, including: 1) displacement, 2) restriction, 3) assimilation, 4) structural accommodation and 5) self-determination. All of these stages and struggles are represented on Anowarakowa. For example, denying the existence of prior or original Nations, denying their equal rights to their territories, denying their legal traditions of consensus when making treaties or agreements, denying their humanity or sense of peoplehood, denying the validity of their stories, traditions, religions and ideas which might counter the invader’s vision of the world seems to be a paramount conception. So, while Columbus

remarked at the “friendliness” and goodliness of the Arawak-Taino’s, the Carib’s and others, he also denied them their humanity and immediately suggested their enslavement, casually importing an Aristotelian logic of “natural slavery”. Violence is also insidious to imperialism and colonialism, and the preceding stages always utilized force, often deadly in order to achieve their ends or to simply perpetuate the occupation. As in the case of education, where boarding schools uniquely killed many of their students, many never gained an education of value except through the punishing process of labor and schooling. While assimilation might be a stated goal of the “melting pot theory” or the “nation of immigrants”, its untenable and false in its foundation for it always means one thing for Native students and communities, and another for those who will reap the privileges bound to invasion, theft, murder, and continued occupation of Native lands, bodies and nations. Native Nations will never be “the same” as the imperialist and colonizer, for they can only mimic their actions especially in a racialized relationship bound to white supremacist and other superiority-based notions of life and (sub)-peoplehood. Native Nations will also never be “immigrants” for their landed histories and traditions ground them to specific places, languages and shared identities born and developed in their homelands throughout the Americas. The educational efforts mentioned above are predicated upon reinforcing these senses of people-nationhood and a critique of the imperial and colonial world they daily grapple with.

Yet the system rages on and we are barely holding onto the children that do graduate from these efforts and remain in community, if they do return at all. We have been attempting to create “decolonized spaces” in the classroom, nurturing critical discursive approaches and minds, and bringing this back into the community context, yet

it seems this is not quite enough (Dei 2010, p. 8). This is especially noticeable in the context of the colony of California where only a few educational sites exist which are doing the work of growing community for Indigenous Nations while a predominance of youth attend public schools that teach a Euro-immigrant (neo-imperial & colonial) relationship, experience, history and understanding of the land and its relations. The dilemma seems to revolve around whether trying to transform colonial society into a more hospitable place, i.e. Native curricula, pedagogy and more Indian teachers in public schools, or moving forward, on and beyond its limited, dare I say, doomed visions for Indigenous students and communities. How many tribally controlled schools are surviving without federal, state, or external economic support which may alter the nature of instruction, the structures of school, and an educational pipeline leading away from community? External funding and education for example are often the ways imperialists-colonizers manipulate original goals and visions, propping up a false sense of autonomy and power that quickly dissolves without a financial lifeline.

Vine Deloria Jr. (1994) once remarked that the western scientific and techno-industrial system of knowledge of public schools was the key to its failure, saying that “Indian educators thus face the question of whether they will move the substance of education away from this essentially meaningless proposition toward the more realistic Indian model that sees the world as an intimate relationship of living things” (p. 13). These colonized models of exploitation, extraction and objective relationships with the living world still exist in most Indian-controlled schools, colleges and preschools as the taught and tested model of life, living, learning and relating to the world. While traditional values and knowledge are taught, they are often taught alongside “tested”

colonial concepts which by the time of higher education, take precedence and predominate the environment. Deloria (1981) points out that what is taught is largely a Platonic model of the world, orderly, conquered, and absolute. Adams (1989) argues that colonial influence is so prevalent that most students continue to seek the “white ideal” even while in Indigenous community settings (p. 132). Imperial science, language, history, politics and philosophies are the culprits which perpetuate the myth of the superior progressive conquest. Thus the two “tribal colleges” owned and operated by the federal government Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute (SIPI) and Institute of American Indian Arts (IAIA) were not recognized by the original TCU’s that founded AIHEC as federal installations but are *now* recognized via coercive terms negotiated in the passage of the Tribal Community Colleges Assistance Act of 1978 (Kachadoorian 2010). Managing, housing and corralling Indians into educational spaces does not constitute Indigenous control of education, reflect Indigenous creativity and ingenuity, ancient and resilient practices or wisdom traditions, or directly improve upon the communities where education is performed, such as in Santa Fe and Albuquerque.

How do we prepare our youth and community for the long road of deimperialization and decolonization using the vehicle of our community education processes and rooted in the “basic Indian philosophy” as Deloria has suggested? How can we move in some direction without identifying it, that is, away from colonialism, or as Elizabeth Cook-Lynn (2007) poses in her critical but hopeful way, “if the fiction of decolonization is to happen” (p. 204)? Is decolonization merely fiction, merely a metaphor (as in only a word or symbol) as Eve Tuck and Wayne Yang (2012) have queried? Or, is there something strong to grasp onto in our educational efforts which can

bear fruit and replant our depleted communities? Forbes offers a lifetime of educational experience, study and analysis from which we can learn from.

*Research Question(s)*

My study of Jack D. Forbes consists of the following research questions:

1. Who is Jack D. Forbes and what did he say and do with regards to advancing a *decolonizing philosophy of education*?
  - a. What does his vision of education look like?
  - b. What was the goal of education in his mind? Who were his teachers, elders and influences and how did they help shape his philosophy?
  - c. What philosophical foundations did he advocate as a “guide for living the good life” as found in his textual corpus and educational work (Zais 1976, p. 105)?
  - d. What were his greatest contributions to educational philosophy and praxis?
2. What were his views of personhood-peoplehood or nationhood?
  - a. What are Peoples, Nations, Cultures and Races? Who and what is allowed to be a Nation versus a People, a Culture versus a Race?
  - b. How did he teach and advocate on behalf of all peoples, but especially Indigenous and Chicano Peoples?
  - c. How did he frame peoplehood-nationhood as a foundational paradigm upon which education and decolonization could take place?
3. What is imperialism and colonialism to Forbes?



- a. What are the core tenets of his views?
  - b. What is the relationship to nationhood and education?
  - c. How does this respond to Cajete's (2012) call for Indigenous community decolonization efforts to focus on "*coming back to our power*", Taiaiake Alfred and Jeff Cornassel's (2005) call for Indigenous "resurgence" within a settler-colonial context via education (Tuck & McKenzie 2015) and Adams (1989) critique of the limits of cultural nationalism?
  - d. What ultimately does he contribute to the discourse on decolonization?
4. What is his decolonizing philosophy of education? How can this be re-envisioned?
- a. What specifically did he advocate which was unique, transformative, was successful and that failed?
  - b. What was special about Native/American Indian Studies and D-Q University, two of the efforts which represent his most innovative attempts?
  - c. What ultimately did he advocate and how can we take up the torch which he left behind?
  - d. How can one reenvision their own personal and community-centric philosophy?
  - e. Can education do the dirty work of decolonization or is it too clean, too distant from the frontlines?

## *Background to Study*

Linda T. Smith's (2012) updated and slightly revised *Decolonizing Methodologies* provides the standard yet bittersweet critique of western colonial research methodologies and a constant reminder as I partake in this archival research study of the limits and context which the colonial present can be studied. Research, which she harkened "is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world's vocabulary" remains so after centuries of exploitation yet explores the possibility that research is a powerful tool for Indigenous scholars (p. 1). This is precisely because of the spaces within the empire that Indigenous peoples refuse to be left out of, to be left alone to the colonizers. Indigenous researchers bring Indigenous issues, history, knowledge, language, lands and community into research. Relevant for my own approach are her advocated methodologies dealing with reading, writing and theory making because it "gives us space to plan, to strategize, to take greater control over our resistances" (p. 150). Research here is defined simply and etymologically as to "traverse, recircle" or to "look again" at an idea. I will draw upon Forbes vast textual archive which details his philosophy in action by encircling his published and unpublished educational works. This study is not an educational biography, which assumes an individual story to be told but rather focuses upon the usefulness of their philosophizing through critical interpretation of key movements, ideas, creations and texts (Denzin 2014). Forbes' life story is invariably the core to reading his words however it can never be so overwhelming as to thwart a critical reading of his collected works and otherwise defer challengers. I am asking not: what kind of an educator was Forbes, but more specific, what does Forbes say and what did he do with

regards to developing a new paradigm for education? There are varying perspectives about what kind of educator he was, and these are all valid.

Forbes (1975b) studied the predicaments of education for “captive nations” and the history of colonization in and related to California and the United Colonies throughout his life such that in 1967 he was appointed by the collectivity of the newly-formed California Indian Education Association (CIEA) to publish and edit the record of their meeting of which he was a founding convener as well as being their keynote speaker that year and many times afterwards (Casper-Denman 2013, p. 55; Forbes 1967; Forbes 1969; Forbes 1976). Cheyenne Lakota educator and leader Lehman “Lee” Brightman (2008) had teamed up with Forbes in 1968 after hearing for example of rumors that there was an “Indian doctor” in the bay area, meaning not a medicine person but an Indian with a doctorate. Forbes is one of the few Indigenous educators to co-create their own kind of educational institutions and programs including the department of Native American Studies at UC Davis in 1969 after declining to head UC Berkeley’s newly established program which was in turn led by his friend Brightman, who was also a co-founder with Forbes amongst others of United Native Americans, of the few representative U.S. national Indian organizations formed one month before AIM in the bay area in July of 1968 (Forbes & Johnson 1970). Lifelong collaborator David Risling Jr. (Hupa/Yurok/Karuk) or as Forbes called him his “elder brother” was a co-founder of both the CIEA and D-Q University (1971) and also joined UC Davis NAS alongside Carl Gorman, Kenneth Martin (Assiniboine) and Sarah Hutchison (Cherokee) in 1969 (Risling Jr. 1975; Greenberg 1996; Kawano 1990; Forbes, J.D. et al 2002). Forbes initial proposal for an American Indian University was first published through the aide of Mary and Carl

Gorman in the *Navajo Times* in 1961 after years of correspondence about it (Forbes & Johnson 1970; Forbes et al 2002). Primary sources corroborate that he corresponded for years with numerous persons about this idea before it took root (D-046, B. 2, F. 7).

Forbes is a defining figure in the coalescing of the American Indian and Tribal College Movements in the 1960's (Talbot 1994; Shreve 2011; Champagne, D., Johnson, T. & J. Nagel 1997). Further, Forbes (1985) worked exclusively as an educational leader, scholar and speaker in his hopes for a peaceful decolonization, calling for the advancement of "warrior scholars" and the development of an "indigenous intelligentsia" (p. 3; see also Forbes 1998a). These efforts, viewed in the context of global and local movements for decolonization have prevailed yet the ultimate goal of "moving away" from colonialism has been stifled. In the Canadian context calls for reconciliation abound and the sloth-like actions of the Truth and Reconciliation commission bears the largest toll on First Nations not upon colonial peoples (Battiste 2013). And what of Mexico? Puerto Rico? Venezuela and other recent state formations with a majority, Indian population? Forbes et. al. (2002) advocated a hemispheric approach in Native American Studies unique among NAS departments and programs with similar ideas ingrained in the philosophical underpinnings of D-Q University, which is usually subtitled as an "Indian-Chicano" university but was imagined in true Forbesian fashion first as a United Nations University and Universidad Indigenista Americana (Forbes 1965, p. 161; D-046, B. 108). Unique relationships exist everywhere between the nation-states and First Nations however, the shared relationship with colonial disempowerment, theft of land and livelihood, and the hope of education unite us while dividing us. Yet can we protect the land we have, heal or reclaim lands we don't have much longer? Taiaiake Alfred (2016)

for one is suspicious of reinforcing the Canadian states claims to land and resources without land repatriation or restoration, advising leaders to name the Canadian negotiations “reconciliation as recolonization”. Tuck & Yang (2012) maintain that settler-colonialism is the dominant overarching form of entrenched power in the U.S. which relies upon occupation of Indigenous lands by illegitimate squatters and pillagers, so called settlers. In using the term imperial, I signify the tradition of empire-building while with colonial, I signify the practice of depopulation and dispossession as imperial acts.

I will be focusing upon the specific efforts Forbes made which directly are linked to the archival record, namely the formation of the Native American Movement/Movimiento Nativo Americano (1960-1967), California Indian Education Association (1967-current), United Native Americans (1968-current) and its publication *Warpath* “a uniquely militant and traditionalist newspaper” (Forbes 1994e, p. 127). He also helped form Native American Studies at UC Davis (1969-current), Deganawidah-Quetzalcoatl University (1971-2005 defunct), and the Coalition of Eastern Native Americans (1971-1986). Forbes also helmed the revival of the Rappahannock Tribe and worked as a field organizer in the 1970’s, and edited a revived Powhatan confederacy newspaper *Attan-Akamik* and *Tsen-Akamak*. The Rappahannock’s were recognized in 1983 by the state of Virginia and has sought federal recognition since prior to the Indian Citizenship Act of 1924 of which recent President Trump signed the Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act of 2017 into law recognizing them and 5 other Nations of Virginia. These are the major activities which he engaged as an educator, as he taught variously from 1955-1967 and then at UC Davis from 1969 to

1994 as a full-time professor, attaining emeritus status until his death in 2011. This is revealing of a total of 51 years of continuous education related work. His publishing and service record totals well over 700 publications and hundreds of speaking and community events. Each and all of these efforts were contributing and demonstrative to his development of an Indigenous educational philosophy that would tackle the neocolonial relations which he maintained forced Native Nations into the imperial order as “captive nations”. There are a number of studies which discuss the history of the California Indian Education Association (Caspar-Denman 2013), Native American Studies at UC Davis (Forbes & Johnson 1970; Risling 1975; Forbes, Crum, Hernández, Varese, & Mendoza 2002) & D-Q University (Forbes, Martin & Risling 1972; Lutz 1980; Forbes 1985; Berger 1994; Christie 1997; Goodwin 2017) and more which describe related movements and institutions but which used Forbes as a primary source (Marquez 2010; see also Casper-Denman 2013 who interviewed him as well). This research will not repeat the stories told within the above studies but instead will focus upon the specific and nuanced views of Forbes himself. Some of these were used by these institutions, some of them were jettisoned, and others were never entertained for whatever reason.

This study recognizes that Forbes was not alone in his efforts, and drew heavily from his familial, national, archival, scholarly and social sources including important aunts and his adopted uncle Tony Del Buono, also Rappahannock, Lenape and other Powhatan leaders and traditionalists such as Roy “Crazy Horse” Johnson, Lucy Blalock, and scholars such as Carlos Montezuma and Robert “Bob” K. Thomas, Lehman L. Brightman, Howard Adams, David Risling Jr. who Forbes proclaimed as his “elder brother”, and inclusive of course of Sarah A. Hutchison, Hartmut Lutz, Dennis Banks, his

students and colleagues, and many others. Many of these persons have passed on or are hanging on that were relatives of his generation making it difficult to interview the most important persons whose voices would be central to a study of the founders and leaders. Forbes unequivocally tells his version of the way things are, and so I am going to walk that route with him in hopes of developing a “lens” from which to proceed with reenvisioning a decolonizing philosophy of education, with all this in mind and taken to the heart of me.

## Ch. 2: A Review of the Literature & Theoretical Frameworks

Important for this study of Forbes educational philosophy I will ground my theorizing in three central theoretical frameworks or lenses from which to critically read and reread the textual corpus of Forbes against the discursive voices he lived and struggled amongst. One of these includes the concept of *Peoplehood* or *Nationhood* as developed by Native scholars. Another key lens is rooted in *Indigenous Knowledge*, *Native Science* or *Ethno-Science* as Greg Cajete (2000) has called it. This describes how I the researcher view the world and the knowledge therein and equally, Forbes culturally-imbued vision of the world(s). Also, to state clearly as obvious through the medium of “ours” and my English language fluency, there exists an imperial and colonial (implanted) knowledge base that is as well as developed if not more than what I would like to think of as my “core” values, knowledge and experience. Lastly, this study will draw from decolonization theories, especially focused on education. In the colonial disciplines of academia these three above fields are rarely recognized let alone utilized together. The contexts which Forbes published and worked speak directly to the ways he was inspired and in turn inspired the above fields of study. Although not explicitly stated in each paradigm below, tackling the “colonial problem” necessarily investigates the interlaced performances of race, class, gender and religious ideologies which influence each of the paradigms as well. Hence the continuous use of the concepts of *influence*, *matrix* and *nexus*, which are used to describe the interlocked, unrestricted nature of our cultural forms.



### *On Peoplehood and Nationhood*

Peoplehood as a basic linguistic-cultural concept is very ancient and stable, as it always refers to a group or as commonly used today, a populous or population, and is a concept and framework that has received considerable attention from Native scholars of recent who have reinterpreted and developed unique contributions rooted in traditional Indigenous paradigms, languages and practices (Thomas 1982; Deloria 1969; Holm, Pearson & Chavis, 2003; Holm 2000; Holm 2005; Cornstassel 2003; Alfred & Cornstassel 2005). Cherokee/Creek scholar Tom Holm (2000) revived Tsalagi sociologist Robert K. Thomas (1982) early work with the idea and includes the same four core characteristics interwoven into a “matrix” (womb or “matriz”) of *ceremony, territory, language and history* all of which are deemed sacred, or made special by a people (originally Thomas used “religion”; Holm, Pearson & Chavis 2003; Holm 2005, p. 12). Holm (2005) argues that peoplehood “is a matrix, a complex, organic, and integrated system of knowledge, symbols, relationships, and behaviours” (p. xv). The questions I have generated come from what Thomas calls the “tap-roots” of a people’s identity and being which might be queried in this way concerning a people’s territoriality: Where do a people live together, what constitutes their “bounded space” (Cordova 2007), how do their stories and language communicate their experiences in place and how do they survive within a “spiritual ecology” of relationality (Cajete 1994)? This is not to imply an essential “list” to proclaim peoplehood or groupness, however, the theory maintains that all peoples have grappled with the circles and cycles of group identity and suggests we are products of creation and inhabit a rich universe teeming with a multitude of life forms which we survive on and through us for our livelihood and also identify the most foundational

relationships people have at their core. This is argued to be “traditional peoplehood” contrasted with what John Lie (2004) has termed “modern peoplehood” recognizing the global imperial and colonial identities such as Whiteness or Europeanness and nation-state identities like Canadian or American when used by Whites as rooted in colonialism rather than Indigenous nationhood. Lie for example maintains that “modern” identities began “in early modern Europe” completely dismissing traditional Indigenous conceptions and a separate historical development in the American archipelago which have specific locatives as well as not recognizing the “creation stories” and other kinds of colonizing myths which are at the core of their own violent nation-states (p. 14). Holm (2000) makes clear why the model of peoplehood is valuable, for it “adequately reminds us as scholars that human societies are all complex and that Native Americans entwine everyday life with religious practice and the view that human beings are part of, rather than an imposition on, their environments” (p. 44). This last point emphasizes the core of territoriality, which all people require at all times in order to survive healthily and is the creative venue and relational grounds from which all other characteristics are bound to.

Sandy Grande (2004) warns about essentializing what a people is and what they cannot be, because in the highly politicized, privileged and polarized world we live in, it is too easy to assume, to pass judgement, and further not recognize others for their own capacity to believe in and live as mixed, complex and difficult to understand people. She warns us that:

essentialism fails the American Indian community. It fails to theorize the relational character of identity by denying the historicity and social comprehensiveness of American Indian subjectivity. It fails to account for the

ways indigenous peoples are forced to negotiate incoherent and other conflicting pressures on identity formation. And, perhaps most important, it fails to provide an explanatory critique of the persistent colonialist forces that undermine tribal life and consequently to provide the transformative knowledge needed to disrupt their hegemonic effects (p. 104).

Rather than accepting colonial models as normative I use the term “imperial or colonial peoplehood” so as to point towards the context of colonization of the Americas and other parts of the world rather than as part of some kind of “enlightenment” period as Lie (2004) has imposed (p. 14). Scott Richard Lyons (2000) suggests a better term, “nation-peoples” because as he argues, “the sovereignty of individuals and the privileging of procedure are less important in the logic of a nation-people, which takes as its supreme charge the sovereignty of the group through a privileging of its traditions and culture and continuity” (p. 455). Within Lyons framework, which pairs close to Thomas and Holm’s, he says the whole body, the people must be considered for they are “a group of human beings united together by history, language, culture or some combination therein—a community joined in union for a common purpose” (p. 454). Unity is key, if not the central element, which brings up an essential characteristic often glossed over by these scholars: kinship, clanship, family and community. For Kanien’kehá:ka, it is said that the creator, Ro’nikonhrowa:nen gave the clans in the very beginning to the people, and then later the Peacemaker, the founder of the confederacy, in revitalizing the nation-people gave the clans to the first Clan mother, Jigonsaseh, until their animal relatives were well represented within each clan-family (Porter 1993, p. 4, 33). Language has often been cited as the single most apparent identifier of “difference”, or as the saying goes, “a

language, a people”. Fanon (1952) suggests deterministically that a people who adopt another language “above all assume a culture”, meaning a “foreign” or imposed one, however, because one can learn another person’s language does not imply that you become one of them or that you are like them, as many people learn their neighbors language out of respect and for mutually beneficial reasons (p. 2). For example, in exogamous marriages, where if we learn our spouse’s language it does not automatically imply we have assumed their culture. Yet what I think Fanon is getting to is the unequal power relations bound by the imperial and colonial relationship where people have another language forced upon them. What happens afterwards is the key to this space between. Within this interrelated “matrix” of peoplehood, an imperial, racial form of identity was developed by one group, now called Whites, and imposed on an “other”, so-called Blacks, Redskins/Indians, and all others deemed their opposite racially and legally, as whites could not be enslaved, could own property, vote, etc. These newly formed imperial and colonial identities are the offspring of a white supremacist construct which places Whiteness and Blackness into a kind of DNA spiral, intertwined forever, a fact Derrick Bell (1992) thought supported the “permanence of racism”, who saying in non-romantic terms that “racism is an integral, permanent, and indestructible component of this society”(p. ix).

Eminent Africanist and decolonial educator W.E.B. Du Bois had originally proclaimed the “colour-line” to be the central social dilemma at the First Pan-African Congress held in London in 1900 (Fryer 1984, p. 284). However, later in life Du Bois (1975) adhered to the belief that instead it was the “colonial problem” which demanded our full attention (p. 236). In fleshing out these markers in Forbes thought I hope to

highlight the ways they contributed to his philosophy of education as he came to focus upon colonialism and in life as a diasporic Delaware Lenape and Powhatan Renape who was born, raised and died in occupied California. Raised away from the centers of tribal community life of his ancestors he fought hard to retain his identity amongst similarly situated migrated and mixed peoples of color and economic relationships near what was once rural Los Angeles. A cursory look at Forbes publications and community organizing record for example reveals also heavy influence from Mexicano and Chicano peoples, sources, stories, and philosophy as demonstrated in the founding of D-QU of one of the few Chicano colleges (Forbes 1967b; Forbes 1968b; Forbes 1971a; Forbes 1973a). He would never have claimed to be a Chicano; however, he was fluent in Spanish and had a vast knowledge of Mexicano-Chicano history, traditions, and ceremonies.

The peoplehood matrix is used as a lens in order to study Forbes influences on meso and macro levels as well as give a structure to storying his perceived personhood and peoplehood (Schwarz 1997). Personhood is viewed as a ring within peoplehood, which is not limited to us five-fingered. A common southern California idiom invoked at the beginning of Chumashan and Payomkawichum stories is sometimes “when the animals were like people” or as Villiana Calac Hyde (1997) put it, *'ataaxum mii-qu\$ animal:mom; pomom ataaxum mii-qu\$* or “People were animals and animals were people” (p. 1262). She had to add the word “animal” to explain the concept to her White linguist learner because even the trees are considered people, in the past and present and are still considered equally to be relatives. The Irish or *Daoine Éireannacha* (People of Eire, the name for the island (fem.)) maintain even today a belief in the *daione sidhe* or the “fairy spirit people”, which is where the English word banshee or *bean sidhe* “woman

of the [spirit] mound” is derived from. My education amongst both Payomkawichum and the Éireannach (Irish) has in part contributed to my own understanding of my own personhood and peoplehood and reminds me of the colonial layers of identity that need unpacking such as science, race, gender and religion, which often form the roots of imperial-colonial identities. A people’s collective knowledge developed in a specific place might otherwise be called a “Native Science” or philosophy and represents a kind of group-think, worldview or lens from which the world is seen through, related to and interacted with. All of the tap-roots are essential to a people, while some are demonstrably stronger, emphasized or carefully guarded while others may be weaker, deemphasized and shared. Each of these contributes to a people’s understanding of themselves as well as others. The “common sense” framework of race for example is centralized by Whites while in many traditional families and communities, it is deemphasized or non-existent as a way to “know” people.

### *Native Science, Philosophy and Territory*

People or Nationalities reproduce social relationships and their own unique vision of the world jointly, that is, in communion with the living world. Native Science might also be framed as a People’s Science or ethno-science, locating place or territory at the center of the discussion. Consistent with Greg Cajete’s (1999) ecological education curriculum mandala which identifies foundations in order to educate the whole personage, this study will focus also upon the sociological, social mythological and political relationships which are as rooted as the land is itself (p. 118, p. 126)). The absolute basic assumptions for this study are that the land owns us, that life is intelligent,

and that we are lucky to have some of this (not all of it). Angayuqaq scholar and educator Oscar Kawagley (2010) remarked that according to his people, “we know that Mother Nature has a culture, and it is a Native culture” (p. xiii). In Vine Deloria Jr’s (2001) analysis, he concluded upon a universal equation which he summarized as “power and place produce personality” (p. 23). Further, all actions demanded recognition not only of the personality of places and individual forms of life but of the social level where the “universe was built upon constructive and cooperative relationships that had to be maintained” (p. 24). To summarize, the power of the people to relate to the world while living with and through it, reproduces persons bound to participate in this eternal economic dance. The key is relationships. In this way science is about relationships as much as “knowing”, where the construction of knowledge together is best revealed through our stories. Science then is recognized as the stories we tell ourselves, for all “science is storytelling” (Cajete 2000, p. 13). These stories continually inform and guide the people to similarly become the people, to groupness and community amongst communities, and above all, right relations (Cajete 2016, pps. 23-24). Leslie Marmon Silko (1997) relates that “through the stories we hear who we are” and arguing that for example “the ancient Pueblo vision of the world was inclusive. The impulse was to leave nothing out. Pueblo oral tradition necessarily embraced all levels of human experience” as valid markers to test their rigorous yet fruitful way of life (p. 30). Thomas King (2003) says “the truth about stories is that’s all we are”, echoing the unlimited potentiality conceived in how we live our talk, and how our talk embodies the living world (p. 122). History in this context is viewed as a particular version of an individual and groups story and perspective as participants in cultural communities and nation-peoples. There is not

one science, one history, one people, or one way. Native Science always comes from people and is not a universalizing paradigm like colonial people suppose when they use the term science to mean *the* superior form or way of knowing. A peoples' science is their story lived and when we apply these frameworks to new peoples such as Whites or Blacks, Metis or Chicanos, Seminoles or Gullahs, we will have a new understanding of what it means to embody a person and a people by recognizing them in their own stories and the stories they tell about others. While the imperial sciences are often regarded as equal products of a never-ending enlightenment period, the story of Native Nations for example is clearly articulated in racialized, scientific, Christian, patriarchal, European, corporate-capitalistic, and other frameworks rather than accepting the stories they tell about themselves. Are we to accept the stories whites, imperial scientists, religious missionaries, and others tell about us while dismissing the stories they tell about themselves?

In an exemplary place, at the Akwesasne Freedom School (AFS) which was founded by unwavering parents in 1979 on the Akwesasne Mohawk Reservation, Kanien'kehá:ka language and cultural immersion students framework for understanding "science" is learned through daily recitation of the "words that come before all else", the *Ohén:ton Karihwatéhkwen* also called the "Thanksgiving address". Traditionally, this is recited specifically at the beginning of any important occasion as a ceremonial interlocutor, with each thought ending with "now our minds are one", connecting the audience to the sources of life and to each other (Porter 2008). At AFS their day begins and ends with this address, following traditional ceremonial protocols, and is usually performed by a student and which spells out the most important relationships they have



as *Ahkwesahsaron* (Akwesasne People) (White 2016; Porter 2008). To become people of a place is the goal, and in this case, its *Ahkwesahsne*, “land where the partridge drums”. The name Kanien’kehá:’ka (so called Mohawks; Algonquin for “man-eaters”, a derogatory exonym) means People of the Flint-Stone Place or the area so called the Adirondack Mountains which is a back formation of our own word *adiro:daks* or “tree eaters”, another derogatory exonym. The “words” must daily recognize the specific sources which nurture all life, and then we can attend to the task of learning with and through these recognized sources of life. Key is the development of “relationships” which in turn reinforce the relationality of the “ecology of community”, that is the relationships we have with Kanien’kehá:’ka, Rotinonshonni, Anishinaabe, *Aseronni* (White people, “hatchet makers”) and all others we share in our bounded spaces or territories inclusive of all life (Cajete 1994, p. 99). A recent study by Williams & Cole (2017) based in part on her original dissertation research demonstrates clearly that “outsiders” who have taught at AFN cannot comprehend the history, community or knowledge base without a minimum “cultural competency”, knowledge of all the tap-roots in a holistic web of relations, a way non-Native educators overwhelmingly lack (p. 4). I recognize that this would include myself, having grown up away from the traditional territories of my people and was inclusive of Forbes (1987) who asserts he had to learn who he was from relatives, libraries, scholars, and other Indian people rather than from his people’s homeland in *Attan-Akamik*.

This study for example presupposes that “all human knowledge is related to the creation of the world” who provides the inheritance to develop community and in creation stories and the migration stories afterwards we find the bounds of traditional

territories, who we are and where we are supposed to be as people of place. Akwesasne elder and founder of Akwesasne Freedom School also a founder of Kanatsiohareke Kanata (Village of the Clean Pot) Tom Porter (2008) maintains that “our Thanksgiving comes from the story of Creation; that’s our instruction about how we are supposed to behave and relate to the world and universe that we live in. That’s the original instructions; that’s the basis, the first instructions” (p. 2). The “original instructions” and relationships are central to this study’s interpretive framework. For example the core of Rotinoshonni theory begins and ends with creation of the world and the fall of Skywoman who was saved by the earth creatures especially the great turtle whom allowed her to live on its back and where she in turn created the world out of the waters after giving birth to twin earth-makers. From this story comes the understanding that all waters are one and that all land is one, *A’no:wara Tsi Kawè:note*, one Turtle Island, the home of all Indigenous Nations. This is an original instruction. The Delaware Lenape among others of whom Forbes claimed relatives share a similar creation story which speaks of a Turtle Island as do a number of other peoples in the region including the Anishinaabe (Bierhorst 1985, p. 195). What “original instructions” guided Forbes in his quest for a philosophy of education? What does he suggest are “original” and what are imperial or colonial? In what ways and examples did he express Indigenous educational philosophies with decolonization in mind? How do these compare to other efforts such as Diné College, Akwesasne Freedom School, the Language Nests and Immersion efforts?

*Deimperial and Decolonial Theories in Education*

John Mohawk (1983) says that if “we are to develop a decolonization strategy, we need an expanded definition of colonialism” (p. 3). Mohawk argues that “there are two kinds” of colonialism (p. 1). The first of which is “raw domination” which we all know to be through force, violence, military subjugation, captivity, removal and extraction of labor and resources. Raw domination was tweaked by the development of institutions and of course reservations, “where it became possible to dominate people through economic and social levers,” as well as inciting divisions and allegiances elsewhere via control (p. 2). The second kind is “neo-colonialism”, which is focused on incorporation of all resources into a system of exploitation that is local and global, yet which includes more nuanced kinds of exploitation and influence such as through mass-media and schools. Schools use artificial environments to influence the core of a person through the dissonance, pressure and a strong focus upon new “ideas”. “Ideas do not exist without people to implement them” and as such schools are key places where “ideas” are implemented, such as the idea of manifest destiny via cognitive imperialism, says Mi’kmaq educator Marie Battiste (2013) in her treatise *Decolonizing Education* (p. 68). Within she explains that schools implant a kind of “cognitive imperialism” rooted in creating new members and teaching the only sense of peoplehood-science they know. Cognitive imperialism is not simply a packet of knowledge, or in Freirean constructs deposited or banked information, but rather it “is a form of manipulation used in Eurocentric educational systems” which “relies on colonial dominance as a foundation of thought, languages, values and frames of reference as reflected in the language of instruction curricula, discourses, texts and methods” (p. 161; see also Battiste 1998).

Cognitive imperialism is the substrate of knowledge utilized as foundational by colonial educators, policymakers, and leaders who rely upon Europe's and the U.S. as European outposts of tradition which maintain and perpetuate the colonial status quo. The "tap-roots" taught in schools reflect an imperial way of life, which are synthesized as curriculum, courses of study, and subjects for instruction. Today however it is a real struggle to untangle the misinformation, lies, fusion and confusion found in current educational curricula which seemingly acquiesce to diverse populations while maintaining the core "story" or "science" of the architects of imperial education.

Informative for this study is Taiaiake Alfred's (2014) recent messaging in the context of Canadian reconciliation with First Nations where he warns of "shape-shifting colonialism" (also Alfred & Corntassel 2005). Cognitive imperialism however is not about ideas as much as it is about relationships and manifest actions. Eve Tuck & Wayne Yang (2012) identify these changes over time, of which they recognize as reoccurring concepts, and who say they are:

Not unique, the United States, as a settler colonial nation-state, also operates as an empire - utilizing external forms and internal forms of colonization simultaneous to the settler colonial project. This means, and this is perplexing to some, that dispossessed people are brought onto seized Indigenous land through other colonial projects. Other colonial projects include enslavement, as discussed, but also military recruitment, low-wage and high-wage labor recruitment (such as agricultural workers and overseas-trained engineers), and displacement/migration (such as the coerced immigration from nations torn by U.S. wars or devastated by U.S. economic policy). In this set of settler colonial relations, colonial subjects

who are displaced by external colonialism, as well as racialized and minoritized by internal colonialism, still occupy and settle stolen Indigenous land. Settlers are diverse, not just of white European descent, and include people of color, even from other colonial contexts. This tightly wound set of conditions and racialized, globalized relations exponentially complicates what is meant by decolonization, and by solidarity, against settler colonial forces (p. 7).

Thus, part of the major problem is that doing anything related to “decolonization” must counter and move away from these relationships which seek to bring resistance onto their side or eliminate them. The possibility of “decolonization to become a metaphor” is great as there is “no synonym” explains Tuck and Yang (2012, p. 2). It has to mean a real move away from colonialism or removal of colonizers and their residual machinations. For example, there are two routes which are required of all “citizens” in the U.S.: Schooling (ages 5-18) and Military service (18 years of age, registration with the selective service is required for financial aid). Schools have become one of the primary socialization tools of the colonial empire while the military has representatives and classes in nearly every public high school, college and university across the U.S. Cornel Pewewardy (2005) and others have appropriately labeled the schooling and education I received at public schools in California as “mis-education”. I received a course of study that began a “deculturalization” process in the words of Joel Spring (2007). Incomplete, as we are always rooted in familial and our people’s experience, we define ourselves in part by colonial school environments that creates traumatized people who instead of finding reinforcement of their cultural core are paraded and forced to compete against each other as colonial-capitalist citizens of the all-exploited world fulfilling dual roles as

colonizer and colonized, oppressor and oppressed, police and policed (see also Goodman 1966; Freire 1970; Illich 1971; Memmi 1965). Democracy has been heralded as the epitome of the “free world” but Indigenous peoples are still hampered by the White judges of the past and live with the contradiction of “one nation, one people” while considered “domestic dependent nations”. Sandy Grande (2004) suggests democracy is actually a farce for militarism (consent to kill) and bears no likeness to Indigenous philosophies of consensus, matrifocality, democracy (people power) and autonomy because “from the perspective of American Indians, “democracy” has been wielded with impunity as the first and most virulent weapon of mass destruction” (p. 41). Democracy is shipped off in the shape of humanitarian aid, textbooks, and bombs to the same states who brutally persecute local “others” in their midst. Imperial schooling is uniquely uniform across the globe because the imperial way has adopted many of the core tap-roots such as supremacist views (racial, gender, religious, economic), while developing centrist-states and military forces used to divide and defeat their own populations as well as the “othered”.

A colleague of Forbes at UC Davis, and revolutionary in his own right, Metis scholar Howard Adams (1975) wrote *Prison of Grass* offering a definitive and critical “native point of view” of colonialism in Canada (or *kanata* the Mohawk word for “village”) just prior to arriving at UC Davis in 1975 to work alongside Forbes. Adams work was inspired by the *Autobiography of Malcolm X* (1965), Maria Campbell’s (1973) *Halfbreed* and George Manuel’s (1974) *The Fourth World* which was based on his own experience growing up in what he has called a “half-breed ghetto” in Saint Louis, Saskatchewan, as a grandson of Maxime Lepine who was a lieutenant that fought

alongside Louis Riel in the Red River rebellion of 1885, and is filled with insight from his political and academic experiences. Adams concluded in this treatise that “only by transforming the objective conditions can we put a final end to colonialism” (p. 186). As a devout Marxist Adams materialist critiques of the structures and discourses of colonialism he saw racism and schools as direct physical manifestations of real unequal economic and power relations inherent within the normalized colonial-capitalist totality as well as being cultural assimilation machines. A longtime scholar who had worked alongside Forbes and Adams in Davis at D-Q University, Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz’s (2014) *An Indigenous People’s History of the United States* represents a key link in the discourse surrounding the neocolonial formations we find locally. Dunbar-Ortiz’s recent work continued to chastise U.S. historians (storytellers) saying the “fundamental problem is the absence of the colonial framework” in their stories, a call I am echoing here with regards to educational thought and philosophy (p. 7). The “colonial problem”, the “colonial framework”, the “imperial condition” shapes all of our discourses today, not in a totalizing way, but from the perspective of relationships and influence. The story of racism, genocide, ecocide, “raw domination” and “neocolonialism” is still the core story of U.S. education, which is the new military force, one used to disarm youth before they find their true nationalities submerged, derided and targeted.

For example, Tribal Critical Race Theory or TribalCrit as developed originally by Bryan McKinley Brayboy (2005) assumes that “colonization is endemic” to society and to education in the same way Critical Race Theory views race as endemic, and therefore must be central in our theorizing as Indigenous scholars, a recognition not received in other critical theories of race and education (p. 429; Solórzano 1997). I have heard

critical race theorists openly denounce TribalCrit as unnecessary and impotent. Imperialism and colonialism shape our entirety not just our theorizing and begins on the ground colonizers claim. Living in a racialized society, Forbes too struggled with its painful castigations, and also critiqued it. My critical reflexivity will intimate Forbes and my own colonial racialization and subjectivities within the context of global colonization and racism such as the fact that Virginia census and vital statistics bare no record of Indians as they were forcibly labeled as Black so as to reinforce White rule and Indigenous erasure through a manipulative colonial and racial “bureaucratic genocide” (Fiske 2004, para 7). This study recognizes that the two are joined as one in many ways, for the colonizer and colonized tango in a viscerally colored world which determines its relations, what Mohawk (2004) called the “tragedy of colonization”. John Mohawk (2008) was quoted by Jose Barreiro as arguing that “colonization interrupts the pattern of learning to survive and substitutes learning to serve”, that is, servitude (p. xv). The creation of “willing workers” by implanting the “dignity of labor” was for example at the core of the Uniform Course of Study (1901), the template curriculum for U.S. off-reservation boarding schools in 19th-20th centuries. While “hard work” in and of itself is a positive trait of any form of life who attempt to “give it their best”, to “do good work”, etc., however when tethered to imperial motives and machinations we understand this ideology and value to express supremacist exploitation in a racist, patriarchal, imperializing and ongoing process of envelopment rather than self-development.

My study is grounded in places, peoples and relationships familiar to Forbes work which is what I will call the California colony or occupied California. Colonizers imagine



it first as an island of its own in Garcia Rodriguez de Montalvo's chivalric novella *Las Sergas de Esplandian* (1510). In this imperialist fiction, Queen Calafia rules an isle of dark pagan warrior women, while the protagonist engages in the reconquista of Jerusalem with her help (Hale 1945; Vogeley 2001). This was a favorite of Hernan Cortés who for instance visited the southern tip of the peninsula (Baja California) in 1535 looking an island "rich in pearls and gold" and had borrowed from the fiction saying in his letter to Ferdinand that he had found an island "populated by women, without a single mate" (Mathes 1971; Cortés 2004, p. 232). Colonization of "Alta California" or upper California did not commence as policy until Franciscans were employed by the Spanish empire and procured to lead the establishment of colonial missions and forts (presidios) primarily in the coastal lands under the head of Junipero Serra who began missionization efforts in 1769 that lasted until 1833 when the missions were secularized and became local parishes not serving specific Indigenous peoples or communities (Bancroft 1884; Sandos 2004). These years established the first external educational efforts via the missions which sought to Christianize and "civilize" the peoples of California, however they were met with ongoing resistance (Haas 2014). Native people were coerced and even rounded up and brought to the missions where they performed all the labor and then received a catholic education in colonialism (Costo & Costo 1976). The mortality rate of the missions in this period is appalling, and the genocide that occurred in these artificial communities limited on average to a life expectancy ranging from 2-12 (Jackson 1994, p. 11). In 1821 on the eve of Mexico's independence from Spain the populations of foreign colonials were reported to be 3,200 settlers in Alta California, and only 2,500 in Texas compared to 100,000 Native Nationals (Jackson 1994, p. 14). The founders of the

ranchos and cities of California were predominantly mixed peoples and the *Californios* were quite differentiated from immigrant Whites who came later such as the governor of California at the time of the U.S. invasion, Pio Pico whose paternal grandparents were listed as a *mulata* (part-African) and a *mestizo* (part-Indian) (Estrada 2017). Pico fought tirelessly afterwards to retain some of his lands through the courts but died in poverty in the end (Forbes 1966; Menchaca 2001). The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (1848) is the original claim the U.S. makes to the colony of California, separating Baja from Alta, and supposedly affirming the rights of Indians and Mexicans, including their lands and languages. Some California Indian Nations were treated with between 1851-52 resulting in 21 agreements that didn't pass the Senate and were sealed in secrecy until the turn of the century (Heizer 1976). The passage of the Indian Act of 1850 labeled California Indians subjects to servitude for any infraction and created an environment where massacres and avarice promoted a state of Indian-hating hardly rivaled anywhere else and went on without any critical voices from colonial Whites until after the publication of *Ramona* by Helen Hunt Jackson in 1884 (Trafzer & Hyer 1999).

As Forbes (1969) has pointed out repeatedly (1982) Native peoples and their descendants were the dominant populations in California for all but a 50-year period, between 1875-1925 and have always been a majority in Mexico and Latin America. The Indigenous population of California dropped dramatically by the time of the U.S. invasion of Mexico in 1846 from possibly 300,000 people to just less than 100,000 and by the early 1900's the population was only about 25,000 people but is now back to pre-invasion levels (Census 1850; Cook 1976; Thornton 1987; Census 2008). California is now host to the greatest number of Indigenous peoples of the U.S.. A 2007 report by

Kresge suggested there could be over 150,000 Indigenous Oaxacans in California which is more than the number of original California Indigene currently in the state collectively. Four off-reservation boarding schools were developed between 1885 and 1915 including schools at Ft. Bidwell, Greenville, Perris/Sherman and Banning/St. Boniface and like the reservations which preceded them forced many groups into institutions of power where part of their lives were archived with the rest of the Indian Affairs bureaucracy.

California Indians had fought against segregated schooling in key cases such as *Piper v Big Pine School District* (1924), reinforcing the rights established in the Indian Citizenship Act of 1924 and were by the 1930's and the passage of Johnson O'Malley Act of 1934 which provided public school funding for each Indian pupil, largely in public schools after this time (Reyhner & Eder 2004, p. 84; 248). By the time of the tribal college movement in the early 1960's only Sherman Indian High School survived of previous federal efforts and is a transformed school in some key ways with a mostly Native population of all positions, yet not "in the hands" of any specific tribal communities. Today there are numerous "Tribal" charter, public, and private schools, colleges and programs but are we in a "decolonial era" yet as suggested by Doxtater (2004) or do most of our attempts at community-based education result in continued assimilation to a neocolonial present? There is great hope and results in some current efforts such as with Semillas Community Schools and the lessons from Rough Rock and Rock Point. This is the possibility I hope to engage as an educator unable to reconcile the colonial matrix of relations from a strictly liberal perspective of reconciliation or assimilation. W.E.B. Du Bois (1945) once said that "education for colonial people must inevitably mean unrest and revolt; education, therefore, had to be limited and used to

inculcate obedience and servility lest the whole colonial system be overthrown” (p. 318). The goal is train people to willingly to commit to servitude, to patriotic wage-captivity so that resistance is seen as foreign and treacherous.

Amidst near cliché calls to “decolonize” the late Diné theorist Larry Emerson (2011) reminds us that what we are missing is “indigenous traditional teachings and practices” which otherwise “offer colonial settlers a peaceful way out of the notion of sovereignty as conquest, power, control, domination, and superiority” (p. 17). bell hooks (2008) has pointed out variously her summation of the colonial matrix to be an “imperialist, white-supremacist, capitalist patriarchy”. In an interview, hooks (1997) was questioned why this term included “white supremacy” instead of racism, of which she said, “racism in and of itself did not really allow for a discourse of colonization and decolonization” and “white supremacy was that term that allowed one to acknowledge our collusion with the forces of racism and imperialism” as racism is rarely suggested to be dependent or empowered by imperialism (p. 7). It is clear from most studies on colonial theory and critical theories in education we owe an indebtedness to our Indigenous ancestors, living elders and communities of place who not only live with us but also left many anti-colonial texts in speeches, literature, and inscribed in the hundreds of treaties where we forced the hands of colonial powers to admit to terms of “peace and friendship” and is why some communities have upwards of 20 treaties with the U.S. government. One thing hooks might include in her label is “Christian”, as in a “Christian, imperialist, white-supremacist, capitalist patriarchy”. Christianity for example shares a deeply rooted imperial and colonial history such as that you cannot talk about the murderous invasion of the Americas without understanding the role between the “sword

and the cross” and the “gun and the bible” as much as corporations and monarchs (Truxillo 2001; Sandos 2004, p. 3). For example, Mofokeng (1988) from South Africa offers this story he insists is known widely and is foundational for understanding the colonial relationship with Christianity, it goes: “When the white man came to our country he had the Bible and we had the land. The white man said to us ‘let us pray’. After the prayer, the white man had the land and we had the bible” (p. 34). Colonialism is built on a legacy of violence, and thus largely what you study today in social sciences is a false master narrative that is sugar coated and whitewashed to teach acquiescence and allegiance to empire as violence, thievery, terrorism, and plain genocide was backed by the rule of law-religion in figuring Native Nations deserved what was coming to them as “outlaws” or “heathens” (Blackhawk 2006; Akers 2004; Prior 1997).

These current discursive threads have similar echoing’s in Forbes, and in many Indigenous leaders of the past such as Wassaja (Carlos Montezuma), one of the founders of the Society of American Indians in 1911, of the first all Native National organizations in the U.S. Wassaja gave a pleading decolonial call in 1915 at one of their yearly conferences that ended, “Let my people go” (Montezuma 1916, p. 33). This was not a plea for equal rights or citizenship, it was to be free of colonial control, exploitation, assimilation and envelopment. In 1973, the American Indian Historical Society led by Rupert and Jeannette Costo began publishing its own quarterly, *Wassaja* named after the leader and dedicated to championing his spirit (Soza War Soldier 2009). D-QU called its proposed school of medicine the Carlos Montezuma Medical School in 1971 but it would never receive the funding to function as they had hoped (D-046 B. 252). In a dissertation study on *Decolonizing Tribal Histories* (2010) Winona Stevenson concluded that “while

much has already been written about the contributions made by Vine Deloria Jr. over the past thirty years, Costo and Forbes have not received due recognition for their contributions to Indigenous historical writing” and I would add especially, perhaps more so, this can be said about the field of education (p. 189). A recent dissertation by Rose Soza War Soldier (2013) thoroughly covered the life and work of Rupert (and Jeannette) Costo, demonstrating for example Costo’s important historical contributions but also his educational and political work with regards to curricular reform. Duane Champagne (1996) and others have traced the disparate and intertwining histories of Indigenous movements from the past and present demonstrating their relatedness as well as their unique approaches and expressions of Indigenous nationalism and adaptation (see in particular, Stein 1992). The spiritual, philosophical and manifest movements of decolonization thought and action by Indigenous scholars and communities have deep roots in traditional Indigenous knowledge, communities and lands. Larry Emerson (2014) argues that although colonization is the dominant visual pattern portrayed by the colonizers, another equal strain is apparent, and this includes “resistance to colonialism” (p. 50). Resistance was found every step of the way, often occurring before invasion could take place during the initial stage of reconnaissance as trespassing is an offence anywhere in the world. Forbes (1969a) takes up this stance many times, and in one case argues that:

it took from 300 to 400 years for the Anglo-Americans to conquer the area of the United States [which] cannot be solely attributed to the ineffectiveness of the Anglo’s military and political strategy, however. Anyone familiar with recent North American history cannot escape from remarking upon the extremely

stubborn and tenacious resistance of the Native American republics, a truly remarkable phenomenon considering the Europeans' overwhelming superiority in numbers and armaments (p. 3-4).

Further, he makes the curious point that the "Anglo-American, even while militarily' victorious, suffered a telling psychological blow. The white North American must forever carry with him the knowledge that the Anishinabeg, defenders of their homes, were both morally superior and militarily more effective (man for man)" (p. 4). This produced a kind of guilt-hate reaction which turned into extreme genocide, massacring of women, elders and children, and from the Crusades to California, namely vengeful racism and cannibalism (Heng 2003, p. 25; Heng 2011). I hope to take up this second strain by following Forbes lineage and legacy to their sources and bounds.

As a recent film title suggests, *Schooling the World: The White Man's Last Burden* (2010), colonialism is now global and its primary arm, schools, are indeed doing the labor (Byrd 2011). Imperialism and colonialism was openly talked about in education circles 100 years ago by Whites like the "father of adolescence" Stanley Hall who also frequently spoke on Indian education at the Lake Mohonk Conferences alongside the likes of Estelle Reel, author of the Uniform Course of Study, the template curriculum to be taught at all the federally run boarding schools from 1901-1932 (Lomawaima 1996). Hall (1904) identified the relationship between empire and education in his seminal work on the subject of *Adolescence*, which is that "the world goes to school. This has become the method of colonization and completes the work of conquest by armies" (p. 494). The concept of schools as assimilative arms of the empire had been tested since before the U.S. founding via segregated churches, praying towns, missions, and finally schools. The

first university in the Americas of non-Indigenous invention was started in 1536, *El Colegio Imperial de Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco*, and which sought to develop a Native clergy able to preach the gospel and create neophytes faster than the Catholic's killing spree had, yet it in fact did not produce a single bishop (Arencibia Rodriguez 2006; Ricard 1966). The college was created to replace the *calmecac* and the *telpochcalli* of the Mexica which had developed advanced higher education institutions to train *tlamacazque* "priests" and other leaders (Lee 2017; Portilla 1974; Brinton 1890). Both societies had fairly rigid social caste systems and thus schools were imperative to perpetuate them. Schools segregate as much as they integrate as the structure implies at its root "separation" or a schism and more so, the concept of control. The root word is *-sekh* "to hold" coming to us from Greek *skhola* "place of learned discussion; at ease (not at work)", and Latin *schola*, Old English *scol*, which developed its first scholastic houses and institutions out of church hermeneutic centers.

Lomawaima (1999) has otherwise addressed the basic colonial education thrust as involving four major tenets which empowered colonizers to perform genocide utilizing whatever means they could justify. First, Christians were a civilized group while Natives were savages (non-citizens, not worthy of rights) and in turn, civilization required conversion, resettlement and subordination, as deficient peoples (p. 3). This in turn required what she politely calls "certain pedagogical methods necessary for their education," at first separate religious and federal schools, praying towns, churches, etc., and later, subordinate public schooling (ibid). Schools are powerful institutions of colonialism, affecting internal and external modifications of individuals and communities' conceptions of personhood and peoplehood, especially when those doing



the “holding” and instructing have an extinctive view of Native Nationhood. Lomawaima (2000), made the comment that “the history of American Indian education can be summarized in three simple words: battle for power”, signifying not empowerment but rather “power over” others (p. 2). Lomawaima and Brayboy (2018) argue that our analysis of imperial education or “schooling” must bear in mind the role the U.S. as empire has historically and presently plays:

When the United States insists on schooling at the expense of Native education through heritage language, culture, and specific knowledge systems; when curriculum fits hand in glove with land dispossession; and when schooling aims to destroy families and children, we can clearly see schools as a battleground of sovereigns, in which knowledge systems, knowledge production, cultural values, and children’s lives are on the line (p. 83).

This is an important point because as Wilson (2004) makes clear that beyond physical oppression, “the process of colonization required the complete subjugation of our minds and spirits so that our lands and resources could be robbed from beneath our bodies” (p. 360). The two go hand in hand. Cognitive or mental imperialism and colonization are supported by forceful subjugation.

The new “buzzword” in colonial theory is “settler colonialism” which says Indigenous removals and replacements by colonizing groups are the major efforts in the U.S. Colonizing groups were allowed to immigrate based not on their ability to adapt, but rather on their ability to reinforce the imperial mission. Settlement, plantation and colonization is a process that can be done by foreign seeds as much as people, but it also can be done by local peoples and seeds. Hence, Deloria (1969) argued for the

“recolonization” of the U.S. by Native Nations given this most basic definition is not always bound to imperial movements but is a life-perpetuating process common to all creation. Most major U.S. cities in fact encompass one or more traditional Native centers and village sites much in the way that *La Ciudad de Mexico*/Mexico City, which is of the largest cities in the Americas today, was also the largest city in the Americas in 1492 (Hugill 2017; Wolfe 2006; Crosby 1997; Forbes 1998b). The problem with “settler colonialism” is that colonialism is and has always meant the act of “planting oneself on the land”, which is even more a rooting concept than “settling”, meaning to set, to sit, to rest. Colonialism is not of one form, such as “exogenous colonialism”, or from the outside or an exploitative colonialism focusing just on “resources” as in “economic imperialism”, but always its involving the exploitation of landed-oceanic peoples of which the term “settler” does not account for either genocide or exploitation (Veracini 2010; Marx 1960, p. 91). The term “imperial settlement” or “imperial colony” clearly distinguishes the allegiance of the group while settler-colonial does not.

There is also “internal colonialism”, which is performed at the local level by a community’s own members, by adopted colonial institutions and knowledge, or by surrounding relationships and influences which are overwhelming (Perley 1993; Thomas 1969). These theories of colonialism help define and describe the specific contexts Forbes discursively worked on and the fields of study he contributed to as well. Forbes used the term settler-colony and colonial-settler but a handful of times, for he probably, like myself, found the term redundant (Forbes 1983 p. 2; Forbes 1982a, p. 5). This study is situated at the crossroads of “post-colonial” discourses. One strand has “hope” in the *post* while another argues against such theorizing as false, similar to the debate found in

anti-racist works which challenge current liberal post-racial ideologies seeking a paradoxically abrupt, peaceful end to racism, which has always been a brutally violent, systematic and deadly way of life (Battiste 2013; Bonilla-Silva 2003). Thus, for this study, I will use the terms imperialism, imperial and imperialistic to describe the invaders way of life, structures, sciences and schools rather than colonial. Perhaps there is a connection between the way “decolonization” is managed by the United Nations, while deimperialization is not a part of the discussion, as the empires transformed themselves into “nation-states” free of their imperial foundations. Identifying the monster beneath the modernist masks requires an alter-*Native* lens.

In following with Emerson (2014) there is a need to look at “Indigenous-centered decolonization”, that which views the multiple ways colonialism has taken root however focused upon Indigenous knowledge and experience, viewing the whole nexus within a “macro decolonization” purview encompassing the whole matrix of interrelationships (p. 58). Given that education is a cultural tradition of creating new members through socialization into a conception of “people”, how does it differ when confronted with producing workers, and other indirect assimilated persons? The answer to this question is at the root of this study, for Forbes describes who and what people are, what education was and is to various peoples and but also what is imperialism and colonialism, and how has it shaped everything we know today. An engaged barometer for the 60’s and 70’s when he was most active, he was an educator for 50 years, and whose efforts identify in many ways, what some people are now beginning to understand. In the mix with many luminous actresses from his time, Forbes view on education is timely as it is unique. My efforts include foremost, a thick reduction of Forbes analytics, a tracing of his

educational and performative efforts, a synthesis of his ideas and lastly, a critique of his work and a sojourn into the beyond. Essentially, what has Forbes left us, and what can we do, if anything, with this insight, now?

### Ch. 3 Methodologies and Methods

#### *Orientations and the Role of the Indigenous Researcher*

The primary methodological approaches or “orientations” as Cajete (1994) calls them, are rooted in the above theoretical frameworks. Cajete (1994) further clarifies this as “rightful orientation” or an approach that is holistic and draws from multiple sources, perspectives, experiences and directions (p. 37). The first of which is a philosophical, theoretical and discursive dialectical approach that is interpretive of Forbes related artifacts and texts as well as my own thoughts and involves a constant reflexive writing method and process. What this means is for this study, the empirical reality is subject to the discursive reality and vice versa. Thus, the basis for this kind of inquiry is in the acknowledgement of a holistic matrix, or “web of relations”. ’Ndeh philosopher Viola Cordova (2007) used the concept of “matrix” to refer to “a foundation from which all else is explained” (p. 66). She often called her philosophical renderings as “windows” or “frames” into her own and others worldviews, beliefs, language and guiding philosophies (p. 61). Holm, Pearson & Chavis (2003) advocated that Peoplehood could be organized into a core “matrix” and is a uniquely Native American Studies (and its relatives) theoretical framework which can be utilized in applied research as it represents like other disciplinary fields a “core assumption” in the same way the law of gravity works in the field of physics. Lastly, as a core assumption “on which any methodology—whether qualitative or quantitative—can be applied” I felt the need to use it to study the matrices and politics of personhood (individual identity *within* community), colonialism, philosophy and education (p. 24). Holm (2005) has expressed elsewhere such as in response to Elizabeth Cook-Lynn’s (2005) polemical article *Who Stole American Indian*

*Studies?* that “one of the big failings in American Indian studies is its tendency to still use the methodologies of the traditional disciplines of anthropology, history, sociology, and so on” (p. 173). My role as a researcher is based upon my intentions, my value base, my matrix, as well as a pre-orientation to the archives or the “field” and the relative keepers of knowledge within it. Performing what is called in the field of History as “document” or “archival research” delimits how I will engage research, as an individual researcher bound by normal community relationships or as a community-based researcher bound also with the specific goals of a community research agenda. This study is not a specific calling drawn from community educational plans but is a chosen site of study from which my role as an educator in community education has inspired me to perform.

As an individually inspired research project a key methodology for example that every researcher has access to and is constantly influenced by is their dreams. Indigenous peoples have long recognized dreaming and envisioning, with eyes shut or open as an ancient approach for “coming to know” and as a reflexive researcher is a foundation from which my research, life and relations revolves around, approximately 7-8 hours each day while sleeping, and 16 hours while awake (Cajete 1994; Cajete 2000). Traditionally, Onöndowa’ga:’ and Rotinonshonni would be implored to responsibly share each other’s dreams usually by guessing or a kind of charades so that “big dreams” could be recognized and responded to appropriately (Wallace 1972, p. 66). I use the term “multiverse” to demonstrate my commitment to the multiple forms of reality that are always present among peoples who recognize dreams as real sources of knowledge and power in the universe, or everything that is “all turned into one” (Cajete 2005, p. 72). My orientation recognizes we are part of a dreaming multiverse and that Forbes and myself

are dreaming beings. Knowledge, relationships, and inspiration can literally come from any world at any time. I come to these archives in hopes that in fully giving myself over to the perspective of Forbes I will in a tutelary way carry forth the generative work he sought to perpetuate in his life as an heir to the movements and efforts he was and still is a core part. As a Native American Studies scholar and advocate these archives form a core part of the history of the movement which I have directly benefited from and carry with me. The archives are in Forbes (2003) declaration, only “debris” of original materials, purposefully saved, but always luck-filled as they are a fragment of his and others communications, performances, creative and productive work. Thus, I come into this study knowing I will not find all the answers in the archives, and that the archives represent at best, both a groomed and random collection that perhaps is flawed as a replete source of living knowledge.

### *Archival Research*

This study is first and foremost a focused rereading and rewriting of the published and unpublished texts and tracks of Jack D. Forbes. A predominance of this “debris” and “residue” as Forbes (2008) called the surviving materials that make up the historical record of the subject is found in various libraries, special archival repositories and collections throughout the California colony, across the other 50 states, in Canada, Europe and beyond. I am sure there are some in European archives as is indicated from a cursory search which elicited 5 archival repositories with Forbes materials. I view the archives as I would a traditional hunting territory filled with deer or as a cattail marsh brimming with warps and wefts. It is a vast place with many histories, lives, sources of

life, tracks (texts), and knowledge. However, as a person raised in an intensive imperial matrix and context of relationships, I recognize that I am already influenced by a lifetime of experiences and knowledge (the English language for example predominates this writing) that at times hinder and help my own work. Forbes archives were pruned and selected for public use by himself, they are one of his prodigious creations in itself and bear his stamp at every turn. It's like reading part of Forbes mind. If it were a forest that survived a fire, some traces of the world would remain, and new life can regenerate on an old foundation.

Cajete (1994) talks about traditional learning contexts and methodologies such as tracking, hunting, gathering and harvesting. In this way I will be looking at Forbes texts as tracks or as tule's in a marsh and the archives as places where his tracks/tules/texts have been relocated, as in a museum. Removed from the marsh, can it sustain life? Are texts as woven ideas anything like the "anasazi" bean found in a clay pot a thousand years later, just waiting to be planted, and imbue "life"? Lucas (2016) describes the process of archival research as "harvesting precollected data" yet I know from experience already that there is a great deal of data, sources and texts which are definitely *not* precollected (p. 7). For example, I the researcher contain a great deal of "precollected" data; about Forbes, about myself, about what has occurred since Forbes passing, in conversation and dialogue with many relative others, and about life in California. Indeed, California the place is a massive archive of information. Lucas further delineates that archival researchers "need to immerse themselves in residues of the processes concerning their phenomena of interest" in order to maintain a "holistic focus" (p. 9). This focus included a locative key and visits to the major places of Forbes life and texts both



represented in archival repositories at these locations and as archived (preserved) places inclusive of: Puvungna, El Monte, Eagle Rock, Los Angeles, Ventura, USC, Reno, San Francisco/Bay area, Sacramento/Davis, Oklahoma, Virginia, Mexico, Spain and more (ibid.). Archival research is largely about sources stored in place, as even digital archives are ultimately based upon physical storage sites and repositories.

This study does focus a great deal of energy upon an already published corpus of texts, or post harvested materials. Like the film *Jumanji* the museum is alive once you play the game, where it's a repository not of "dead" or encrypted materials but of data in flux, in transition, always in process as people use what's left of them, copy them, and revitalize the originals. Archives, texts and "dead leaves" still contain traces of life as they are part of the living world with language "pressed" into a rigid form via symbols and space. Mapping the "geographies of a collection" and in this case numerous collections for research has taken years in order to understand the terrain, roughly six years (Moore, Salter, Stanley & Tamboukou 2016). Further, I approached this research mindful that time "in the field" collecting and processing materials is paramount to developing a cyclical process of data analysis and synthesis (Hill 1993; Creswell 2014). I've worked hard to properly orient myself towards knowing the landscape or developing a "map" of the archival spaces Forbes texts are found, most of which are in California. Born and raised close to Forbes old stomping grounds we also share some similar maps in our heads. I entered "the field" with prescribed processes for collecting, storing, using, analyzing and sharing data, and as Goetz and Lecompte (1984) have said, my methods were "adjusted, expanded, modified, or restricted on the basis of information acquired

during the mapping phase of field-work.... Only after final withdrawal from the field can researchers specify the strategies they actually used for a particular study” (p. 108).

I recognize that I am a single step, blink or thought away from participating in a “ceremonial dialogue” with the inspirited envelopment I find myself and the archives wrapped within. Applying Indigenous methodologies or approaches to knowledge development such as resetting my intention or making “prayerful askings”, smudging with *qaashil* (white sage), or attending a meeting before, during and after research excursions has helped re-focus the research goals within my larger matrix of relations (Cajete 1994, p. 110). In this way, “research is ceremony” in the words of Shawn Wilson (2008) because research “is a ceremony for improving your relationship with an idea. It takes place every day and has taken place throughout our history” (p. 110). I have explained my experience to be as a fiery and passionate educator and researcher, and Forbes is not my own Don Juan Matus but rather more like Wendy Rose (1992), of the “most schizophrenic of creatures, an American Indian who is both poet and anthropologist” (p. 403). I came to this research with these standards and value orientations well anchored and infused. There are communities from which a ceremonial way of life still exists and from which individual, familial and community rooted traditions are drawn. Rekindling and honoring the original sources, the relatives and communities Forbes (and those touched by his scholarly work) represented is also key in maintaining a ceremony-like process which is giving, reverent and grounded in daily and responsive sacrifice. Thus, in the process of doing this archival research, I located and co-wrote a Council for Library and Information Resources-Recordings at Risk grant with UC Davis special collections in order to preserve the 225+ audio and video recordings

located in the collections of Forbes, Hutchison and Risling Jr. We were successful. I couldn't leave the archives after finding out that these recordings were deemed inaccessible for fear of their misuse or destruction. This was a responsibility I felt in my heart to leave things better than the way I found them and to provide local NAS students an opportunity to still learn from the wealth of information about their own program's history, the history of D-QU and the CIEA which are stored on those recordings. They may even listen to their own relatives voices ever clearer. Indeed, I was able to co-teach a grad course with UC Davis NAS students, in which we visited Forbes, Risling and Hutchison's archives and never before had I experienced archival research to be so fulfilling as with a group of like-minded persons. This is not the normal archival experience as you are often solitary, alone, in silence and separated from the mass of patrons and persons who normally walk right by the Special Collections on campus. Further, I was in constant communication with the campus community, with Forbes and Risling's family and relatives, with other scholars and researchers, as well as with the terrain he traversed, as I walked a few miles every visit alongside Putah Creek, soaking up the life Forbes jogged and walked past on his way into town from his 7 acres (Forbes 1987a, p. 122).

This effort was a part of my reverence and respect for the sources and their relations but to also bring up new questions, new visions in the vein of Dakota scholar-warrior Elizabeth Cook-Lynn (2007b) who advised NAS scholars "to keep the plot moving" (p. 67). I have had the opportunity to participate locally in the UCD NAS department because of my active presence, sharing the archives and lessons learned with NAS grad students, in monthly meetings held to revitalize D-Q University, and in

numerous educational opportunities. For me, this research is something I had to do, it's an obligation that I must complete as part of intentions and prayers put forth long ago, some my own, some from my elders who are no longer here, and at the request of community and relatives. The land, place or territory is the ultimate terrain from which all of these archives and actions survive upon and it is the land I return my thoughts to. This study takes place primarily in the colony of California.

### *Critical Place Inquiry*

This study is rooted in the above epistemologies and theoretical frameworks which unequivocally denounce the imperial-colonial matrix of relations as an aberration, and rather as a problem that is quickly making all peoples and communities complicit as we become workers, teachers, etc. of the empire in many ways and forms. Forbes lived his entire life in southern and central Alta California, although recently incorporated as the 36th state, it in many ways epitomizes the new heart of the empire, the Constantinople of Rome. I wanted to make sure that I centralized place, especially in the political and relational sense which is often left out of education research. Drawing from Eve Tuck & Marcia McKenzie (2015) who relate the most salient points that characterize Critical Place Inquiry, a view that regards places as “mobile, shifting over time and space” as are the wind, peoples and life that use them yet are specific and localized interactions and dynamics (p. 3). Further they argue that all of the “disparate realities” such as gender and race are well represented in “place-based processes of colonization and settler colonialism, and works against their forgone-ness or naturalization through social science research” because we can highlight them as well (p. 4). Tuck and

McKenzie (2015) like so many others continue to point out that a “critical politics” of place is needed, one that “takes seriously the conceptual and empirical contributions of Indigenous epistemologies of land” (p. 4). Considering the land, plants and animals as “first teachers” reintegrate my research into the ecology of community and casts shadows upon the archival record revealing itself to be minute compared to creation (Cajete 1994, p. 56; Styres 2011). CPI helps contextualize the archives as littering’s within a colonized land/seascape which is central to rather than on the periphery or background. The “war for America” as Bob Marley’s (1982) *Redemption Song* speaks of is ongoing, and it rages on. Important for this study is the integration of an ethics and orientation with regards to place and to target specific issues which highlight the role of place in a decolonizing philosophy of education, as envisioned by Forbes, myself and others. I see these archives inhabiting a critical nexus, near the capital of the “state”, down the road from D-QU, and the home of NAS, a few miles from Forbes old house, and close to home in so many ways. In tracking Forbes intellectual work, I seek to identify key markers which locate him in place, specifically within a California context but also as one who worked above and beyond its limited boundaries. Also, my own identity and authorship is rooted in a place-based experience comparable in some ways to Forbes as one who was born and raised just down the road. These are our local archives. This is what has happened in this place.

### *Methods of Archival Research*

This study engaged various texts, photographs, audio-visual recordings and artifacts as found in the collected archives of Jack D. Forbes and his near colleagues as well as those he solicited feedback, wrote letters to, and otherwise came to procure

Forbes material. This included in particular his close friends and family who have their own “archives” and memories of Forbes such as Dick Livingston, Carolyn Forbes, Barbara Risling, Quanah Brightman and many others. The main processes involved a deep preliminary scavenger hunt for the location, accessibility and relevance of the sources for this project. Given I have performed such studies in the past I will reiterate my basic steps (see the following helpful collections on archival research; Kirsch & Rohan 2008; Ramsey, Sharer, L’Eplattenier & Mastrangelo 2010; Eidson, Gaillet, & Gammill Jr. 2016). First, I located the “finding aids” to the archival collections. These can be studied in great detail but might differ from what is actually in the collection as these are often created by student employees without prior connection to the research subject, except in the case of Forbes who largely organized his collection himself and was aided uniquely by Melissa Johnson, his sister-in-law who submitted the post-mortem texts and documents. The finding aids ideally reveal what each box and/or folder contains although I know from Forbes collection already the labels may not match the contents, there may be no folders, and even damaged texts as I’ve encountered (Warner 2010). Then I learned that Cutcha Risling Baldy, a niece of Dave Risling Jr. was the one who organized and wrote the finding aid for her uncle’s material as well, and to whom I owe a great debt. The archives are often devoid of indigenous power: there aren’t many Native librarians, most often the materials were collected by non-Native scholars, many were simply stolen, like the lands the schools are on, while most universities are administered by white boards of trustees, and whose goals and mission while public, largely ignore Native Nations until pressed to consider the matter. Indigenous communities are not put on notice when a person uses a related archive unless specified in the collections donation

agreement which have only recently occurred. Indigenous texts, possessions and bodies were before the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) of 1976 widely held by individuals and institutions who have only recently returned some items a group can be connected to while purposely ignoring or mislabeling desired materials. When I was a student at UCLA, we could report that there were more dead native people on campus than live ones (given our count of Native student enrollment versus the number of “interned” bodies stored in the vaults, collections and museums on campus). A film, *Uneasy Remains* was made to bring to light this same circumstance at UC Davis by NAS students there and from which contained an interview with Dr. Forbes on the subject. This study serves to bring more light to the archives so that more justice can be done with respect to education, as I have found many of my students are completely amiss as to what the various archives contain and more importantly, why they “preserve” specific kinds of texts, artifacts and bodies. The archive is also a stained battleground, one that is not often talked about. Forbes archived materials represent a unique, and new tradition, where Native persons and peoples have become of the most significant collections held in imperial, public state universities. The three “founders” of Native American Studies at UC Davis: Jack D. Forbes (D-046) contributed 161 boxes, David Risling Jr. (D-334) 96 boxes, and Sarah Hutchison (D-240) 15 boxes, and represent a purposeful effort to document their creations of D-Q University, the California Indian Education Association, the Tecumseh Center and Native American Studies at UC Davis, as well as California Indian politics, Indigenous education efforts, and the larger Native resurgence which they participated in from the 1950’s to 2011.

One of the strategies employed today that was unavailable in the past is the ability to take photographs of rare documents, as duplicates were often very costly, thus they were only rarely made. This means that most reading and research of archived materials was done on site and in the archives, over long periods of time. This has changed recently and now UC Davis for example does not even charge to use your camera where many other smaller institutions still do. Archival research has changed in the digitization age where rapid obsolescence of former writing and recording mediums is ongoing such as the move from wire recordings (40-50's) to magnetic film types in the form of reel to reel spools and to audio and video cassette magnetic tapes (60's-90's) and now digital laser-read formats predominate and are predicted to make all of the former, minus the most stable mediums such as record, obsolete in a few years. With growing populations as well, archives are consolidating their collections, making parts of them available online and reformatting their materials to current mediums while jettisoning some that are easily reproducible. Youtube.com and other video storage and sharing sites are utilized by academic researchers for their unique sources procured from both institutions and individuals as digital archives. Part of the preparation of this research involves locating, reformatting and transcribing audio and visual recordings which have been otherwise unavailable except through a number of grant initiatives. A majority of archives are held on site, at UC Davis Special Collections in Shields Library. In order to study Forbes thought, I purposely identify Forbes productions as archived texts.



### *Participants, Sources of Data, Instruments and Procedures*

Succinctly, my main participants are the sample size of Myself, Forbes and our Texts as well as the various other authors, interviewers and persons he collaborated with such as is found in letter writing, interviews, committee meetings, and the few joint publications where he had co-authors. Forbes like many humble authors credits his spouse, dearest relatives and loved ones with a great deal of inspiration so I will always highlight the “influences” I find. My sources of data include Forbes empirical textual corpus including drafts, secondary data and observations, audio and visual recordings and their transcribed texts, correspondence, field notes, memos, and journals are part of the textualization and writing process I will help intimate the multiple dimensions of the research experience and the exploration of ideas over time. My primary instruments include myself as the medium for collecting and analyzing data while digital archives are now available which add another dimension in terms of searching and accession. As mentioned previously library websites contain search windows, and archival institutions often make their finding aids searchable as well. I used basic handwriting equipment, and a camera for the archives (no flash photography is allowed in most). My basic procedures are described below. The process is of utmost importance as it maintains a structural approach which although leaves room for spontaneous moves it keeps me aligned with my “prayerful askings”, research questions and goals for the research study.

In Cajete’s (2000) treatise on *Native Science* he advocates a fourfold cycle of “coming to know” which is a “creative process” that begins with “first insight” and completes itself through immersion, creation and reflection (p. 14). My first insight began a long time ago and has festered since, and became especially pronounced during my

engagement with D-Q's revival, an internship in the archives and finally, a special dream. From a physical standpoint I performed this research study as part journey and another part tracking and interpretation, and another part of articulation or sharing. The journeying performed includes my own life's journey paired with Forbes own life journey upon the land and was documented via a journal (handwritten) and will take help from my own personal archives and published works. Journeying and working the bounds of the archives is my process of immersion. The major part of the journeying took place in California as I lived near Davis where Forbes worked-lived during the last half of his life. I lived in the mountain town of Paradise, so-called Pleasure by President Trump after it burned to the ground, and Prejudise by us local residents who know better. Fortunately for myself I stored all of my data on backup drives, and had typed up my handwritten notes before everything was turned to ashen sludge. I narrowly escaped the flames and feel blessed just to write this. My archival journeys took me to southern, central and northern California and those relative archives out of state and in federal, tribal and international archives. Consistent with "tracking" approaches I recircled and revisited important places and archives, especially Davis, and the family and close friends of Forbes such as Dick Livingston, Barbara Risling, Carolyn Forbes and Hartmut Lutz. Forbes began writing early on in life and thus left more than a few traces for people to follow. The third movement of "creation" involves all of the mental and physical notes, journals, memos, poems and prose that I used to create in the process of immersion and through constant reflection, or reflexive reading and writing. I created different versions of texts through transcribing audio and visual recordings into script. Each of these cyclical steps repeats itself constantly. Reflection took place throughout and became an

embedded reflexive practice built into the research by creating spaces not just for memory but for redirecting the course of action in research. Often after a long day of research in the archives I would sit and talk with his family and friends in order to make sense of what I was reading, sometimes it was the archivists. Sometimes I would talk with current grad students, or with NAS faculty and staff. I would walk the Poo-tah-toi (Putah) creek across Davis wondering what he thought when he ran and walked the creek to and from campus 20 years before. I wanted to follow in his footsteps, and so I have.

I hoped the documents would reveal much about what he thought, as they also reveal for Prior (2004) not simply the “content but more at how it is produced, how it functions in episodes of daily interaction, and how, exactly, it circulates” (p. 358). For example, Forbes was a well-received public speaker and has a number of monographs, mimeographs and handmade texts that were circulated after events, handshakes, meetings and through the mail. Further, his later works reveal warm attention to current events, a poetic writing style, deep personal reflection, and a wider range of topics. For example Forbes (1987) notes that the summer of 1979 was a turning point for him as he travelled abroad, “switched to his right brain” in writing poetry and short stories while supporting a student of color writing group on campus at Davis, and began to reevaluate many of his earlier texts and ideas (Forbes 1978a). Forbes was an archival researcher and any study of Forbes must attempt to track a wolf in the woods, or someone who knows the terrain well. Further, he was of the few people who utilized his own archives to continue to write about his own work (see Forbes 1985a as a prime example). I found that most of his speeches and talks were actually lectures first, and further that most of his writings were also lectures, turned speeches, or texts at some point. Thus, he knew his stuff well before

he started writing such that there are almost no early drafts of his works much unlike the great novelists and literary authors of our time who have numerous drafts before the final one, a fact partially confirmed by Talbot (2015) who remarks that when he worked alongside him at the Far West Regional Laboratory at the Claremont Hotel in Berkeley from 1967-1969, he recalled that:

Jack's daily routine at the Far West Lab often began in the morning at a nearby café where he routinely wrote fifteen to twenty manuscript pages daily for his various academic projects. Remarkably, his manuscript drafts required little if any editing (p. xv).

Secondary data analysis is little understood or talked about in qualitative research and has developed a large culture with respect to reanalysis of previously collected archived quantitative data (Corti and Thompson 2004, p. 290). However, as an Indigenist researcher who seeks to challenge colonial hegemony while invigorating and inspiring Indigenous resistance and resurgence I come to “education”, “knowledge”, “data”, “texts” and “art” much differently than my imperial contemporaries (Saunders, Usher, & West 2010). I will use the word “text” as my primary framework for the data collected whose relatives, textile and texture offer insight into the creative and complicated aspects of “rereading” and “rewriting” the “word-world” in Freirean lingo (1987). The primary sources of data are previously created texts such as published works, drafts, letters to and from the author, collected artifacts, notes, professional, organizational and research materials as well as the intertextual personality of a prolific author and educator. This interplay of diverse texts will allow for creative clear thinking and critical in-depth analysis. Newly accessible texts include transcribed audio speeches, lectures, interviews

and poetry. Forbes should be viewed not as one kind of author, but as a performer, and a creative artist who was always sharing with others. Forbes once explained, “I like to use poetry to discuss ideas as well as feelings” and “I wrote from the very beginning different kinds of poems – some poems were romantic, some poems were about adventure and some poems were philosophical” (Filipina 2008). After a local Davis poetry reading of his unpublished collection called *California Songs* at Bistro 33 in April of 2008, weekly host UCD lecturer Andy Jones described Forbes poetry as “historical and trans-historical”, for it “touches upon issues of justice, geography, a sense of what makes up a people, what makes up a society – the responsibility we all have to one another and to the earth. These are important, enduring themes.” (as quoted in Filipina 2008). Thus, to revisit Forbes the performer, as all of his poetry is read-spoken to public audiences is to understand Forbes motivation as an educational leader: to affect internal changes in his audience towards transforming social relationships, environments and experiences.

Imperial and colonial conceptions of texts, data, art and other human produced items made out of the life of other things (trees, rocks, metal, etc.) are perceived as being lifeless, simple “material” artifacts reshaped by human hands, somehow destroying the essence of the subject. In my own view I see how the archives represent a core center of the colonial’s archives of power, and believe they are more than “objects” to be interpreted but rather “subjects” containing life and knowledge. My elders admonished me to consider texts created by my own or others’ ancestors to be taken literally and metaphorically, and to not “crease or scratch their skin” as if they were living trees/people, and to not hastily discard something that could be picked up by others from hair to tools because they contained my essence, my imprint, and access to my intimate

space and power. Stories likewise are also personal creations, and should be safeguarded. Kwaymullina, Kwaymullina & Butterly (2013) offers this perspective on the value of stories and knowledge which speaks to their own traditional teachings:

Aboriginal stories, however expressed or embodied, hold power, spirit and agency. Knowledge can never be truly separated from the diverse Countries that shaped the ancient epistemologies of Aboriginal people, and the many voices of Country speak through the embodiment of story into text, object, symbol or design (p. 5).

It is understood that many if not all communities maintain that their language and culture are oral traditions *first*, inseparable from “culture” which in no way discludes the creation of other forms of representation, be it text, audio-visual, new designs or motifs, etc.

“Researching texts, whether published or archival, creates a relationship between the knowledge and the reader that intersects and finds its embodiment in many realities, laws and relationships. It is a complex process” (ibid, p. 6). I do not assume that the texts simply “give” somebody knowledge as much as they might only “inspire” or fuel the life inside of the reader while taking up space in occupied places. They can just as easily be misinterpreted or misunderstood and in turn, misused. The *Walam Olum* is a key example of an imperial historical text that was utilized for nearly two centuries until denounced as a forgery yet it fooled many scholars for years, including Forbes who cited it a few times before accepting that it was a hoax (Oestreicher 1994; Oestreicher 2005; Forbes 1986). Forbes fought hard to get his texts archived for future generations knowing too well how Indigenous peoples were represented in the archives as “captives” of colonial institutions as well as whose stories are nearly absent from the discourses found in education.

### *Archival Methods of Data Collection*

This is an archival study which seeks to ground itself in the published and unpublished texts of Jack D. Forbes. I decided on a textual approach and analysis once I realized that it takes a certain kind of person to perform archival research, and finally when I learned that there was a great deal of unpublished materials including audio and video recordings of the subject Forbes. I chose to focus on Forbes because he represents an inspiring educational thinker who provides a clear link to the struggles of the past and those transpiring today. This link is most clearly articulated through his oral and written performances which he and others recorded during his lifetime. One way to which I am able to collect, examine, scan and analyze the relative archives is by *journeying* to and from various archival locations throughout the state. Journeying for me also means *returning* to places where Forbes was raised, loved, lived and worked; and some of which I relate to as well. Cajete (2000) maintains the act of journeying for knowledge was a common Indigenous learning practice which might involve solo or group treks or runs to sacred sites and to engage the world as teacher. What makes a site sacred? The key I believe is sacrifice. Thus, colonizers claim their deaths over the land as somehow more sacrificially valuable than Indigenous demographics for 30,000 or more years in the Americas. I identify strongly with the power of movement and how researchers should be inclined to venture to the locales where stories are made, where people come from, and where the archives are located, including and importantly with “people as archives”. Here, the phrase “our elders were living libraries” carries great meaning. Yet what elders have Forbes ideas “archived” as well as Forbes prolific pen? This is where document and archival research methods find a valuable role in an Indigenist process of data collection,

one which is critical of the limits of the archives yet journeys to and from them in order to draw upon elders Forbes, Risling and Hutchison to name a few. This study is rooted in what historians call primary sources or those sources which come “before”, “first” or are “chief” as in direct firsthand knowledge of a person, event or idea. Texts derived from Forbes memory via his voice, pen and actions are prioritized. As a master of his craft, I understand he had the power to include and exclude and so am careful not to hold his words as high as the heavens.

Eichhorn (2008) suggests “the archive is both a point of departure and destination for writing” (p. 1). Eichhorn’s (2013) call in feminist studies for an “archival turn” is being echoed here as they are often dismissed for lack of evidence, a fault of patriarchal social relations and an inherently patriarchal archival tradition. Of the few archival based studies I have found recently from Indigenous scholars include Jennifer Denetdale’s *Reclaiming Diné History* (2007), *To Remain an Indian* by Lomawaima and McCarty (2006), *Education for Extinction* by Adams (1997), *Red Power Rising* by Shreve (2011) and *Clyde Warrior* by Paul McKenzie-Jones (2015) which demonstrate the various kinds of Indigenous stories and people’s found in the archives. Africanist and anti-colonial scholar Reiland Rabaka (2010) studies on educator W.E.B. Du Bois drew from all of the author’s creative works as found in the multiple archives dispersed across the U.S. Rabaka maintained what he called an “epistemic openness” to new ideas and sources by not remaining confined to one kind of source type or restricted by a discipline (such as education) limited purview of what stands as relevant sources or research (p. 28). In this way this study is highly trans or intra-disciplinary, and seeks to make contributions which recognize the nuanced ways we influence and are influenced by others. Influence is a key



concept I focus upon because, as water is life, the fluid nature of the archives must also be recognized, as air knows no bounds, as the sunlight is so great that it bends around corners and shines literally through things, so, may I remember that everything is learning, everything is influential, myself included. A researcher in the archives comes to influence the sources as well, as they can add, take away, destroy or support the archives in-situ. While my destination or destiny is the archival spaces Forbes text inhabit, this is not the endpoint, but a new venue for reflection and movement.

As a wide-ranging scholar, a primary data collection method employed was to mine the archives in order to build a comprehensive library of texts and create a synthetic corpus as a data set. A preliminary survey of these archives began in the summer of 2013 and I have since located at least 22 archives which house materials by Forbes or related to Forbes, not including personal internet-based archives, local libraries, the California state library or the Library of Congress. Fourteen of these archives are located in California. The 6 outside of CA include archives located in New Mexico, Nevada, Utah, Texas, Oklahoma, and Tennessee. Of these 6, I have visited the archives in Texas, Nevada and New Mexico and have received copies of the archives housed at Vanderbilt University (TN). Further archives such as those located at Simon Fraser University Indigenous Studies Department were procured through Dr. Lutz, as well as I made a number of FBI records requests which came back with hundreds of pages of documents on Risling and D-QU, and of course Dennis Banks but with only a few mentions of Forbes. He was not their target. Forbes family and friends also hold great stores of archival material still, and who mostly live in California, but also outside as well. Forbes the lecturer, speaker and poet is archived across the U.S. and Europe in many local libraries and museums who

recorded his voice and presence, of which the majority are in California. These are closely related to Forbes places of residence and work throughout his life such as the Bay Area, Sacramento Delta region and southern California. The main archival repository is at UC Davis within the Shields Library's Special Collections and of which the actual boxes are stored off-site. Here was the academic and enduring family home of Forbes from 1969 to 2011 and where his friends David Risling Jr. and Sarah Hutchison worked alongside each other forming and developing D-QU and the Native American Studies department at UC Davis. Local newspapers and texts from in and around UC Davis further document Forbes and his colleagues struggle to survive and thrive near the capitals of power, knowledge production, and Indigenous community. This is the main site of my research.

This study sought not to be limited to a specific type of data source such as audio, transcribed interviews, poetry, letters or newspaper articles so as to tackle the question of where does he intimate a “decolonizing philosophy of education” across textual forms. The texts are for the most part pre-collected, however, I have uncovered various sources not represented within any archival institution such as audio and visual materials from observers as found on YouTube and other sources. A film, *Finding D-QU: The Lonely Struggle of California's Only Tribal College* (2005) by Christopher Newman for example interviewed Forbes, Risling and others is of the few publicly available audio-visual texts however the original interviews are unavailable due to court proceedings which stunted the film's ultimate production and dissemination. Forbes has at least 555 publications that were previously solicited not including reprints. Building a data set around the key foci for this study is a key task of the collection process from which I will perform an in-depth

textual and interpretative analysis of Forbes lengthy corpus. The core audio and video, published and unpublished texts for this study include around fifty core texts, with half being audio-video. I purposely chose to balance Forbes the performer-author so as to intimate a public persona and leader he was, not simply an armchair historian or email activist which are so prevalent today.

### *Data Analysis Methods*

In following Gall (2007) and Martella, Nelson, Morgan & Marchand-Martella (2013) and other educational history researchers I relied upon three main avenues from which to analyze the artifactual records. My baseline analytical framework includes the purview of *internal criticism*, *external criticism* and *synthesis*. External criticism “establishes the validity of the data, internal criticism establishes the reliability of the data. External criticism would seek to determine if a letter was actually written by the person whose signature was contained on the letter” (Gall, Borg & Gall 2007, p. 177). Internal criticism refers on the one hand to “the accuracy of the information conveyed” but also seeks to dig into the actual arguments the author’s present once deemed authentically related (Martella et al. 2013, p. 343). The “synthesis of meaning” involves braiding the various strands of thought and critique into a cohesive argument (Gall, Borg & Gall 2007, p. 178). Wineburg (2001) suggests three cornerstone practices for analyzing any kind of document: *corroboration*, *sourcing*, and *contextualization*. The difficulties inherent in this study related to these three processes are many. It is difficult to corroborate some of Forbes facts as he is often the only source about many things yet in others he has been corroborated from many sources. Such for example is the case of him using the term *Aztlán* in order to refer to a Chicano homeland of the Southwest as far

back as 1962, a fact checked by scholars who nearly all agree, he was the first to use this term in a contemporary 20th century context and meaning for Chicanos 7 years before *El Plan Espiritual de Aztlán* was publicly conveyed at the Crusade for Justice summit in Denver, Colorado in 1969 (D-046, B.73, F.22; Alarcon 1997, p. 22; Alarcon 1990; Sagarena 2014; Chavez 1984). Sourcing refers to not only authenticating the text via external and internal criticism but also verifying every statement a text makes for internal validity, from the author, grammatically, linguistically, and with other people's versions or truth. For example, it is often difficult to trace the source of a person's ideas, especially if they do not draw themselves unto critical examination or reflexivity. Lastly, contextualization provides the meta-story which frames Forbes narrations and texts and thus gathering perspectives critical of Forbes and the contexts he worked is important for this study as he did not live in a vacuum but rather worked intimately with and amongst like-minded and hostile participants.

A key area of discussion arises with concerns to the audience or intended ears and eyes and hearts that each story or text hopes to speak to. In the case of speeches at an organizational convergence, there are mixed persons from many paths and relationships that are receiving the initial message, however, the archived recording from the view of the audio recording device now audible to the researcher is a set of peculiar relationships indeed. In the case of Forbes, he cared for and deposited a number of audio recordings which are the primary ones available along with fellows Hutchison and Risling Jr. whose collections are studied as well. The next generation of audiences will hear and understand his voice differently given their context, knowledge, language, etc. These are compared alongside written works of Forbes whose audiences are often much greater, and

handwritten letters whose audience were singular to perhaps a smaller number, say 50 recipients. The diversity of audiences and voiced perspectives of Forbes will be an undercurrent found in my approach to the various kinds of texts studied. The use of my own writing process will help facilitate another angle from which voiced approaches may or may not have an audience, and thus the editing process will be highly scrutinized as Forbes was obviously highly literate in English as well as proficient in Spanish and considered by some a speaker of Lenape and other languages. His written record reveals multiple forms of language, symbolism, and other creative expressive forms such as maps, letters, speeches, drawings, new words, and ideas and thus deciphering texts involves a great deal of linguistic and textual analysis.

*Writing as Inquiry, Method, Analysis and Synthesis*

If we think of writing as a tool of the political imagination, it may mean that we need to expand the boundaries of what we define as literature... In expanding our view of literary production—geographically, temporally, and stylistically—we reimagine the bounds of the relationships that Native people have to writing. We are challenged to consider how multiple kinds of texts might serve the multiple needs of Native communities; we are moved to contemplate how writing can operate as a living force of change and sustenance in the landscape (Brooks 2014, p. 256).

Writing as a method of inquiry was also discussed in length by Richardson and St. Pierre (2005) who argue that writing is a method of data collection as well as a method of

data analysis because of its intentional creative possibilities which rely upon interpretation of already collected data or texts. St. Pierre (1995) has previously called upon relegated and absent forms of data which may exist within the spaces of texts (reading between the lines), in the margins (as responses to letters or texts are performed) as well as non-embedded forms of data emanating from both the researcher and researched. These include dream data, sensual data, emotional data, response data (1995) and memory data (1997). These are collected as the researcher utilizes “writing to think” such as by journaling and memoing but may also include letter and grant-writing. Richardson and St. Pierre (2005) offer at least 20 ways of writing as inquiry and method including to “write writing stories” or stories about how you do research. They also include writing data in multiple ways such as narrative and poetic representation. Writing in the margins, or marginalia, is an often-overlooked data source performed with prose, poetry, images or symbols. One exemplary marginal writing by Forbes is found in a letter which represents one of the first times the author has found on any text where he identifies himself as an Indian to others as a response. White Anthropologist Nancy Lurie who was working with the recently formed Indian Teachers Association suggested to Forbes “you should talk with some Indians first” about his idea for an “American Indian University”. Forbes response is missing but within the margins of his received letter Forbes writes, “But we are Indians!” and it is unclear if he ever responded to her as I did not find a corresponding letter in her own archives held at Chico State University (JDF B.7, F.1). These notes and my own create some of these tensions between the spaces of time not recorded elsewhere and brought some generative ideas with them. Note-taking, memoing and journaling were heavily adapted in order to develop generative themes

between various kinds of texts, spaces and styles of both prose and poetry, oral and scripted forms such as this question of the identity of Forbes.

Unfortunately, all of my notes and memos were burned in a fire which identifies for me that knowledge must be duplicated, stored in your memory and used, incorporated directly and applied to your life, otherwise, it's a decaying memory, or worse, it disappears. Such is the case for example of the many libraries destroyed which have yet to be replaced, because you can't just replace these things, they are special and unique, like a person. In the same way, many people learn a mother tongue as a child but because of schools and the larger imperial environment, they are unable to use their language daily and often those people who are able to retain the language talk to themselves or find writing to be their few and only outlets to continually use their memory and languages. Use it or lose it, it's so true. The same goes for archives. They will all decay, degrade and disappear at some point, we don't really know when.

Forbes considered himself an educator, and historian, but also a poet (Forbes 1972; Forbes 2008; Hernández-Avila quoted in Bailey 2011). Although records of his published poetry do not show up until 1968 and primarily in the 1970's, he offers evidence that he started writing poetry regularly in high school in the late 1940's and early 50's, as found only in the archives (JDF D-046, B.151-2). Eisner (1997) argued at the American Educational Research Association (AERA) yearly conference that poetry along with other alternative (maybe normative/traditional to your community) forms of data representation offers a number of positive attributes not found in prose whose language, story, image and use of metaphor predominate the message, and where "evidence" is embedded and incorporated in the total story. First with poetry, there is the

ability for readers to empathize with the work rather than read objectively without regards to the multiple subjectivities at work. Second is poetry can focus upon the particularity rather than abstract generalizations, the “real” and move towards greater authenticity by centering the voice and personhood-peoplehood of the author or other characters. Third is what she calls “productive ambiguity” or where “the material presented is more evocative than denotative, and in its evocation, it generates insight and invites attention to complexity” by the reader themselves rather than relying upon assumptions, definitions, stereotypes and generalizations (p. 8). In this way I seek to evoke readings of colonial California and of Forbes ideas and experiences which are not encyclopedic but dynamic. Fourth, alternative forms can help “to increase the variety of questions that we can ask about the educational situations we study” as well as recognize that

our capacity to wonder is stimulated by the possibilities that new forms of representation suggest. As we learn to think within the medium we choose to use, we also become more able to raise questions that the media themselves suggest; tools, among other things, are also heuristic (ibid).

Poetry is seen then as a finding aid which utilizes different languages and thought. The last argument for alternative forms is the need to meet what she calls “individual aptitude” or rather “everybody’s cup of tea” (Cahnmann 2003). Forbes prose cannot be analyzed without a sense of poetic justice. The archival record of Forbes elicits a strong correlation for poetic interpretation. Poetry is my preferred artistic form of writing while prose is what is demanded in academia. I attempt to bridge this timely gap by providing poetic exegesis when appropriate from Forbes and to include his poetry when



appropriate, as it is his preferred internal reflective kind of writing whereas scholarly texts. Forbes the poet reveals another side of his perspective, as does Forbes the performer, ones that are distinct from scholarly works and formats. The epitome of his theoretical fluency is displayed for example in his *Columbus and Other Cannibals* (2008) which combines historical works, with fiction, anthropological and political texts, poetry and speeches, personal experience and reflection with other literary formats into an enriched and fortified polemical message.

### *Thematic Analysis and Coding Data*

The “data set” for this study is the corpus of Forbes, and while other emic perspectives may be drawn from, as well as etic sources, in the main, Forbes self-produced texts comprise the composite set especially those that speak upon education, peoplehood-nationhood and imperialism-colonialism. Qualitative analysis often utilizes “thematic analysis” by “searching *across* a data set . . . to find repeated patterns of meaning” (Braun & Clarke 2006, p. 27, emphasis original). The critical problematic for this or any study is the concept of “pattern”. Does it mean something repeated or prevalent? Or does it mean more along the lines of authoritative or assumed? A look at the root of this word implies a search for patriarchal knowledge or that approved or parented by *pater*, “father” or bearing fatherly influence.

Thematic analysis can be an essentialist or realist method, which reports experiences, meanings and the reality of participants, or it can be a constructionist method, which examines the ways in which events, realities, meanings, experiences and so on are the effects of a range of discourses operating within

society. It can also be a 'contextualist' method, sitting between the two poles of essentialism and constructionism (Braun & Clarke 2006, p. 13).

*Themis* is the Greek goddess of justice, derived from *thema* or "to set [down]" such as a verdict or weighing of evidence, and it is this concept that I hope to invoke rather than its contemporary patriarchal idea of "patrolling" or "laying down" the law. Themes were chosen based on theoretical but also inductive claims, as I do not possess any special knowledge which would claim to read so deeply into a text as to find a "grounded theory", or a theory not found elsewhere (p. 21). Forbesian thought is unique to its author, however, Forbes would argue for example that much of his idea development is rooted in ancestral thought. This study looks at predominantly "latent" rather than "semantic" themes which "involves interpretive work and the analysis that is produced is not just description, but is already theorised" (p. 24). In this way, themes don't simply "arise" passively from the text, they must be found or identified. Braun & Clarke (2006) suggest 6 steps to thematic analysis which begin with familiarizing oneself with the data and performing any preliminary transactions, transcriptions and translations. Next is an "initial coding" stage of first reading followed by clear "searching for themes". Next is "reviewing the themes", then "defining and naming" them, followed lastly by reporting upon them (p. 45). With using writing as a method of analysis, my themes are not derived only from verbatim text passages but rather from the reading as a whole. In the case of "reading" audio or video texts, active communication is transcribed into a textual or scripted body which is then analyzed for meaning.

Bernard and Ryan (1994) offered 12 different ways to analyze texts of a qualitative nature (content over quantity) which included: (1) Word frequency, (2)

indigenous coding or “local terms”, (3) Key-Words-In-Context (KWIC), (4) Compare and contrast, (5) Social science queries which “At the center are actions and interactions,” conflicts, judgements, privilege and power (6) Missing information, (7) Metaphors and analogies, (8) Transitions, (9) Connectors, (10) Unmarked texts, or those that missed early thematic coding, (11) Pawing, eyeballing and scanning with hunches, ideas or nothing, (12) Cutting and sorting, or pasting (pp. 4-5). With each of these approaches there are limitations. Some of these involve looking for linguistic markers, others are creative and deconstructive, while some involve looking at the content as a whole (Bernard & Ryan 2003). These are helpful tools also in discerning important texts within massive archival collections. Audio or video-based texts for example are subject to many kinds of readings or interpretations that are invisibilized in the transcription process such as the numerous body remarks or actions which go unpronounced as intuit responses and are thus, non-transcribed language. Therefore, in the case of video recordings, a running non-linguistic record will be synthesized with the verbal-linguistic script so as to create a dynamic reading of the body as a total performance. In one of the interviews I analyzed that Forbes had done with Lois Crozier-Hogle in 1991 (published in 1998), Forbes repeatedly said the phrases “uh-huh” and “yah yah” in order to show agreement, but these were left out of the final edit of the interview, as were the numerous times he laughed out loud along with the actual questions posed by Crozier-Hogle demonstrating the edited interview to be a new text, derived from the original performances. In this case, for example, I use the original drafts rather than the published version because they intimate the personalities of interviewer and interviewee together rather than appear, as in the final version, as a monologue by Forbes. Thus, transcriptions

of audio are susceptible to the transcriber. When I transcribed audio and video recordings of Forbes, I purposely included these gestures if and when possible so as to have a complete transcription as possible. However, we have to admit that any transcript is never a perfect rendition of all gestures, audible sounds, or voices in our heads, let alone ideas. So, while Forbes may have read the transcript of their interview (a copy was found in his archives), it is unclear how much power or influence he had on the final manuscript published 7 years later.

In Hanes Walton Jr.'s (2004) study of the political science educational philosophy of early Africanist educator Ralph Bunche, his textual analysis offered five intellectual categories of which Bunche spoke diligently upon, one of these was colonialism, while another was education. These each were located in the empirical texts of Bunche rather than "others" interpretations. Eduardo M. Duarte (1999) performed what he termed a "synthetic textual analysis" by what he describes as a process which "braids" the strands of evidence he gathered in his piece by piece reading of Paulo Freire's *Education as the Practice of Freedom* which focused on this single text (p. 389). Marlene Kadar (1993) talks about creating an "epistolary constellation" in her study of Trotsky, Kahlo and Birney by combining letters from numerous archives into a fabricated field, one that totally surrounds the researcher with evidence not of their making (p. 103). Coding, collage, constellation and braiding will help visualize and distill the luminous and relative sources from the distant and dim while moving in and out of focus. The first thing I did however is "map" out the life of Forbes showing movement. Next I mined the texts for his philosophy and refashioned the gems I found. Lastly, I critiqued and revisited the questions, texts and larger critical community to bear upon his ideas. The most valuable

step in this whole process of my performance of listening, analyzing and coding for themes involved: time. Without letting themes resonate over long periods of time I would have been unable to discern his meaning with a single listening session. Further, I let the themes resonate as well as diffused and shared them with family, friends, colleagues and strangers (such as the special collections staff), which allowed me to confirm or revisit his works again with a fresh vision, with questions, and with more information. The key in locating themes is context as they fit into a larger picture beyond a cursory scan. Often, I would bounce what he said off another person and then read or listen to them for some kind of response about specific ideas Forbes shared. I often doubted if I even understood who Forbes was at all because he lived and worked tirelessly for so long and had so many connections and relationships which continually demonstrated that he did not live in a vacuum and more importantly, he shared his ideas frequently. It was key to locate people and sources who could confirm what I heard before moving further with analysis as they *knew him*. For example, when I first listened to Forbes speech on “racial myths” in education (D-334, B. 61B), I took handwritten notes back in 2013 based upon a single listening session, only to return to this same recording 4 years later which produced a whole new transcription based on a total reading of his other texts and recordings which helped inform my listening. My first notes and listening had misunderstood and mis-transcribed much of what he shared.

#### *Methodological Issues: Trustworthiness, Limitations, Delimitations*

With a focus upon archival research, I was weary as Fraser and Todd’s (2014) experience in the archives left them querying, are the archives worth decolonizing?

Further, they remind readers of the *context* of colonialism and its genetically engineered spider web where “to access archival materials in Canada [or California] is to move across geographic, political, and even linguistic boundaries” (p. 3). Some of the major issues I dealt with involved the initial series of questions which guided this research. The sources bear a considerable trustworthiness given the periods they were produced (recent) and the dearth of the record, however, major questions arise when one considers that Forbes practically groomed his own collection to perfection, that is, until around the time of his death when his remaining materials were filed not by himself but by others such as his sister-in-law Dr. Melissa Johnson amongst others. She knew him personally, so I had to trust her intuition and organization greatly. Thus, a search for outlying texts is paramount. This study is thus limited as to what kinds of “new” facts it can reveal regarding various details of Forbes life as its focus is upon the ideas expressed in the available texts. The sources overwhelmingly are rooted in Forbes own pen, voice and creative efforts and can be triangulated across the record for variation and patterns. Forbes literary and public voice is the subject. Therefore, I have adopted the view that Forbes texts and performances are to be centralized. Lastly, I sought to comprehensively and completely read the corpus which I believe no other scholar has *except* Forbes himself. He cites his published texts frequently, but never his performances, demonstrating that the text when viewed in comparison has a specific kind of value, to him, to readers, to imperial auspices, to historians, to Native scholars, relatives and community.

The limitations of this study are many. First and foremost is the lack of outside voices who can speak to Forbes as experienced by others. However, this aspect was

restrained so as to provide an opportunity to do both by critically interpreting the entire corpus of Forbes and later, focus upon Forbes relatives, colleagues, students and critics stories and perspectives. Part of this study's rigor is in its transparent exposure of the limits of archives itself by drawing upon *all* of them rather than only a few major sources which say predominantly what others are saying (these are the only sources they know). Further, by relying on only a few sources I noticed that many scholars who have studied Forbes have relied upon a very limited data set (such as a single text) and often come to the conclusion that this was his final and only say on the matter. A prime example is scholars of race who utilized Forbes (1993) *Africans and Native Americans: The Language of Race and the Evolution of Red-Black People* as the premier text on the subject when in fact, it's a culmination of nearly 25 years of prior research, and the second version of his earlier work, *Black Africans and Native Americans: Race, Caste and Color in the Evolution of Red-Black Peoples* (1988), of which he was advised to drop the word "Black" by the publishers. Forbes worked with many of these major themes his entire lifetime, and constantly developed his ideas over time. Lastly, as a study of his philosophy and the philosophy of educational institutions I sought to bridge the biographical distance with a replete view of the ideas he made sure to share in his text. Thus, I seek not to tell his story as much as synthesize how he told his story and make this perspective more known. The archives are not the "official" record of Forbes as they represent mostly materials with his bias, yet given these debatable limits, the textual record can only say so much and it is these perceived limits this study seeks to tackle. A firm believer in the power of the oral tradition, I see the textual residue of Forbes as a

variant format with unique limitations and values. Part of this study's goal was to demonstrate clearly these limits while distilling a unique voice amongst them.

### *Conclusion*

I struggle to advocate the idea that any one study can and will find a plausible solution to the problems engaged herein, namely, the “imperial or colonial problem”, a thread so thick and reinforced that it has not been overcome but merely challenged since the end of the wars with the French empire in the early 1800's and the defeat of Tecumseh in 1813, where after there never was again a unified resistance during the removal period to 1830 when Native Nations were collectively subordinated and internalized legally East of the Mississippi river. However, resistance to colonialism cannot be judged only by military engagements of which some lasted in California until 1915. Forbes (1971) suggested for example that “a man can be outwardly conquered, and if he opens his soul to the conqueror he can be inwardly conquered as well. But if he keeps his soul, he can remain free although his body is in chains” (pps. 241-242). He furthers the point by arguing, “*conquered but still free*, that is the secret of Indian survival from Alaska to Patagonia!” (emphasis original, p. 241-242). What does he mean by this and how does this statement characterize his lifelong acknowledgement and advocacy for Indigenous resistance to colonialism? The archival record reveals that Forbes reflected on this maxim of his, and concluded, “if you can help our students to comprehend that message you can be proud of your role as a teacher” (Forbes 1989b, p. 39). How does this translate into a philosophy of education, one which supports autonomous Indian communities and community control over education? What



does this look like and what do we have to do to get there, meaning, to a place where Indian, Chicano and other peoples are able to resist the further erosion of territoriality, ceremony, language, history, clanship, governance and power while revitalizing and maintaining the core of community life and lands? Essentially, how does he advocate for a deimperializing and decolonizing philosophy of education, one which challenges empire while supporting communities will to survive and more, to thrive?

Looking at Forbes early and posthumous manuscripts, I have found a trajectory which is developed over time, yet the core of his ideas remain substantially the same as they advocate continuously for a genuine rebirth of Indigenous thought and action as manifest in community survival and the establishment of healthy communities in a seemingly bounded and enveloping empire. For example, Forbes advocacy for American Indian Studies was part of a long-term process of decolonization, one in which entailed the creation of a Native American intelligentsia, or a cadre of strong leadership that could wield all the tools in their tool belts without becoming conquerors or masters themselves however haunted by Audre Lorde's (1984) cautious message that "the tools of the master will never dismantle the master's house" (Forbes 1980; Forbes 1996). I have found that Forbes live performances contain comparatively and remarkably similar language and positions with regards to his promotion of an Indigenous rebirth and decolonization, where many of his most well-known published works were in fact speeches or talks given to Indian and Chicano Peoples first and foremost before they became "public record" (see *Educational Liberation; Evolution of Native Americans; Decolonization and the Search for a Philosophy of Education* (1979) as well as other speeches that became literature *after*). It was my belief that after a careful examination of his life, record of scholarship

and community work that the consistency of his ideas and messaging, as well as the development of them over time offer powerful points of departure for advocating and building upon community struggles for autonomy, “coming back to our power”, rebirth and respectful relations today and for future generations.

One clear example comes to mind which is the articulation of the educational idea of “full education”, meaning, education that teaches the whole person, and the whole community and judges its success based upon the latter’s health (and wealth) given their standards and values of what the “good life” looks like (D-046, B. 160, F. “Full Education”). Any educational approach, whether its rooted in the home, in their territories, at school or college, in the garden or forest, in the home, *hooghan*, *kiva*, roundhouse or longhouse or wherever opportunities for learning are performed and worked, they must contribute to the success of the People from which an individual or group is rooted. Greg Cajete (1994) has consistently advocated for the development of an endogenous education, who like Forbes found insight and confirmation of the power of Indigenous educational philosophy in drawing from the Mexica teaching dictum of *in yollotl, in ixtli* or “with heart, with face”, who in addition adds the notion of “with foundation” meaning, a cultural or community fount for knowledge such as a trade, vocation or specialization. Forbes forged his foundation early on as a historian, educator and leader in the 1950’s. Consistent to Cajete’s message is the idea that education is a community-based learning process, one which reinforces the sociality of the group or family from which people are related. White people for example have consistently created separate and inferior forms of education for “others”, those they deem at the time to be unassimilable through the same kind of educational experience (or experiment).

Thus, any school or institution of learning that Indian and Chicano People attend, if not controlled and recreated in their own image are in fact attempting to further the colonial project of displacement and exploitation. Now in a “desegregated” era, we find however schools are not wholly transformed, as students, communities, languages and ideas are indeed “segregated” from each other by subject matter, by location, by funding, by “gradations” or grades, by “achievement” and test scores and many other avenues for control and manipulation. The focus has moved drastically away from “full education” and from a “spiritual education”. Forbes (1989b) once explained the struggle today this way:

History is not progressive, but cyclical. That is, the evils of the white man and some Indians and others are a repetition of previous eras wherein other people went astray and contributed to the destruction of a cycle. We are now in the fourth or fifth world from the Native perspective. This world may be destroyed because of man’s evil. More and more inventions, etc., may not lead to any great “utopia” in the future, but simply to the end of this epoch. Furthermore, what really matters is the spiritual struggle of all creatures, the struggle for perfect “character development,” not a great invention (p. 39).

Given the resurgence of anti-imperial and decolonial thought and actions expressed today as well as the longtime promotion for Indian control of education from the bottom to the top, I have found Forbes ideas and actions even more prescient, yet disturbingly absent from most educational and community-based scholarship.

I want to conclude this discussion by attending to the fact that much of Forbes published works are out of print or have never been reprinted, although some studies such

*Apache, Navajo and Spaniard, Native Americans of California and Nevada* and *Columbus and Other Cannibals* are currently available, these are merely three of more than 555 published works, and are neglectful of his myriad unpublished manuscripts, his live community-based performances (speeches, talks, workshops, poetry readings, board meetings discussions, and others), as well as sorely limited to his historical and cultural studies completely distancing himself from contemporary readers and community as an all-out educational leader and Indigenous intellectual. I hope that my careful comparative study of his archival texts and performances, I have been able to distill the basic and specific details of his educational prowess, his anti-colonial and critical imperial legacy, as well as rejuvenate insightful and generative discourse which reestablishes the ideas of Peoplehood-Nationhood, Education and Decolonization as intricate and interwoven strands of the same taut thread.

Essentially, we are related, and so are all of our problems, especially the “colonial problem” and as such, eliminating or reforming one of the strands will not in itself untangle or unweave the major cord from which all of our nooses, collectively, is secure in our own mass hanging. Indeed, many western scientists say our lands and waters will be so polluted by 2100 that they will be uninhabitable. Linguists are equally saying that so many speakers of “small nations” will not reproduce new generations of the more than 5,000 languages and unique dialects into the next century. As an educator, as one who believes that peaceful decolonization through massive and revolutionary changes in a majority of the world’s consumers values and ideologies is of the few possibilities we have left on the table, meaning, I have hope still. Unless of course we choose a totalitarian state which tells us right from wrong and can either save us or destroy us all

in a single, mechanical thrust, a position advocated by Marxist come Socialist and Communist ideologies since the mid-1800's. Forbes was a revolutionary democrat however, and he believed that people should have the choice, the freedom to be as they are without being forced militarily or through mass brainwashing or miseducation, which is also the freedom to fail and make mistakes along the way and to make decisions that other Peoples or groups might not want for themselves (Forbes 1979b). He argued consistently, that "we can have new visions", and that we should because these visions are unknown and unseen as they will be envisioned by the next seven generations, and hereafter (Forbes 1991/1997). Will totalitarian states allow for new visions? Will republican democrats allow for new visions? Will democratic republics allow for new visions? Will capitalist or communist or socialist states allow for new visions? Or do these great visions and visionaries come always from a community of people engaged in a struggle to live peacefully, with health, with beauty, with sustainability and a "theology of nature" as Cajete (1994) has poignantly framed our traditional community philosophies? I believe Forbes life and career as found in his vast archives holds the key to his position, and although we may not agree with it, it certainly did not advocate for a one size fits all approach to solving the colonial problem. Instead, he consistently advocated for pluralism and diversity, for the "small nations", for the numerically inferior, yet spiritually superior groups which cling to and develop ways of living, learning and loving, which in the end, embrace all of us.

#### **Ch. 4: The Development of a Philosophy of Education**

Let us be frank. The values of Native American culture are at many points directly contradictory to the values of the dominant society. Will white school boards allow such different values to be taught in “their” schools? If not, then desegregation is nothing more than another enemy of the Native people and must be resisted at any cost (p. 90, Forbes 1973b).

##### *Introduction*

Nearly twenty years after *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* (1954), thirty years after *Mendez et al. v. Westminster* (1946) and fifty years after *Piper v. Big Pine* (1924), Forbes was arguing that federal desegregation efforts, were by and large, white imperial compromises towards the ultimate goals of incorporation and envelopment of native American, Black, Chicano and other communities as imperial subjects. Community creation, control, development, and assessment of education, let alone a repeal of the draconian, racist, and paternalist infrastructure were side barred for whimsical integration, soft and safe multiculturalism and an otherwise limited reformism which re-sanctified imperial, white, patriarchal and capitalist values as the tap-roots of a neoliberal schooling system. Forbes historical view of imperial education is always intermeshed with his personal social-political-spiritual framework, and thus to study Forbes unique philosophy of education, one must understand his root system of values and influences as well as his own experiences in education as a student, teacher and leader.

Unique to Forbes the educator and in this study in particular, is that Forbes archives have left very little in terms of material or documentary evidence of his actual teaching practice, with more information about his philosophy and approach to education. Normal records of teaching materials and the dialogical dimensions of his pedagogy are faint in the archives Forbes, Hutchison and Risling minus the sporadic syllabus (7 in total), student work (20 in total), a few maps and handouts, and no lecture recordings. Yet what is apparent is that his work is transparent and fluid, as demonstrated through his performative approach to social dialogue via public speaking, lectures, poetry, writing and organizational work, such that all of his efforts are threaded together. His style was not vulgar or obscene, but rather persuasive and emotional as he relied upon his own research, and the experiential lore of his and related elders in order to weave his truth into a granary packed with the seeds of wisdom he had gleaned. He is consistent from one medium to another, from one setting and context into another, providing a critical current and voice from the 1950's until 2011.

Of his more than 555 published works, over 100 speaking engagements, hundreds of letters, notes and unpublished drafts of various authorship, Forbes only advises educators and education in the specific, and as the central topic of discussion a handful of times. This chapter will pull together these limited sources while inferring from the most relevant related works in order to describe Forbes general philosophy of education and his pedagogic practice, in and outside of the classroom. On the whole, I have found that Forbes chose to make his home in an educational environment for a number of reasons, including: previous experiences in k-12 and college level as a student and as an instructor, the opportunity to make positive contributions on behalf of the public in a

community service type role, to work in an environment surrounded by like-minded persons, and to transform the education system. Forbes did not have a degree in education nor did he come to the university primarily to make contributions in the field of education. Instead, Forbes decided early on in his career that he was going to fight on behalf of all peoples, especially his own Native American and related community by advocating for the central tenets of any educational effort, which is to raise good people. More specifically he taught and advocated for particular views upon: personhood-peoplehood or nationhood, democracy or community rule, Americanization or indigenization, diversity and pluralism, imperialism and colonialism, decolonization and anti-imperialism, anti-racism, castization, and sexism, spiritual revitalization as well as ecological sustainability. Within these areas we find some of the other more commonly devoted subjects he chose to teach and talk about including history, language and literacy, religion and spirituality, law and governance, the arts, music and poetry, family and community, and also those things he despised most of all, such as war, abuse and oppression.

Forbes spoke and wrote about education from a revolutionary democratic and Native American perspective prior to 1967, and is clear to the author that the founding of the Ad-Hoc Committee on American Indian Education in 1961 and the formation of the California Indian Education Association in 1967 had a major impact on him and solidified his influence upon others as well (Forbes & Crozier-Hogle 1997a; Forbes 1985a; Risling 1975; Caspar-Denman 2013; Marquez 2010). It seems that many other sources and influences all were combining in ways which forced him to take stronger stances and seriously develop an anti-imperial and decolonial perspective in education.



For example, while at the Far West Educational Research Laboratory from 1967-1969, he was the only person committed to grass-roots community struggles, development and educational issues. As Shreve (2009) has noted “under Forbes influence, Far West Labs sought to incorporate Native perspectives when devising new educational programs,” which they had never done and would never repeat (p. 164). For example, in one of Forbes (1967c) texts written while a part of the “Far Out” lab as some coined it, Forbes complained that at the time “deficit thinking” was a common explanation for so-called minority groups plethora problems in education:

The concepts of “culturally disadvantaged youth” and “culturally deprived youth” have been coined and they serve to suggest that the minority group pupil and his family are at fault. The pupil and his subculture should be manipulated, this line of approach suggests, while the traditional school is, in effect, a finished product which has served majority group pupils well and should, therefore not be seriously challenged. Minority groups must adjust, must conform, must change while the schools and their programs are basically sound and need no fundamental revision (p. 7).

However, unlike most educators, his framework for understanding why this was the case, was deeply historical, nuanced, and pragmatic. Forbes had studied the fine points of Christian, Anglo and Spanish imperialism and in turn, the role of education within empire (Forbes 1957; Forbes 1959; Forbes 1960; Forbes 1963; Forbes 1964b; Forbes 1966a). Forbes perceived audience was expansive, as he focused his research upon historical and contemporary community education efforts, so he speaks candidly to imperial white educators and liberals about their privilege, role and approaches, while centering

indigenous, Black, Mexican and communities of color as the primary populations rather than he considers to be the real Americans. For example, Forbes (1967c) points out that,

[white] Educators seem often to operate in a mythical world created by the nature of their own middle-class contacts. Having little to do with non-Anglos or low-income people generally, they assume that the possession of Anglo middle-class skills and values will, in effect, function successfully everywhere and at every level of life. Anglo educators in much of the Southwest live, for example, in self-created Anglo oases, cut off from the Indian-Mexican reality around them. They and their fellow migrants from the Middle West or South have created middle-class spatial and attitudinal ghettos which have little meaningful contact with at least large portions of the surrounding population. But the educator fails to suspect that it may be his culture which is alien and regionally irrelevant and, therefore, he attempts to train young Navajos, Hopis, and Mexican-Americans to be middle-class Anglos. What kind of a social context will most of these non-Anglos have to make their living in? Certainly not an Anglo middle-class one! (p. 11).

White people must be ancillary rather than central to Indigenous, Chicano, Black and other communities educational and national struggles, for they cannot teach or model what they do not value or understand as the privileged citizens and subjects of their empire. White people, and their many sects, can only teach what they know from which Forbes (1966a) says, “on the basis of the treatment of the Indian, one must conclude that the ideological attachment to liberty and democracy has often been less strong

than tendencies towards White Supremacy and cultural imperialism” (p. 17). This includes the core stories, traditions and structures of: whiteness, imperialism, patriarchy, exploitation, capitalism, Christianity, imperial English and the other “alien” and “irrelevant” tap-roots of their embodied peoplehood. Further, and more to the point, Forbes clearly understood that he was saying what needed to be said to those in power. He argued very succinctly, and in language that the academy would understand and accept, which is that the basis of contemporary schools to be not culturally in-sync institutions, but rather, they are indoctrination centers:

More telling than any other argument is, however, the fact that Anglo middle-class people have had their own way for at least a century. Negroes, Indians, Mexican-Americans and other racial-cultural minorities have been guinea-pigs for “experiments” in monocultural, monolingual, “vacuum ideology,” “compensatory” education for as many as five or more generations, and the record is not one to inspire confidence. What is needed today is not simply more and more of the same in greater doses (that has been tried before also) but a completely different conception of the function of the school and of its relationship to cultural heterogeneity (p. 12).

The great experiment of empire has failed everyone except those in power, and thus, only a “completely different conception” of education and schooling is required. What is the alternative conception and what are its prime values and roots? The answer is located at the center of Native communities’ traditions of democratic living and learning, as well as the unique approaches to surviving and challenging empire which are both ancient, and cutting-edge.

Forbes conception of democracy and democratic education is founded on a number of principles already established by 1967, including: community control and consolidation of power; lack of external pressure to conform, change or be infiltrated; consensus and the ability to talk things out and come to an agreement together; while force, coercion and violence negate democratic decision making and authentic unity; decisions cannot be made by a majority for a minority without *their consent*; and a democracy is also an economic, spiritual, and tradition-bearing Nation not simply a set of laws or procedures that are required to identify with such a name. In a democracy as imagined by Forbes, education begins at home, and then one should find “home” at “school”, and after “school” one should find “home” again. There should be no clear separation between these institutions in an integrated, holistic, and open democracy governed by familial communities. With the disintegration of ancient familial and national traditions is the loss of educational practices which have been assumed by federal, state, religious, and local imperial governments. Thus, in Forbes view, if any of these locations of learning are negating democratic experiences, then it is assured there is going to be a disconnect, push-back, and alienation.

To this point, Forbes (1971b) complains that in the U.S., white’s as a political power group have effectively disabled any real chance of democracy or a democratic education:

theoretically, public education in the United States is “democratic” and responsive to community needs. In fact, however, the Anglo-American has come to control the schools almost everywhere, either because of numerical superiority in a school district, gerry-mandering of seats on the school board, control of the state

educational apparatus, or simply because of the power and influence of the Anglo educational establishment. It's difficult to ignore the fact that American Indian children go to schools controlled either by a rigid federal bureaucracy or by local white school boards; that Negroes are either barred from control over their own schools by state action, as in parts of the South, or are a minority in a large metropolitan school district; that Mexican-Americans are in a position similar to the urban Negro, except in rural areas of the Southwest where they are, as of yet, submissive even when in a numerical majority; and that most other minority groups are in equally powerless positions. Most educators are not obligated to serve the interests of these groups, with the result that most non-Anglos still have little voice in educational affairs (pp. 15-16).

Forbes (1967c) early democratic vision for education attempted to solve the issue of "hodge-podge" multiculturalism, tokenistic measures, English mono-lingual schooling, authoritarianism, and other founding principles of modern educational efforts as epitomized at public schools, saying,

the problem of educating pupils in such a way that the school is both relevant to the individual and to the full heritage of the region and of the nation. True education is always cross-cultural and always cosmopolitan. Perhaps we have now arrived at a stage of sophistication sufficient to allow us to proceed with education and to dispense with a fixation upon conformity and Anglo-American superiority. But if this is the case, it will demand a radical change in the fundamental orientation of most schools, and this in turn will demand intensive

analysis, experimentation, demonstration, and leadership on the part of innovative educational agencies (p. 26).

In comparison, Forbes (1967d) spoke upon the topic of “The Need for Indian Involvement in Education” at the first statewide all-Indian education conference held at North Fork, CA on Oct. 20-22, 1967 as part of the convening conference of the California Indian Education Association. His key point was that

education is the key to [the] development of self-sufficiency and improvement.

But before education can be successful, the programs must meet the needs and desires of the local community. To bring this about, Indian people must become fully involved with their schools--as school board members, PTA members, teacher-aides, etc., and must be concerned with the education of their children (p. 49).

He clearly summarized his views which he had been sharing to all the diverse cross-strata of Native community members present when he said,

It may be well that a conquered population can be truly liberated from the state of being conquered and powerless only through a process of self-liberation wherein the people in question acquire some significant measure of control over their own destiny. As a part of this process, a conquered people must acquire some control over the various mechanisms which serve to develop or destroy that sense of inner personal security and pride which is essential for successful participation in socio-political affairs. All forms of education, including that which derives from the home, the community and mass media are crucial in this connection (ibid, p. ii).

Why is education a key battleground, if not *the* central place of our struggle? Part of his perspective comes from his own experience being mis-educated in public schools, and while he speaks glowingly of the learning he gained at home from parents and other family, on the streets of Los Angeles and in his barrio, he obviously feels that the threat posed by white and imperial education forms was real and dire and that alternatives were needed, fast. What were these influences and foundations which Forbes relied upon in order to develop his unique philosophy of life and education?

### *Forbes Influences and Education*

Forbes describes his own learning journey to have been an intricate sweltering of teachings, stories, experiences, dreams, education and relationships which he amassed during his youth and continuously grew upon throughout his life (Forbes 2008, pp. 61-63). For example, he recalled that early on in his life he wanted to be a historian, in his earliest estimate, by 7th grade (Forbes, Escamilla & Meade 2001, 6:38, Get the Word Out #54). Forbes was raised by family, among his mother's parents as his father's parents had passed before he was born, as well as amongst a plethora of aunties, uncles and significant others (Forbes 1991a; Forbes 1997c; Forbes, Escamilla, & Meade 2001). Forbes had many teachers in his lifetime whom he paid homage to and from which he regarded as key to his genius and development. His parents, grandparents, aunties, and uncles provided a consistent source of inspiration and rootedness for the young scholar, and of course, there are those family that provide the opposite kind of modeling (Forbes 1991a; Forbes 1997c). Forbes worked all his life, as a youngster helping his family at their bakery and elsewhere through high school, whereas after high school he could be

found driving milk trucks with his father and uncles, loading trucks and working in a warehouse, also with the forest service until he started to substitute teach while a graduate student and then teach at the college level while finishing his doctorate (Forbes 1987; Forbes 1997c; D-046, B. 41, F. “The Greatness of the Native Mind).

His mother Dorothy was remembered as to have an incredible green thumb “always planting things” and as he recalls he gleaned from her “the love of beauty and sensitivity. She was a very kind person, very thoughtful person. Very spiritual”, although a Methodist Christian which he rebelled against (“Forbes interview by Crozier-Hogle” 1991/1998, in BANC MSS 98/144c, B. 1). His father was always working, and young Jack would accompany him often:

Actually I started that learning process early on, since my father was a truck driver and I used to go with him a lot. My father walked these streets Staying in cheap hotels looking for work fifty years ago And he and I both driving trucks All around these alleys Delivering milk and cottage cheese butter ice cream To restaurants forgotten now Starting out at three a.m., a little boy at his side sitting high in the cab of a big truck One day I got my own so I know, I know these streets (Forbes 1987, p. 118).

He would also take him out on the land for hikes, would tell him stories and “study” with him, training and testing young Jack on Indian history, labor struggles, and other subjects (Forbes 1987; Forbes 1991). He developed his core values he credits to these early experiences with family and in special and sacred places he called home in the 1930’s and 1940’s near Los Angeles which was still rural beyond the downtown center. He recalls, “those were hard times, but growing up poor has given me a sense of loyalty to



working people, to the oppressed, and to the struggle for human dignity which I don't think I'll ever lose" (Forbes 1987, p. 114).

As Forbes (1981b) paints it in one of his poems, young Jack was always "looking for the wise," in his barrio of El Monte, on the streets of Los Angeles while riding the red cable cars all around town, or walking in the hills around Eagle Rock, in the blooming high deserts of Joshua Tree and Coyote Hole Canyon, hitchhiking all around California, by rail to Chicago and back, and in his global adventures that led him to dozens of countries as a celebrated scholar, educator, speaker and leader. His experiences on the land and amongst family and community are the most relished of his sources, for they offer avenues of learning where love and respect were found, where his potential, giftedness and genius were treasured and nurtured. His mother Dorothy was a constant influence throughout his life, living until 1990, while his father George died while he was 21 as a student at USC in 1955, he was remembered as a hard-working and honest man who provided a solid model for young Jack. Also he speaks of "great aunts" and uncles, "wonderful grandparents", and cousins who formed his core circle of influence while constantly in touch with the environs he lived in: a rural ½ acre filled with plants of all kinds, goats and geese, surrounded by farms and dairies with his family was also working in the dairy business, and then later in the sage scrub filled hills around Eagle Rock as well as the sacred stone itself which he often perched to expand his vision and dream of the world, and himself (Forbes 1991a; Forbes 1992b; Forbes 1997c).

Raised in the once rural southern California of the 1930's and 40's, the post-depression era and world war II urbanizing projects were major influences on Forbes upbringing and family life. As a Rappahannock, Lenape, and mixed European descendent

raised in El Monte and also in the suburban town of Eagle Rock, Los Angeles, Forbes early life was in proximity to Los Angeles' cosmopolitan and corrupt imperial metropolitan which nearly engulfed his spirit, his indigeneity, and resistant mind. He developed a special sight through his "half-breed eyes", through "hard narrowed Indian eyes" (1992b pps. 22-25), coupled with a spiritual insight that caused him to see and dream beyond and within from a young age. He writes in a poetic narrative form, "I'm very proud of my tribes — all of them — surviving in the face of terrible obstacles. Yes I could tell you about these people. Native Sons of Virginia fooling Genocide, managing somehow to hold on to Indian-ness. "We're really Indians. We are Powhatans. Pocahontas sprang from us although the White ladies of the dar have her now, in Richmond, at Tea parties" (p. 122, Forbes 1987a). Forbes always identified with his people, who he was able to seriously reconnect with, learn from and about, and in turn, help and influence. Forbes took every opportunity to learn with and beyond his family, utilizing the spaces between school and work to traverse downtown and greater Los Angeles, the inland Empire, the desert and the local sage scrub canyons and the layered universe within him (see Forbes 1987; Forbes 1991a; Forbes 1992b; Forbes 1997c). After leaving the diverse barrio of El Monte in 1943 for white conservative Eagle Rock, Forbes clung to his early formed "core" of indigeneity, kinship and values, a connection to all creation, creatures, and peoples, writing (1997c) reflectively

I was, I think,  
about nine then [1943]  
and we had moved  
from the country

to the city  
and I was all alone then  
without my old friends  
and I was among whiteskins  
with none of that  
Indian shade of brownness  
I had been so used to  
in the EI Monte  
I had left behind. . . .  
Of course I had known all along  
that I was part-Indian  
aunts and uncles  
spoke of it often  
but in the city  
among strangers  
I need that knowledge . . . (p. 95).

He concludes this reflective narration with this final thought,

My fate was decided early it seems  
and even though  
I must always remain  
a mixed-blood  
a man of many ancestries  
it seems

that the Indian inside  
will always be  
my core,  
my destiny (p. 98, *ibid*).

Forbes clearly viewed himself as a relative of his Indian grandparents and family from various nations, and while he doesn't dismiss his European family and ancestors, he never identifies as a white man, instead, taking the view that he was part of a new "cosmic people" forged in the fires of the "war for America" (Forbes 2001). Later he would express this as his own kind of "revolutionary genealogy" that served also as a teaching modality and framework (Forbes 1996a; D-046, B. 41, "The Greatness of the Indian Mind"). Raised with the core values of love, respect, and humility, he accepted the many diverse peoples and places, the plethora of life he survived amongst and with, recalling how critical it was to learn with our earth mother as "first teacher", he survived *El-Lay* and its alienating schools and streets, with a stalwart and integrated identity, with

a hearty thanks or *wanishi*,  
But the earth  
the spirits of sacred places  
bound me  
the trees as well  
and the deserts,  
the mountains,  
to the Indian inside  
which was,

clearly,  
and forever,  
my core  
my destiny (p. 97).

In high school, between 1947 and 1951, he formed and was a part of a solidarity type of pan-Indian identified group of “rebels”, of Indio-Mexicano, Chicano, mixed California urban Indian, poor white and other young adults of his school and neighborhood, perhaps a precursor to the formation of the Native American Movement in 1960 (Forbes 1987a; Forbes 1991). It wasn’t until after high school that he really began to crystalize his relationship with Indian peoples and communities, where in describing his experience at Glendale College in the late 50’s through his connection with the Southwest Museum of Los Angeles curator, M.R. Robinson, a part-Lenape scholar who encouraged the young Forbes to learn all he could, saying “I was obsessed with an interest in everything Indian” (ibid, p. 120). Yet part of his core was formed much earlier, at home and in his El Monte barrio, as he explains in a live television interview:

[living amongst Mexicans was] a really very important and formative thing. One thing it taught me though was that, um, uh, even though I didn't have many Indians around me who were U.S. Indians, I still had a lot of people of indigenous ancestry around me. And I always carry that idea with me later on, uh, that, uh, when we talk about native people of the Americas, we're not talking just about reservation tribal people from the United States or Canada. We're also talking about millions of people from Mexico south. And that's always been in my mind

and it influenced my work, uh, in a, in a big way (Forbes, Escamilla & Meade 2001).

Forbes earliest publication was through his connection at the Southwest Museum and M.R. Harrington from which he wrote about his Powhatan peoples, and reporting that they had survived, for “there are many Americans with Powhatan blood in their veins, including myself” (Forbes 1957, p. 7). By 1969 he started to work for the stubborn Rappahannock Tribe where he traced his surviving people and family to Oklahoma and Virginia, was a leading reformer of the Powhatan Confederation as well as working to create and lead the Coalition of Eastern Native Americans by 1972 (Forbes 1987, p. 120; see also Forbes 1971f; Forbes 1979f). Perhaps taking his perceived whiteness for granted, he shares, “I could tell you how hard it is To hide right in the midst of White people. It is an Art Learned early because Life depends On dissimulation and harmlessness. To turn into a stone in the midst Of Snakes one pays a price. . . .’ (1987a p. 120). Yet he always found himself working with and for Indian peoples of his own and other communities, who in draining his early memories into the poem “My Core, My Destiny” (1997c) he reflects on playing an Indian in his schools play, and concluded, “in the forty-five years given to me since then I have never once wanted to join with the oppressors” (p. 97). At some point in his early youth he accepted his fate, his destiny to work with his own and other Indian people, to study history, to write and speak, to dream and do!

Forbes also gleaned and learned throughout his life alongside close friends such as Richard “Dick” Livingston of whom he made an instant connection with in middle school and were close as brothers until the day he died (Forbes 1991c; Forbes 2008; Livingston 2011). Dick and Jack met at Eagle Rock High (6-12), and attended Glendale

College together until Jack would leave for USC in 1953 after attaining his A.A. in Philosophy and Political Science while Dick was drafted to fight in Korea. Dick would go on to become a high school history teacher in Los Angeles, and then after Jack had been working so hard to create Native American Studies at UC Davis and D-Q University, Dick found his way to Davis where they became neighbors, and supported each other's efforts (Forbes 2009; Livingston 2011; Forbes & Livingston 2005). Jack and Dick were both part of the original "rebel group" he reminisces upon in his poetry, writing elsewhere of this powerful connection:

I had few real friends in Eagle Rock until some kids transferred or moved in from poorer neighborhoods. Dick Livingston was one of these. Gradually we built up our own group, comprised (as I look back) almost entirely of Chicanos, Italians, poor whites, or "breeds," the "outcasts," as it were, of Eagle Rock. We were not conscious of what drew us together, I guess, but it is now clear to me that it wasn't just chance (p. 36, Risling, Kelsey, Lee, Longfish and Ramirez 1975).

Livingston (2011) called the group the "pathfinders" as they would meet in a cave nearby, and would "philosophize beneath the stars" while atop the sacred Eagle Rock. Original Eagle Rockers along with Jack, and he and Jack would engage democratic and radical politics together while in high school, writing small articles, working on campaigns, visiting local politicians of Los Angeles, all which prepared them for leadership and a lifetime of learning (Livingston 2011). Livingston eulogized Jack's high school time this way:

Jack was an Eagle

He graduated from Eagle Rock High School in Los Angeles, CA

In 1951

He was a very good Eagle - played football, played trombone, played hookey, ran track - a very good runner.

He was a good student - not just in the classroom

He was a student for life (Livingston 2011).

The two would later retire together in Davis, and would often get together to talk about the political state of education in their very own public television segment, “The Dick and Jack Show” with Davis Media Access on a casual basis. Their conversations on the show were merely recordings of the ones they had off-camera, for they were not shy boys since their Eagle Rock days in the 1940’s and 1950’s. Forbes was a social being who recognized the value of friendship, which is really love freely given, and while family is often the core of our identities, our friends that stick through thick and thin, become true extensions of our kin, for they adopt each other, support each other, and survive after we have passed on.

Forbes also identifies that most prominently and influential in his early years was his adopted uncle Antonio “Tony” del Buono who fought in the Mexican Revolution, and was a leader in the Union de Obreros y Campesinos (Union of Workers and Peasants), the Oxnard Civic Improvement Association, the Community Service Organization’s Oxnard chapter, the Ventura County American Civil Liberties Union, as well as the Native American Movement/Movimiento Native Americano, the latter is an organization he helped found with Forbes and others in 1961 (Forbes 1964). Del Buono was for Forbes as revealed in his dedication in *Columbus and Other Cannibals* (1979a), the epitome of the Chicano wise one, a “Cosmic Man”,



“A Man to be Remembered, A Man to be Imitated

He came to this Earth to be an Eagle and a Jaguar” (Dedication, para 3).

The latter line comes from an ancient Nahuatl poem rephrased in the Florentine Codex as “Ca yz tonoc in tiquauhtli in tocelutlah in ticueie in tiuipile” and translated as, “Here you are, you who are an eagle, you who are an ocelot”, who were of the two warrior classes of the Nahuas and frequently used in the “flower songs” or *xochitl cuica* of their rich poetic tradition (Sahagun, Anderson & Dibble 1977, p. 79). Like his father and family, Del Buono exhibited the highest values Forbes was raised with and clung to and in a feature editorial he wrote about his “Uncle Tony”, he praises his tío this way:

all must be impressed with those qualities which make him, in my estimation, a great man: honesty, frankness, and integrity, tempered by kindness and a deeply felt outward flowing humanitarianism (Forbes 1964a, p. 3).

In another editorial (Forbes 1964c) he writes, “Tony’s heart has never been in business or in making money. Generous to a fault, his wallet seems always open for good causes” (p. 4). His search for “wise men, wise women” was guided by these core values, by the good works and actions which are the products of years of self-development within community and upon the land, and which led him increasingly to more and more Indian elders, leaders and revolutionaries, those he would imitate as much as the heroes of old his father taught him about such as Powhatan, which provided the starting block for his lifelong learning journey towards becoming a wise man himself and a venerated elder.

Forbes reached out to many Indian people between 1960 and 1965 including Thomas Banyacya (Hopi), Robert K. Thomas (Cherokee), Melvin Thom (Paiute), Clyde Warrior (Ponca), D’Arcy McNickle (Flathead Salish), Dillon Platero (Dine), Vine

Deloria Jr. (Lakota-Dakota), Browning Pipestem and many others, but probably during this time, none so close as Carl and Mary Gorman. Carl Nelson Gorman was a Diné WWII code talker, artist and educator who had been in southern California since the early 1950's, and by their meeting was a leader in the urban Navajo community of Los Angeles, helping to form the Navajo Club among other organizing efforts. Carl, Mary and Jack would form the American Indian College Committee on July 1, 1961 in order to promote the idea of an American Indian University (Forbes 1985, p. 4). D-QU was born out of this initial struggle, and in 1969 Gorman returned from working for the Navajo Arts and Crafts Guild to join Forbes to teach in the Native American Studies program at UC Davis at his request and at D-QU the following year when it began classes in the summer of 1971 (Forbes 1961; Forbes 1966; Greenberg 1996, p. 140). Forbes often gave ultimate credit to Gorman for the founding of D-Q University, but this may have been a reference to Gorman inspiring Jack rather than it coming out of Gorman's thoughts and mouth (Forbes 1994, p. 124; Forbes, Escamilla & Meade 2001; Forbes and Risling 2008). This inspiration went well beyond their organizing and permeated much of Forbes thought, for Gorman the artist, warrior and leader was a kind of renaissance man for Forbes. Gorman once related in a speech his own peoples Diné theory of life this way to a Presbyterian Church gathering:

We [Diné] believe that everything originates in thought. That the power of thought is real, for good or evil, and that good thoughts, pure thoughts, thoughts pure as corn pollen, pure as dewdrops, will maintain harmony, health and happiness. When evil thoughts, fear, envy, hate, enter our minds-even of things that may have happened a long time before, that have caused the mind and the

body to become out of balance-prayers and ceremonies are given to restore thinking to a straight and harmonious path and well-being is restored. Prayers also may be for material blessings that are necessities of life, food, clothing, even jewels. To have these things as a blessing and right, symbolize in the material, the need for spiritual food, protection, and the jewels of wisdom, knowledge and understanding (Gorman 1972, p. iii).

Forbes was not enamored with Gorman but rather respected him for his courage to continue to work his people however and whenever he was called. After helping NAS and D-QU get off the ground, Gorman returned to Dinetah to work in the community in 1973 and lived out the rest of his days there. Forbes honored Gorman by helping push to have the museum that he started named after him, known now as the Carl N. Gorman Museum, which is a main feature of UC Davis Native American Studies.

Forbes also bestowed a great honor and credit to his “elder brother” David Risling Jr. who was a longtime leader of the California Indian Education Association, California Indian Legal Services, the Native American Rights Fund, the Association for American Indian Affairs as well as in the Native American Studies program at UC Davis and at D-Q University among many other efforts and roles he played (Forbes 2002; see also Forbes 2005). Forbes clarified upon Dave’s passing that, “more recently, Dave has been known as the co-founder of D-Q University” yet makes sure to set the record straight and says, rather “it was a dream that the late Carl Gorman and I had worked on from 1961-2, but it was Dave’s organizing skill and patience that came to the fore in 1971 when DQU finally acquired flesh and bones” (p. 2). Risling Jr. and Forbes worked in tandem on everything from their meeting in 1967 onwards, they just clicked. Forbes and Risling Jr. shared the

same sentiment with regards to the struggle for Native liberation, yet Risling Jr. who was ten years his senior was a towering and powerful figure for Forbes as he had been an instructor at Modesto College for many years while constantly working on behalf of his own people back at the Hoopa Reservation in northwestern California.

Risling was also a tremendous organizer, as he helmed the early work of the California Indian Education Association as its first president in 1967, and then moved to Davis to be an instructor and coordinator in the newly founded Tecumseh Center and Native American Studies program. In 1969, he helped form D-QU and after the site was acquired in 1971, was its first and only President of the Board of Trustees until 2005 when it closed its doors (Forbes 2005). In a speech given at Arizona State University in 1981, Risling Jr. explains the absolute necessity of native languages in the liberation struggle:

In a real sense, the liberation of Native languages from the bonds of colonialism also will represent the unleashing of the native masses. No liberation movement can succeed without the broad participation of the people. To participate, the people must be extremely knowledgeable about the conditions affecting them.

This cannot occur without the full use of native languages (p. 3, DRP, D-334, B.

41, F. "Publications: Risling, Early American Newsletter").

This speech for example may even show Forbes influence upon Risling, as it was known that Risling Jr. was acutely dyslexic and often would run his speeches and writings by Forbes and his wife Barbara's keen eyes for review first before finishing them. Barbara herself became one of Jack's closest friends as the couple lived and worked closely together in all of these combined efforts Jack and Dave became enmeshed in (Forbes and

Risling 2005). Risling Jr. was the son of famed leader Su-Wohrom, who had founded the Indian Rights Defense Association in the 1930's and had fought many educational battles at Hoopa and elsewhere, and was a consistent influence on Forbes throughout the formation of NAS and D-QU (Forbes 2002). Risling Jr. explains his father's influence back at Hoopa to be:

My father was also responsible for the conversion of the Hoopa BIA boarding school into a public day-school fully controlled by the Indian people it served (1931), and for the establishment of the first Indian-controlled high school in the United States (Hoopa High School in 1933). Currently my father is one of the ceremonial leaders for both the Karok and the Hupa Tribes (Risling 1975, p. 40).

Forbes also looked to the genius and actions of Indigenous heroes and heroines of the past, including Tecumseh, Sarah Winnemucca, Carlos Montezuma, William Apess, Opechancanough, and many others that represented the highest ethics and values he himself sought to embody. For example, Yavapai doctor Montezuma (1915) once gave a speech before the Society of American Indians annual conference held in Lawrence, Kansas, and whose message concluded:

To dominate a race you do not want to educate them. All one needs to do is to make them believe black is white, and get them to believe everything you do is all right. Let them live Indian life. Let them fear you. Let them quibble among themselves. Give them plenty of sweets and tell them things will come out all right; for them not to worry, but leave it all to their "Washington Father," he is "Good Medicine," and all will be well ("Let My People Go").

He hoped to enshrine this indigenous leader's work at D-QU's Carlos Montezuma Medical School, but this did not come to fruition as Forbes had hoped. Forbes worked alongside many other such persons in his life whom he surrounded himself with because of their innate goodness, moral convictions and leadership. One such person included compatriot nurse, author and teacher Sarah Hutchison of D-QU and UC Davis Native American Studies whom Forbes memorialized this way in poetic verse:

How many years you have  
given to special ones,  
to creating D-Q University,  
to UC Davis  
to Native American Studies  
decades of unstinting service  
your home always open  
to those in need! (Forbes 1998c, p. 1).

One of Sarah's friends, Jake White Crow of the National Indian Health Service once shared with her this truth revealed by her many students and patients over the years:

"Sarah, my friend, I meet your students all over the world. Do you know what they tell me?" I put my hands over my face and said, "They tell you I was a tough teacher?" He said, "Yes, they did say that, but they also said, 'She taught me to be proud of my Indianness'" ("Sarah Hutchison: How to Make Magic", in BANC MSS 98/144c).

Forbes constantly developed loving and strong bonds with powerful and leading Indian men and women who perceived the great need of Indian people to come together and work for social change and justice.

Another one of these people who Forbes was influenced and inspired by was the humble work of Cheyenne River Lakota educator and leader Lehman “Lee” Brightman, a co-founder of United Native Americans and longtime instructor at D-QU, UC Berkeley and Contra Costa College in California. That saying, you are who you hang around with is indeed telling of your true character and ideals. Has indigenous public education changed much since 1969 when Brightman (1971) stood up and spoke before the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education and said these words:

Let us look at the present school system as it stands today. The schools are controlled by white men. You don't find Indians on the school boards. You don't find any Indian teachers, very few if any. The schools are named after white men. The pictures they hang on the walls in our schools are not of Indians, they are white men, famous white men, not famous Indians, but white men. Then you get into the school teachers. About 99 percent of them are white. They teach a white curriculum that was established by the dominant white middle-class society. A good indication of why this is not working with our Indian kids, it was established as I said, by the dominant middle-class white society for non-Indians in urban areas and it is not working in urban areas (p. 38).

Brightman was the founding coordinator of the Native American Studies program at UC Berkeley in 1969, which Jack had turned down, and would go on to be a leader at D-QU, where he helped organize alongside Dennis Banks (who he worked with since 1970) the

Longest Walk of 1978, and the Longest Walk for Survival of 1980. As quoted in the Lakota Country Times upon his death in 2017, Brightman once said, “Every mile of this country is stained with Indian blood, and every mile contains the bones of our ancestors. They fought and died that we may be here. The least we the living can do is to continue that fight. We are American Indians.” Forbes provided inspiration for his compatriots but was also inspired by their own work as well, and he developed strong relationships which would nurture Native American Studies and D-Q University to a beautiful fruition.

When Forbes first articulated his own ideas about education in the mid-1960’s, he was already clearly influenced by family and friends, by political and social actors and sources and by 1969 and the founding of Native American Studies at UC Davis which occurred at the same time as the occupation of Alcatraz, Forbes had surrounded himself with lifelong influencers such as Livingston, Brightman, the Gorman’s, Del Buono, the Risling’s and Hutchison’s. Forbes wrote and worked alone but also equally worked with others, and as he described to Crozier-Hogle (1991), “I’m not a person who pulls away from world”, meaning he felt a need to interact with and participate with community, refusing to become a hermit or remaining uninfluenced by other social actors and actresses. Forbes recognizes that he is indebted to many peoples such as his wife Carolyn and two children, mother and father, “uncle” or tío Tony who he memorialized elsewhere as , “elder brother” Risling Jr., as much as his friends and colleagues and is quick to point out the other forms of life such as those stalwart “friends” he has found in an old oak tree, various creatures and special places such as the Eagle Rock, who in his mind, have all clearly supported his growth and development in important ways (Forbes 1987;



Forbes 1991c; Forbes 1997c). Indeed, the land has always been a perpetual and loving source of nourishment, inspiration and modeling for young Jack. He writes clearly of the ways his El Monte half-acre haven and all its creatures taught him unconditional love, describing the plethora of animal and plant life surrounding the hills and canyons of the sacred Eagle Rock. Where life was found, Forbes engaged it, honored it and respected it. Yet the land was not something that we chose to passively love, it must be fought for and protected. Young Forbes found himself waging midnight battles with construction crews who recalled, “I saw a lot that I loved destroyed — not only there but in El Monte del Sur, which became an industrial zone, and all over southern California, where freeways, smog, and development chipped away at a land that was still beautiful when I was a child” (p. 117, Forbes 1987). In a later interview, he tells Crozier-Hogle:

It hurt me when the area began to be destroyed. Our house was taken for the freeway. Fortunately it didn't happen until I was gone, but, earlier, they took the nearby canyon and made a dam and put a reservoir in there. I tried to fight against that. I tried to sabotage their equipment and things like that, by myself. You know, I was just a young teenager, but... It really hurt me to see the beautiful oak trees that I loved so much . . . and the pines and prickly pears and other things that lived in that canyon being destroyed. The wildlife, the deer just decimated, just to make a dam. . . . And, I'll probably never get over that. I don't know exactly how old I was, but I was probably about 16 or 17 ... maybe 15 or 16. It was very, very rough experience for me to see things that I had really loved, that had really nourished me, be destroyed (“Interview with Jack Forbes” in BANC MSS98/144c, C.1).

Forbes would fight many battles to save sacred places like Santa Susana regional park in north Los Angeles, Coyote Canyon Hole in Joshua Tree and Putah Creek which ran through the UC Davis campus, recognizing that we can only become complete people with all of these influences and experiences of living on the land and in connection with other creatures and life (Hyman 1961; Forbes 1998h). In the interview with Crozier-Hogle (BANC MSS 98/144), he recites one of his lifelong poems which takes on a new form yet which gets to the heart of his influences, beliefs and praxis as a person and educator:

we are one with the environment. There is no boundary. Like I say: We can lose our hands and still go on living. We can lose our legs and still go on living. We can lose a good part of our body. Our noses, our hair, our eyes, our ears and a lot of things, and we can go on living. But to lose the air, then we cannot live. If we lose the water, we cannot live. If we lose the plants and the animals, we cannot live. So they are more a part of us than that which we normally call our “body”.

Thus, to penetrate Forbes thought as a person we must recognize that he was drawing from all sources, all the time, without fixing rigid boundaries to what can influence him, for what deserved his love and respect, and to what “life” and “learning” was, for everything was influential, permeable, unbounded. That is how he lived his life.

### *Forbes General Philosophy of Education*

*What is the purpose of education? To me it is not mainly the acquisition of specific skills or factual knowledge. Rather it is learning how to be a human*

*being. That is, how to live a life of the utmost spiritual quality. A person who has developed his character to its highest degree, and who is on that path, will also be able to master specific skills. But if they don't have that spiritual core, they will use those skills to hurt other people. They will use those skills in the interest of that which is bad, rather than that which is good. We see this all the time with people who have know-how, but use that know-how for their own good, like many of the mad scientists that we have in the world today who are willing to let their skills be available to any dictator or government who will pay their salary. In return for that, they will use their skills to produce modern instruments of torture, weapons, and drugs that will change people's behavior. They have the skills, but they have no morals. They will do whatever they are paid to do. So knowledge without the spiritual core is a very dangerous thing (Forbes 1979c, p. 11).*

Forbes (1992c) alluded to what Zais (1976) has called the purpose of education as something that leads towards “living the good life” which he addresses most pointedly with the question, “how does one get on a good path” (p. 38; see also Forbes 1980). In utilizing the concept of a path, we can intimate that he is speaking of a lifelong learning journey. Also, Forbes discusses this in terms of a personal or individuated path as well as a path towards finding one's place or role in their people's community or nation. As a historian, he understood that the story is a path walked and talked about. Another avenue for this idea is how a person progresses down a particular path, or how they walk the path. This of course is in connection to what Forbes imagines as a “wrong path”. The Lenape term Forbes (2001) used was *lauchsín* “to live, walk, in a certain manner” and

*wulauchsowagan* or *wilaosowákan*, “for good behavior, good life” (p. 111). The Lenape Talking Dictionary cites the term *wəlapeyəwakàn* for “good life” and *təlawsin* “the way he lived”. Compare this to Anishinaabe *Mino-bimaadiziwin* “the way of a good life” or Cree *miyopimatisowin* and *miyo-pimâtisiwin* “the good life” or “good way of living” (Rheault 1999; Ojibwe Peoples Dictionary; Online Cree Dictionary). One might say that Forbes is judgmental and that his own bias and beliefs cloud his objectivity, and further, that this might set him up to arrogantly prescribe a way of life for others, one that he himself may not even follow. Forbes (2008a) however distinguishes very clearly what he means by a wrong path:

*imperialists, rapists and exploiters are not just people who have strayed down a wrong path. They are insane (unclean) in the true sense of that word. They are mentally ill and, tragically, the form of the soul-sickness they carry is catching* (p. iii, emphasis original).

The crazy or insane person might best be characterized as a person who cannot follow their own path, or a pathway of their people’s because they are “split” or schizoid or simply unhealthy, and the path they are on not only endangers themselves but others as well. Another reason is because people have been led astray, that is, they are following another’s path or they are on a path of destruction and exploitation, selfishness and greed without recognizing it. Forbes, Martin & Risling (1972) identified this among schooling efforts in the U.S. which teach the “white man’s path” for white’s are in control of the entire system of education which teaches *their* history, *their* knowledge systems or science, *their* language or kind of English, *their* laws and rules, *their* way of life or pathways to becoming a person (p. 6 ). The white man’s path is especially distinct from

the hundreds and thousands of other people's path's borne and learned in Turtle Island since their inception as people's. The white man's path was specifically developed in the process of destroying and exploiting the peoples and the lands of America and Africa.

Forbes expressly related this to his own people's path of becoming a person. Important for a Lenapayok (Lenape man) was to follow a "White Path" *Weelipeleexing* or "Righteous Path" (*weelausit metomakan*), and is symbolic of the life path from birth to death as epitomized in the Big House ceremony, a yearly ceremony of renewal (Speck 1931, p. 23). Forbes study of the Lenape language and people put him into direct contact with this White Path despite not growing up in a time when the Big House ceremony was still performed (Forbes 1976b; Harrington 1921). Further, Forbes like many others was greatly influenced by the Lakota people's concept of the "red road" *chanku luta* and related traditional concepts via the life and works of Black Elk (1979) who also referred to it as the "good red road" or "red path" (p. 274) or even just the "good road" (p. 6). Surely as early as the 1950's he had met others who spoke of the "red road" and finally with the arrival of the Lakota Sundance and inipi at D-Q University in 1975 and its caretaking by Darrell Standing Elk, it was not a distant community value or ceremonial tradition as it was a core learning arena of the university thereafter (Lutz 1980; Forbes 1985a). Forbes notes that the first structures which darned the Tecumseh Center's lawn in the old Aggie Villas were tipis, while sweat lodges lined Putah creek (Risling 1975, p. 3).

At a commencement address Forbes made at Navajo Community College on May 9, 1973, he emphasized to the students that first and foremost "*one must learn how to live--not just how to make a living--but how to find a path of beauty in this life. We must begin by knowing who we are!*" (p. 2, D-046, B.205, F. Choosing a Path of Beauty and

Heart, emphasis original; see the published version in Forbes 1978, pp. 118-120). He knows his audience, and so attempts to speak to those graduating about the many paths that lie before them, some of which he feels are destructive while others embody beauty.

He said:

The white world offers many tempting paths--the path of alcohol and drugs, the path of the rip-off and con-artist, the path of the corrupt watergater in his suit and tie, riding in a Cadillac limousine, the path of the convert to religions which require you to deny all the beauty of the Indian past, the path of the Air Force pilot dropping bombs on unseen people and other creatures, and the path of the scientist madly inventing things, the use of which he cannot or does not want to control. But there are also many paths of beauty, paths that have a heart (p. 2 *ibid*).

The last line is drawn from the words of don Juan Matus, the teacher of Carlos Castaneda (1968) whose repeated refrain from his maestro was summarized as a question, “does this path have a heart?” (p. 105). Part of Forbes commencement speech was removed and what he did not share with the students that day, probably for the sake of time or redundancy, I feel its essential qualities speak to his conception of a “path of heart” and which demonstrate himself not to be an angry cynic, because he believed we have choices before us, some perhaps better than others. He offers these listed options:

- 1) the path of helping living creatures
- 2) the path of creating things of beauty
- 3) the path of working for justice
- 4) the path of helping others to discover themselves

5) the path of seeking knowledge about the unseen world (p. 2, *ibid*).

Finally, he qualifies these statements by discussing what kind of qualities a person has which demonstrate they are on a good path, a “path that has heart”, and lists the most essential ones:

- 1) They are not afraid to be alone
- 2) They don't need alcohol or drugs to escape
- 3) They don't need fancy cars and houses
- 4) They don't need to wear expensive clothes
- 5) They don't need to try and win respect by bragging, loud talking, or aggressive acts
- 6) They are respectful of others
- 7) They do not exploit others
- 8) They are calm, although they may not be serene because their path may demand struggle
- 9) They have a face--They can be relied upon--They do not lie or deceive
- 10) They are humble and do not try to convert others by high pressure; they know there are many paths of beauty (p. 3, *ibid*).

Part of Forbes convictions is based upon the idea that finding a good path is what he has done in his own life, so he is speaking from experience. As a young person he knew early on he wanted to study history, he wanted to help people and work for justice, and he had many dreams and visions which he attempted to follow through with. However, Forbes was not a saint. He had his bouts in life, full of temptations and

turnarounds, follies and fallouts, mistakes and poor choices. Yet, he found his own way and followed it as far as he could go. For example, Forbes (1987a) relates in a poem how early in his life, he dreamed his path:

When young I had a dream — vision I joined the bee and wasp nations they adopted me and I helped them in their lives and to guard against invaders and they were my friends I've always liked bees on my skin seeking salt but now I understand that that dream was a map of my own life helping many nations to find justice (p. 116).

Forbes (1973) was drawn heavily to those persons who exhibited this same kind of discipline, devotion, purpose and dreams for themselves and others. He respected the person who knew who they were and were walking a path of their own making such as that traversed by John Fire Lame Deer (Lakota). The Lakota *wi'ca'sa wakan* or holy man John Fire Lame Deer (1972) once described his own people's beliefs saying the "great spirit", *wakan tanka*, "only sketches out the path of life roughly for all the creatures on earth, shows them where to go, where to arrive at, but leaves them to find their own way to get there" and after they find their path or calling, others must respect their becoming because "to us a man is what nature, or his dreams make him. We accept him for what he wants to be" (p. 156-7). Forbes (1974a) elsewhere hammered this point home when he said, "it is the essence of the native viewpoint that individuals must assume responsibility for their own life-path" (p. 16). The responsibility each and every person has for their own life and how to live it is buttressed to the responsibility of the nation and community to have high standards, ethics, principles, laws, models and ways of living which allow persons to follow their own path. It is widely recognized that traditional peoples of the



Americas did not apply physical coercion to their children because this in fact models poor behavior and does not instill self-discipline, while at the same time leaves an internal mark and memory which they bear their whole life and may cause unportuned problems later, possibly creating a cycle of abuse, fear and conformity they pass on to their children or other creatures. Everything we do is part of our learning process and path, and in this way, we can learn bad habits and traits as easily as good ones. This is one of the reasons mentorship, apprenticeship and intensive personal training was developed by various communities who sought to develop specific kinds of skills, knowledge and characteristics through a guided learning path aided intuitively by an elder, master and wisened person (Tonemah 1991; Cajete 1994).

Although Forbes (1987) says much of what he has gleaned over his lifetime was a product of his own ambition and drive to learn, saying, “in a lot of ways I was self-educated — in nature, in the city, and with books from the libraries” he describes consistently in his poetry and interviews how many family members-teachers, the plants as teachers, and later, living next to his friends the Livingstons, UC Davis NAS and D-QU, he recollects how “Working hard Seven acres Taught much to me” (p. 118, 124). Forbes worked as a young child until the day he died, walking a careful path of power which fit his gait, yet he did not walk alone. He recognizes throughout his life that his teachers are many, and that he is in fact not an independent being, but an interdependent one, always a part of a community and family. Yet this interdependent relationship he found in jeopardy everywhere he went, so he rebelled, not against his family or people but to being a feel-good academic who makes a paycheck while uncritically supporting institutions of power and exploitation. Instead, he was “plotting revolutions” with “other

nonconformists”, from his high school rebel days to the occupation of buildings at UC Berkeley for the first Native American Studies courses in 1968, to the occupation of D-Q University (which he supported but did not perform as he was a part of the non-profit corporation which had filed suit through California Indian Legal Services, a suit that won the site) (Forbes 1987, p. 123; see also Caspar-Denman 2011; Lutz 1980; Forbes 1985; Marquez 2010; Risling 1975). Forbes (1975) explains he was not raised in a reservation community, and the kind of Indianness he was raised with was not bound to his ancestor’s homeland of Attan-Akamik. He says “I got a lot of my education in the downtown streets” of Los Angeles, as well as riding everywhere while on his father’s milk deliveries, also with his mother and then solo on the electric cable cars, with his grandparents out in Joshua Tree or by Dalton Creek at his mother’s parents “ranch” (p. 117, Forbes 1987). “I continue to seek wisdom and understanding wherever I can find it, and I continue to survive psychologically because of Native American religion and philosophy and what they teach about the sacredness of all living creatures” which resonated with him deeply to his core, allowing him to dream his dream and walk his own path at a young age (p. 126, Forbes 1987). Life was the teacher, yet it comes in so many forms that we must learn to sit, watch, listen and mimic in order to pierce the richness of its teachings.

In order to summarize Forbes precipitated influences over the course of his early lifetime, or that which forged his foundation, I look again to his own verbiage on this issue which explains the inexplicable, how he found his way in an imperiled and imperialized world and forged a positive indigeneity that drove him to do good works on

behalf of Indian people, but also, for the benefit of all peoples struggling to survive in this mad world.

Understandably, among Powhatans, it is meaningless to talk about “degree of Indian blood.” After four hundred years of oppression, very few of us can be certain of our ancestry, although the people as a whole undoubtedly have considerable Indian blood. In spite of Virginia's efforts to destroy us, the Powhatans have survived. Our nationality is a true nationality, not based upon blood alone (or on precise numerical quotients) but on “spirit” and on continuing dedication to our Powhatan identity. (I am also of Delaware and other tribal ancestry.) I have gone into all of this because it is part of me, part of my everyday existence. The destruction of Attan-Akamik, our fertile homeland, the death of 20,000 or more of our people, and the continuous oppression over four centuries is an inescapable reality which I can neither forgive or forget, especially since the whites have made no effort to offer any redress for what they did, and are doing. I was raised to be proud of being Powhatan and other Indian descent. I was also made knowledgeable quite early of injustice to my people and that has influenced my entire life. These feelings have been reinforced by the fact that I am also of Highland Scots, Swiss, and Czech ancestry, all of whom have been conquered and have struggled for freedom. On all sides I am descended from poor peoples who have experienced oppression and conquest. One of my grandmothers attended a teacher's college for one year, but otherwise my people have never had any formal “higher” education until my own generation.

I was raised to be proud of being a “working man,” of being proud of working with one’s own hands. Ideologically, I have never, at any stage of my life, identified with the oppressor, or aspired to be a part of the ruling class. Instead I have always identified with Indian people fighting in defense of their homelands: Scottish clansmen struggling against English invaders, Swiss mountaineers fighting off Austrian nobles, Czech rebels throwing off Germanic imperialism, and working-class people seeking dignity in a wealth-dominated society. One might call it “romanticism” but one's dreams determine a person's life, it seems to me. Thus what I dreamed of, and thought of, and felt as a child has continued with me as a dominant force (pp. 35-36).

It is clear from this description that Forbes “way” of thinking, remembering, working, researching, teaching and living was unbounded by imperial formations however this does not disclude the varied and distinct influences apparent, such as a Powhatan or Rappahannock (Lenape/Renape) and working-class rather than as a citizen of the state, placing ancestors-kin-nation and place-territory at his core. But to dream, the most unbounded act, is to do, is to make real. By 1968, Forbes had helped reenergize and reform the failing Rappahannock Tribe, working tirelessly as one of its Field Directors under the guidance of a revitalized council, edited the nations newsletter *Tsen-Akamak* and *Attan-Akamik* (1968-1974), and in collaboration with a reconstructed Powhatan confederacy he helped organize the Coalition of Eastern Native Americans in 1972 creating a unified front for supposedly “vanished Americans” (Forbes 1970c; Forbes 1971f). The tenuous relationship with an Indian personhood that Forbes recalls,

blossomed and bloomed from rhetoric to reality, as did Native American Studies and D-Q University, his offspring. Raised in southern California but having lived also in Nevada, Berkeley, and Davis of northern California, Forbes connected with the sacred lands, histories, languages, and religions he came into contact with, and there were numerous contact zones and sources. To pinpoint Forbes sea of influences is difficult because like any good sponge, he incorporates his learning seamlessly. We can indeed learn a great deal from Forbes individual, national and international development. For what is the purpose of education, other than to learn how to learn, to know what to learn, to apply or act upon this circle of learning, and to pass on this learning cycle.

To summarize, Forbes was raised in an all-encompassing Nature, as we all are, however, particular places and opportunities to “learn from” the living world around him were quite abundant, or at least, the few opportunities that did exist, he took full advantage of. While not growing up wealthy, he was an only child, and certainly benefited from having two loving parents and a nurturing family. It is clear that Forbes did not follow others pathways but rather was consistently on his own path, and while recognizing that he could not follow the ancient path of his ancestors in many ways, he felt it was his duty to pick up the slack where he could, and to learn all he could of his peoples history, language, religion, land and traditions while filtering the ill, evil and alienating examples all around him. He explains in an unpublished poem, “Ya-Town: The Big El-Lay Classroom”, that in his of rejecting LA “City schools master plan to make most of us dumbled-down proletarians” Forbes recognized that he had to educate himself wherever, whenever, and however (D-046, B. 183, F. “Ya-Town”). Further he explains, that the affirmative acts which followed his path of completion and personhood-

peoplehood, were accompanied also by choices and acts of resistance where one's values and relationships were tested such as when the hills of Eagle Rock were being destroyed by city, corporate and private interests. He boils it down later to a single maxim, "Learning, it was *all* learning" ("Ya-Town", emphasis original). So while he often ditched class to learn in the influential world beyond, he "studied and studied", doing "research, research, research" all the time, for his learning path, his life path, was his own, and he knew it through and through, for as he explains, he had found "my core, my destiny", early on, and one cannot deviate from their own path in life (ibid; Forbes 1997). In the following chapter's discussion on Forbesian conceptions of personhood and peoplehood, this becomes opaque as he is truly a student of Life, in all its manifestations.

*What is the purpose of Education?*

[In California, there was a] strong emphasis upon character development which was very common among Californian and other Indian groups; the emphasis upon what one did as a man, how one behaved; emphasis upon behavior, rather than upon some kind of artificial status gained by the way you were born, or through some kind of class system. ("Speech on Far West Indian-White Relations", in D-046, B. 43, F. "Conference on Education of Tribes of California Indians [1968]")

Our schools are now "lies." They have little to do with truth. They pretend to teach the history of this land when all they actually teach is a biased version of the story of the white man's conquest of this country. They pretend to teach the music

and art, and literature of this land when almost always they only teach the music, art, and literature of the elite segments of the white population. They pretend to prepare people for self-development when, in fact, they usually only socialize them to authoritarian-bureaucratic systemized behavior and conformity (Forbes 1974a, p. 16).

Education is not a separate sphere of activity or tradition. It is an embedded, continuous process related most closely to intergenerational stability and survival via concerted and individual efforts of learning how to live and the acquisition of wisdom, skills, values, etc., which a person and people utilize to maintain family, community, national and international relations. Education is never done alone because we are creatures of a creation that is extremely populous of diverse life, also of ancestors and spirits unseen. Education is equative with Living, for everything we do and interact with provides influences (good and bad and everything in between), and is an opportunity to grow and develop. “Life” according to the ancient Nahuatlaca and Mexica wizened elders was summarized this way: “we come only to dream” (Leon-Portilla 1992, p. 153). Bernardino de Sahagún’s collection of Nahuatl wisdom, laws, stories, and traditions included an entire manual of dream interpretation found in the Códices Matritenses. The chapter on the Heavens and the Underworld, describes specific auguries and portents given by the keepers of the ceremonial calendar and cycle, the *tonalpouhque* (Sahagún & Nicholson 1997, p. 10). In a conversation with Sakej Henderson (2012), he asked the Arrow Keeper at a Sun Dance “What is the purpose of Life?” who responded with:

We only come here to dream. You know that in the spirit world and in the other worlds we have many other lives and many other consciousnesses in translation. But when we come to this earth realm we only come here to do what you can't do in the spiritual world and that's dream. We come here to dream. And all of our culture, all of our ceremonies, are all a dreamlike stance that we talk about as reality (p. 149).

Life is a dream. Education is the perpetuation of that dream. And even more specific, each people have their own dream, and so does each person. Yet, we are all connected in this dreaming, and especially, to the spirit world, the world behind, beyond, surrounding this one. In Australia, the “dreamtime” and “dreaming” are derived from ancestral beings, places of power, symbols and experiences. They literally fill the person up and direct their actions with dreams and which are fruited in reciprocal expressions and honorary actions such as ceremony, art, dance, and song.

The practice elsewhere of seeking a dream, spiritual help or teachings, or a vision is crucial for many peoples at the onset of adulthood because it represents the ultimate practice of learning from creation, and in turn, following a unique path (Cajete 1994, p. 44). The dream is the ultimate reality. Or as one Paiute man has put it, “in our culture, one must dream something first before doing it” (as quoted in Hirschfelder 1995, p. 154). John Fire Lane Deer (1972) once shared that “I am a medicine man because a dream told me to be one” (p. 158). Indeed, the term Pow-Wow, *powwaw* in Algonkian, *baw/paw* in or Anishinaabemowin, shares its roots with famed leader *Powhatan* or *Wahunsenacawh*, and refers to a gathering of dreamers as in the phrase, *pawa tan* or *bawaadan* “to dream about something” or Cree *pawa tam* (Ojibwe People's Dictionary; Proto-Algonquin



Dictionary; Online Etymological Dictionary). Following one's path in life is absolutely crucial to the educational process, that is essentially, learning who you are in relation, and then moving about in this world based upon your established relationships-experiences towards becoming complete as a person and of a people. Little Doctor, a Menominee, explained that the puberty fast as a rite of passage was a key technique "so that he might see a vision", so that the spirits would take "pity on them" and bless them and were respectively approached with hopes of "giving them help" (as quoted in Hirschfelder 1995, p. 205).

For Onöndowa'ga:' or Seneca people, if we dream of the *hadoui* spirit we are to share this knowledge as we become members of a medicine society and must learn the requisite ceremonies, songs, dances and teachings associated with this practice. Taught at a young age that we are to look out for "big dreams", good or bad ones, for they are real, we must always do something about them. If the youth of today are not doing education like they used to, many of these traditional ways of knowing and living will be lost. I can't even count how many times I was scolded, made fun of and punished by my teachers for "dreaming" in class instead of listening to the lecture. One time I was forced to stand in front of the class and tell them my dream, which I did because I was proud of it, but the outcome of the teacher's desire was produced upon me that day: they all laughed at me. Growing up near the *Taxsliwetam* or Cahuilla people I learned of the power of the Tahquitz/Takwish spirit, from which they have many traditional and contemporary stories about what happens to the people who dream of it. If you dream of the Takwish spirit, it causes you to become evil like Takwish, who is known in legend to torture and eat people (Patencio 1943; James 1969). I lived in the shadow of the Takwish

spirits home, for it is said to dwell in a cave beneath the rock of Tahquitz peak but also can appear as an ugly old man or take on other forms. Australia Aboriginal author David Stanner entitled his collected essays as *White man got no dreaming* (1979) for it was apparent that this was a key distinction between his people and the invaders. Indeed, a common refrain among white people and western scientists is summarized in the pronouncement, “I don’t have dreams”, for not only are sleeping and waking visions misrepresented as hallucinations or chemical reactions, some even go as far as denying they have them at all, or that there is anything else out there beyond brain-vision stimulus.

Forbes was heavily influenced by the Mexican traditions and ways of wisdom which he encountered as a historian of the southwest, and growing up in the barrio of El Monte del sur in the 1930’s and early 1940’s. He frequently cites and refers back to the Nahua approach of education as epitomized by the Calmecac and in the numerous kinds of teachers such as the *tlamatinime* who sought to help youth develop a heart and face, or *yollotl ni ixtli* (Forbes 1973, pps. 48-69). Forbes (1973b) argues that “one has to seek one’s own paths of knowledge, of wisdom, of creativeness, and seek them diligently, ever mindful of the necessity of complete dedication to realizing all of the ultimate potentiality of what is being done”, because this is the actual purpose of education, to realize our potential, or power (p. 211). Forbes et. al. (1972) suggested during the founding D-QU that “all living things--*seek to realize their fullest potential*”, and that founding the university was an attempt for Indians and Chicanos to be provided this opportunity, especially after 200-500 years of imperial warfare, colonial dispossession and the various kinds of miseducation they had experienced (p. 5, emphasis original). For Forbes

(1992c) this choice entailed a commitment to a particular learning path that was circular, and he was convinced that “if we are willing to travel a path of knowledge, [and learn] something about ourselves, which is to say that when we study ourselves we are studying the universe and we are studying part of the Great Creative Power, and when we study the world we are also studying ourselves” (p. 39).

The catalog details the “purpose” of D-QU as outlined in the 1973-74 catalog, which was during the time period when Forbes was most influential in its design as he had recently finished serving on the Board of Trustees during the 1972-73 academic year, demonstrates clearly both the indigenous roots, as well as individual D-Q University educational programs:

are designed for the purpose of encouraging the student to assume the direction of his or her education, personally determining his or her own educational needs and in general pursuing and following an educational path selected and designed by each person. A student may desire to gain an education by following a standard curriculum which will be possible at D-Q University, but structured into each curriculum will be a wide variety of classes from which the individual can make choices to reach his or her educational goal. The Knowledge Path Plan is so structured as to allow the maximum personal freedom to the student in the pursuit of knowledge. The student following a Knowledge Path Plan not only has the responsibility of desiring his or her own educational program, but also of determining the people with whom he or she will be studying and the area in which the studying will be taking place. The primary purpose of any educational

program at D-Q University is to assist the individual to become as self-determined an individual as possible (“D-QU Catalog”, D-046, B. 259, F. D-QU).

Does this produce a self-determined individual, and reinforce and support them to be citizens of their own nations? Key to Forbes approach in all his efforts was the focus upon providing an Indigenous environment, imbued with a plethora of voices and traditions, teacher, staff and community forms of knowledge which could be practiced in place. At the root of any educational effort is the work of a particular people to reproduce the intergenerational community and their ability to survive in their territory and homeland, through cultivating their own bodies, abilities and traditions and by cultivating the lands they live upon. But what is cultivated? This is the riddle of “culture”.

The term “culture” and particular to education, “multicultural” education, could mean any number of things when applied by certain peoples upon others. The term “culture” has its roots in Latin *colere* and also in Proto-Indo European *-kwel* which is the source of such diverse words as: colony, colonial, chakra, cyclone, encyclopedia, pole, teleology, telos, and even wheel. Most of the words that have come from these roots have the meanings of moving upon, tilling, and inhabiting a place with some meanings such as Lithuanian *kelias* “road or way” which compares closely to Forbes concept of the educational or learning pathway. Forbes (1979c) was aware of these origins and various meanings and in turn concluded that “multicultural” might mean “many paths, many roads” and “if we boil it down, the closest thing that we come to is the concept of “way” or “road” or “path”. The way people do things, the way people behave, the way people think, the ideas they have in their minds, all cause them to follow certain paths or roads. For example, Griffin-Pierce (1992) describes that as five-fingered, pollen-earth people,

the Diné traditional way of living and learning how to live was symbolized as a sacred journey of travelling down a *Tadidiin bee Kek'ehashchiin* or The Pollen Path (p. 192). Forbes (1979c) concludes that each People must find their own way, must travel down their own path, and thus there are “many roads to education” and is his best definition of “multicultural education” (p. 4). However, schools do not offer “many roads” for students to traverse, especially those which are aligned with their communities’ dreams, or the students dream for themselves. Any definition of culture ultimately resides within a people, and is not a description but a prescription for being a part of the greater family or nation. The anthropological term, which is often separated as material and symbolic forms of culture does not adequately describe a whole people but rather identifiable traits, which may or may not be shared by other peoples.

Culture is always place-based and people specific, for we are always defined by our relationship to specific lands, peoples and sources of sustenance. It is difficult for people today to imagine this when so many do not grow, hunt or harvest their own foods and medicines and instead rely upon unknown others to do this work for them. The purpose of education as expressed by the Inupiat people of North Slope Borough School District identifies these core tap-roots at work in a contemporary context by those who survive in a largely enveloping landscape. The basic philosophy of the district is summarized as being the recognition that “Education, a lifelong process, is the sum of learning acquired through interaction with one’s environment, family, community members, schools and other institutions and agencies” (as quoted in Okakok 1989, p. 412). Okakok (1989) clarifies her own position, arguing that Inupiat “values” are different than what is taught in school, saying, “remember that education is also the

passing down of a society's values to children” and further, “education is more than book learning, it is also value-learning” (p. 412). Is a definition of culture adequate to teach “cultural values”? Forbes (1979c) ended his discussion with answering the question, “what are their implications for the education of many paths?” and related that:

the main thing I want to emphasize is that there can be no education that is multicultural involving the Native American tradition unless it gets into this area of the meaning of life, unless it gets into the area of values. If it just pays attention to painting or basketry or material culture, it is nowhere close to that which constitutes the real meaning of the Native struggle in this American land. So we have to somehow consider how we can bring that in. That is very hard and it is a challenge for all of us. I don't have the answer as to how you bring a spiritual path into schools in a society which is going in the opposite direction. I don't have the answer as to how you do that, except that we must try (p. 11, *ibid*).

Forbes assumed that at the core of education was a people's spiritual path, a way developed out of 20,000 or more years of living in America, which was unique to each people-nation. Within this spiritualist-relationality a people form other tap-roots (culture), however rooted in the core values of what is often called in Rotinonshonni circles, “original instructions”. Subsistence for example is the relationship a people have with the land that supports them, not necessarily a particular kind of economic tradition. What is taught today in public schools across the U.S. is based upon a European view of the world, one which assumes an imperial scientific view, an American migration from Siberia, and immigrant viewpoint which begins in 1492 in this land, as otherwise it draws its long-view from European and Abrahamic stories and traditions.

## *A Spiritual Education*

Forbes (1974a) variously describes the goals of education to be a spiritual one, arguing that:

from the traditional American perspective the central essence of education is not, in any case, the acquisition of specific skills or factual knowledge (although this is a necessary part of a person's growth through life) but rather it is learning how to be a human being, *and how to live a life of the utmost spiritual quality* (p. 19).

In relation to finding one's path, the purpose of education is inherently the means, the process whereby we help others on their own journey in life. Life is understood by Forbes to be an experience we have as spiritually imbued beings where the core of ourselves is the "spiritual quality". Forbes used the metaphor of the acorn, the seed of the oak to identify the potentiality of the spirit. Forbes analogy was that, "an acorn seeks to explode and send forth roots and a stem, to grow into as mighty an oak as it can be", and drawing potential, or potency (Latin *potentia* "power") to its foundational meaning of power (p. 5, Forbes, Martin & Risling 1972). The acorn "has "power", the only real "power", the *ability* to grow into what it should be" and this power comes from the "Universe, the Creator" who is "like an acorn. It is "power exploding forth", it is "power yet unborn", it is "power going back into itself" (ibid, pp. 5-6). What this means for people, Forbes says is that we are "like an acorn, except that a human not only has the "power" to grow into body but also has the "power" to develop other potentiality, such as in creating beauty, in doing great things, in learning about the Unseen World. . . . all life, but especially humans have the ability to serve as the means whereby the Creator's dynamic potentiality is given expression" (p. 6). In sum, "a person must learn how to express the potential of the Great

Creative Power” (ibid). So, while the spiritual core is an important element in any educational endeavor, it will not be a realistic goal if the people’s traditions and community are not in control, empowered and the creators of their own people. So, we see today that while in places like Hawai’i, Alaska, and Dinétah that locally controlled schools do exist, the issue of full implementation of the spiritual core of tradition is not always endorsed or adhered to because of the foreign and corrupt ways schools are recognized and developed as part of an imperial system.

It is assumed that “religion” is different from “science”, so much that in the case of *Edwards v. Aguillard* 482 U.S. 578 (1987) any subject taught without a “clear secular purpose” can be labeled “religious”, yet this does not apply to imperial science. Secular means what in a society that is highly interactive between religious, scientific and other knowledge traditions and institutions. Forbes (1975a) on the other hand considers religion and science to be the same thing, a profession of belief. Further, Forbes (1973b) articulates that Native Nations in general “did not create a gap between the “spiritual” and the “material”” because they are “but one process of unfolding and return. This avoidance of dualism is very important because it saved Indian societies from the kind of sickness and repression which has so often typified European groups” (p. 214). U.S. public schools invariably teach a new imperial religion: Science. Part of this is because while a semblance of control is attained, the economic or sustainable foundation is not secured locally as federal, state and other funding sources dominate the landscape of education. These funds ultimately transform the basis of education from learning to become spiritual people, to learning to become economically viable people according to



the sources of economic funding, the dictates of global market capitalism, oil industry, etc.

*What that means for education is to try to help children to grow so that they have the strength to follow a path where they can see the entire world and other humans as their responsibility, rather than just see themselves and how much money that they can make (Forbes 1979c, p. 12, emphasis original).*

This is a pathway of spirit, which as Forbes (1998) reminds us is an old one, an old *mutomakan* or road (in Lenape). The pathway of spirit leads us back to our ancestors, to the first, to the eldest ones that are now wholly spirit. Forbes thinks of his journey at a crucial time in his life, just after he has begun to become a new “elder of sorts” after retiring from UC Davis NAS which he helped lead for nearly 30 years, Forbes (1998d) says,

How should one live such a life as we have?  
my quest, my seeking is the same  
as that of all the Old Ones  
to take my place in the long line  
of the ones who have gone before  
along this same well-worn path  
which at the same time may be new and fresh  
for those who travel without a guide (p. 98).

And this is one of the key elements of education, which is that we are guided somehow by others. We have mentors, models, ancestors, spirits, teachers, family, cousins, children, students, the “Old Ones” and all the creatures of the universe that came before

and after which can show us the way to live, to travel down this “well-worn path” of spirit. He (1998) explains that for him, “his strength comes from Mother Earth,

*Gaahseena Hakee*, and from my friends the trees, the clouds” and

all my relations indeed

and the Great Rock Tosaut on the beach

my good friend to whom I say *waanishiee* [thank you]!

and the wind and fog [of Bandon, Oregon]

and the humans whom I love

and all of this I find so liberating

just to know these gifts of *keeshaymelokong*,

Creator of us all . . . (p. 98).

Forbes (1994) conceived of “creator” not as a man but as a powerful spirit creator possessing male-female qualities akin to the Mexica concept of Ometeotl (two spirit), as is apparent from his frequent references to “Mama God” (Forbes 1994a), “The Great Creative Power” or *manitowic*, or “kitche manitou” the Great Spirit, or “The Great Holy Mystery” (p. 114), but also as Grandfather (p. 118). Forbes personal understanding of the great mystery was in part shaped by a Christian upbringing which he almost totally rejected, and while he respected “Jesus the Palestinian”, he despised the organized church of sin and its inherited legacy of imperialism (Forbes 2009). For example, in his last year of life Forbes (2011) summarizes his view this way:

I take seriously the Jewish Genesis view of us humans as “Earthers” (*adhams*) made from the Earth because many Indian tribes have the same stories of how our ancestors originated. And I will surely return to the earth and be embraced by her

and her living body of worms, microbes, and active organisms. Church school teachings often left me very dissatisfied, but Native American stories gave me permission to be the kind of person I really was (p. 13).

Further, Forbes relates his view this way, “the Creator, the Great Spirit, is everywhere I always feel close to her/him” and later as “mother-father” revealing a continuity with his earlier work showing he clearly did not conceive of “God” as a male maker and power. It is also clear that his perception, his beliefs, his understandings and feelings about the spiritual core of existence were formed early on, and then developed and nurtured all along his *mutomakaan* through life. This seems to be one of the core reasons why he insisted that students and peoples must be free to develop and form their own ideas about their beliefs rather than be force-fed indoctrination in rigid institutions. A spiritual education was clearly for Forbes an open way, one which seriously engaged the forces of the universe with respect and reverence. He had, and desired others to embrace the benefits of a liberated mind and body, which above all, respects the liberty of others, in word and deed. A spiritual education was equated often with a liberatory education.

### *A Liberatory Education*

Many educators speak of liberation but very few have envisioned liberation from the U.S., Canada, or other states. Few openly discern of a liberatory education which exposes the evils of corporate exploitation, which puts an end to the gulag prison labor system, which speaks of repatriation of Native Nations territories, or reparations for enslaved Blacks or Native Americans, Mexicans or Chicanos, and other grave legacies of exploitation and dispossession constructed by an imperial system. Forbes (1980b)

imagined that a Native American founded and controlled university could serve as the “midwife” of decolonization through re-socialization into traditional Native American communities and thought. He suggested however that the need for an indigenous intelligentsia was paramount, or the development of creative and intelligent leadership from *within* Native communities. However, he differed from many of his contemporaries in that he distrusted some tribal governments or at least, held a certain skepticism about their overall allegiance to the people and territories they represented. Foremost was because:

the brainwashed colonial intelligentsia have “given up”. They have accepted conquest. They accept the rules laid down by the conqueror. Nationalism, resistance, liberation, and struggle are concepts which are frightening to them, because these concepts threaten the comfortable “bargain” they have made with the system of oppression (p. 80).

Forbes view of education is that it supported the most basic aspects of community and nation, the defense of people to become their potential, to follow their own paths, to follow a spiritual path, but also for a people to live and move in their own direction without imperial repercussions. Indian education in the U.S. prior to the 1960’s was a constant battle over the life of children and families who were subjected to alien laws designed specifically to regulate and resocialize all Native Nations into a neo-imperial and colonial relationship. Native Nations continued to develop their own community despite various forms of captive, segregated, special, and intolerant kinds of living environments. It wasn’t until the 1960’s that an Indian could “let their hair down”, and

not be subjected to the gross patriarchal conditions of religious and public assimilationist schooling.

Forbes (1972c) historical view was that liberation, revitalization and resistance movements were rooted in traditional education which had raised Native leaders organically without white education. He viewed the Society of American Indians (1911) as extremely elitist because most never returned to actually work with their respective Nations and instead were “an organization hostile towards “grass-roots” Indians” (Forbes 1980, p. 77). When the National Indian Youth Council (NIYC) was formed in 1961 in Gallup, NM, many of its leaders at this time had an advanced degree including Herb Blatchford (UNM alumni of 1952), Shirley Hill Witt, Mel Thom, and Clyde Warrior to name a few. The NIYC’s Mel Thom issued a number of calls to transform Indian education in the early 1960’s, and in May of 1966, he and Forbes, who at the time was the director of the Center for North American Studies at the University of Reno connected at first by letter and then, established a stronger relationship after moving to Berkeley as the new director of the Far West Educational Research Laboratory in 1967, where soon after the NIYC headquarters were temporarily located into the Claremont Hotel (Letter from Forbes to Thom, D-046, B. 3, F. 1966-68; Forbes 1985, p. 10; Shreve 2012, p. 164-167). While Forbes had developed the Native American Movement also in 1961, he did not make it to the infamous American Indian Chicago conference whose 20 Declaration of Purpose has been heralded by many scholars as an epiphanic and “a major watershed in the history of native peoples” with the formation of NIYC and the fish-ins in mind (Hauptman & Campisi 1988, p. 316). By 1968, Mel Thom had successfully led the NIYC through many battles, and after joining the Poor People’s Campaign (NCAI

pulled out after an initial commitment), read a collectively written statement to Secretary of State Dean Rusk during a meeting on May 1st as the campaign converged on Washington, saying:

Our chief spokesman in the federal government, the Department of Interior, has failed us. In fact it began failing us from its very beginning. The Interior Department began failing us because it was built upon and operates under a racist, immoral, paternalistic and colonialistic system. There is no way to improve upon racism, immorality and colonialism; it can only be done away with. The system and power structure serving Indian peoples is a sickness which has grown to epidemic proportions. The Indian system is sick. Paternalism is the virus and the secretary of the Interior is the carrier (as quoted in Cobb 2008, p. 167).

Forbes conception of a liberatory education meant independent in creation and control from colonial power structures and relationships which was framed by its many opposing liberal persons and institutions as segregationist and separatist. He found the leading members of the NIYC more receptive to his idea for an independent American Indian University than as Forbes (1985) recalls in the numerous others he contacted in the four years preceding their connection such that in 1963 he estimated it was:

at least 34 tribal councils, 7 inter-tribal organizations, 14 white organizations, and dozens of individual Indians had been contacted, in addition to 11 U.S. Senators, 4 representatives in Congress, 2 Supreme Court justices, several executives in the Interior Department and the Office of Economic Opportunity, officials with the Organization of American States, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson and many others (p. 5).

John A. Carver, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior responded to Forbes letters sent to then President John F. Kennedy and VP Johnson in March of 1963 speaking positive about their support of the Institute of American Indian Arts (IAIA) in Santa Fe while speaking against a “separate institution at the college level” (D-046, B. 3, F. 1963; Forbes 1985, p. 5).

By 1967, Forbes had attempted to establish a unique independent University for all Native Nations (which he had called variously as an Indo-American University, United Nations University, and American Indian University) through numerous conversations, letters, proposals, publications and outreach efforts but it wasn't until the founding of the Ad Hoc Committee on Indian Education by California Indian leaders and the establishment of the California Indian Education after the historic meeting at North Fork that year where his idea gained impetus and ground among a large following of local peoples (Forbes 1985, p. 18; Caspar-Denman 2013). By 1969, the CIEA had received funding for an American Indian University Pilot Project after Forbes and company had proposed an initial survey and series of courses that were conducted in and near various Native communities from which D-Q University was eventually founded to follow up the CIEA's mandate to develop a non-profit and then search for a site, staff and funding to carry its program (Forbes, Martin & Risling 1972, pp. 1-2; Forbes 1985, p. 19; see also “CIEA: A Case History of Trailblazing”, D-334, B. 78). In the wake of the Third World Liberation Front (TWLF) strikes and protests at UC Berkeley and San Francisco State University in 1968, Forbes declined to accept a director and faculty position of the Native American Studies program because as he claims, the CIEA advised him towards a more rural and amicable location from which most CA reservation and rancheria

communities are based as well as his own personal reasons and instead chose UC Davis, which was near the future D-Q site as well (ibid; see also Forbes TWLF declination speech, D-334, B.77, F. “Correspondence 1968”). If, D-QU as imagined as anything, it was “many roads to education” which included a liberatory quality that focused on freeing the mind of the brainwashed masses, a spiritual education which supported the diverse community traditions of Native Nations, and it was Indian created and controlled from the beginning and from the ground-up. More to this point in the next section.

Forbes (1973) described the creation of Native American/American Indian Studies as an avenue, a path, a road, from which Native peoples would be able study what they wanted, such as with or upon their own people, and in turn be able to continue following the destiny and way of their nation. Forbes (1974c) said, “Native Studies is a path of liberation, a path of liberation for groups and for individuals. . . . in the sense that it will help our conquered-colonialized people to overcome the negative effects of five centuries of genocide and oppression” (p. 15). This is unique in that his vision of education was that colonial-imperial forms were setting youth and community on a path which directed them to become workers, murderers, junkies, aggressors and exploiters because that is what and who the education system is founded upon and is funded by. Forbes knew that what Native people needed was an alternative route back to their people because the goal of colonial schooling was to siphon students off into this whole world of exploitation away from their people. Yet many peoples and families have not been able to offer the youth a positive alternative because of the deprivation and trauma experienced in boarding and public schools, on and off the reservation or rancheria, in the workplace or while on the streets. A major aspect of this problem is that peoples are actually part of



“captive nations” or they have been de-nationalized and instead have adopted a number of various allegiances and identities via racialization, castization (caste) or proletarianization (class), and resocialized or nationalized to the U.S. imperial state and other subject states. Further, Forbes talks about decolonization in education from the standpoint of liberating the mind, heart and spirit from outside and undue influences.

Indian people are a conquered people, and they are also a colonialized, that they have been ruled by aliens for too long, their decisions have been made by aliens for too long, Indian people have been corrupted by all of the influences that come from a colonial experience (Forbes (1968), “Educational Liberation”D-334, B. 43, F. 5).

This is the reason Forbes believed was of the greatest difficulties that lay before Native Nations, because liberation is not simply about being, but it is the alternative actions and experiences that are made by free peoples which is at stake and will make the difference.

. . . in the final analysis they [public schools] have to be changed by the local Indian people in that area. In any case this is where it has to be done because the real answer I think to the problem of powerlessness, and the problem of negative self-images, inferiority complexes and the other kinds of things that go along with conquest, these kinds of things all have to be overcome by particular Indian communities, particular Indian people obtaining power over schools. There is no way that I think we can talk about a kind of national Indian leadership, or even state Indian leadership, or regional Indian leadership acquiring power and then saying that this power is saying that all Indian people have power. It doesn't work that way. It has to be each Indian community that has power over its own destiny,

over its own community self-development, that is meaningful in the long run as apart of American Indian liberation (ibid).

Forbes (1968) recognized however that schools or education efforts alone can never lead to liberation because the heart of education is rooted in the relationships, experiences, traditions and movement of community. The community should be the real focus of education, not the other way around. Forbes argued this point clearly when he said,

. . . although what happens in these kinds of schools is important, what really counts is what takes place in the Indian community, because all of these other things depend upon what happens in the Indian community. You either have a liberated Indian community that will fight for the kinds of things that I've been talking about here. Or these things will not be achieved. I think that although it may sound kind of trite in a way, I think that many Indian communities in the United States that have experienced an extreme form of conquest must go through a process of being reborn. One could almost say the traditional way that perhaps many people need to go through a real ceremonial re-induction into being Indian once again, in the fullest sense, or being a part of their community once again, other communities might not need to do that but in some way whether it just be an awakening of the individual or a some kind of more elaborate process that might eventually evolve in Indian communities as they begin to rediscover themselves and want to make themselves whole again. The Indian community needs to experience a rebirth. This rebirth is already taking place in many areas, but this needs to happen. There needs to be a rediscovery of the greatness of the Indian heritage. Of the tremendous value of what the American Indian people have to

offer not only to themselves but to the society at large (Forbes 1968, “Educational Liberation”).

Further, Forbes offered that outside of schools, community members and parents were to take the lead in liberation because it is their modeling which will make the changes necessary. Forbes (1968) says “there are many ways that an Indian community can liberate their own territory without fighting the white power structure. Because much of the colonialism that exists in Indian communities exists in the minds of Indian people” (“Educational Liberation”). How is this possible? How can a community liberate territory through mental liberation?

Part of the answer Forbes reveals elsewhere is that a community divided, a community without a consciousness of the colonial realities and relationships so prevalent, a community ignorant of the goals of schools and education in a colonial society, a community which casually allows the leasing of its lands to corporations, or does nothing to prevent further desecration and destruction by other kinds of exploiters, merely perpetuates its own captivity, its own oppression. Forbes believed that psychological liberation, political liberation, territorial liberation, etc., were all interconnected facets which cannot be overcome alone. Harold Cardinal’s (1977) own thesis outlined in his *Rebirth of Canada’s Indians* states that “the liberation, the rebirth of the Indian people” requires the revitalization of traditional laws and spirituality which should be the “principal basis of Indian nationhood” (p. 221). But where are these learned and practiced if on the one hand public schools teach instead adherence and allegiance to imperial laws and a near absence of spiritual relationships, traditions and discourse? Forbes (1974) crucial understanding was that “education is a process of significance and

it is, therefore, *never neutral* in a situation of oppression. It is either a liberating anti-colonialist process (and is, either suppressed or “underground”) or it serves to support and maintain the status quo” (p. 22, emphasis original). Forbes often paints an either/or dichotomy or sphere of possible activity whose determinism is off-putting and arrogant, pitting the traditional and accommodationist, colonial and anti-colonial, liberatory or reformist-conservative always in contrast. Forbes (1974c) view was that Native Nations were the only authentic American Nations and within this view, he emphasized Americanization, or the indigenization of all institutions so that native American traditions would be the standard of all criteria taught in education. He says vehemently:

The American Way, the native way of this vast land, offers us all a chance to save the Americas. We must create conditions which will allow Native People complete self-determination and the resources necessary for survival. At the same time we must make available the possibility of Americanization for the non-native sectors of the population. Native Studies can be one valuable tool in the struggle to save our people and this land (p. 26).

Forbes view was that liberation was a need of imperialized others as well, one which could be led native American liberation traditions rather than Christian liberation theologies. Yet, the point remains, are any reformist style schools doing the work of anti-imperialism or decolonization today? I know from my own experiences in many kinds of educational settings that even the presence of a single dissenting individual often poses a challenge to even the most “progressive” of efforts. Schools are not neutral locations of learning, but on the other hand, they represent the pinnacle of concentrated imperialism

and socialization upon the most weak and influential members of a family and people, the youth.

Forbes (1974d) considered that the only pathway forward was the full-scale introduction of an Indigenous or American school system which provided the opportunity for students to learn upon a “Liberation Road and an American Road, which is to say that it becomes Americanistic” or Indigenous at its core (p. 34). This American and Liberation road of education has as its mission and goals for American and other communities the desire “to live a self-[-]determined life which respects the rights of self-determination of all other living creatures, the only kind or way capable of saving us from imperialism, totalitarianism, and materialistic destruction of our Mother Earth” (pp. 35-6). Forbes consistently goes back to the destructive realities of imperialism so to always keep in mind that the task of education is indeed greater than simply liberation, but also revitalization, nation-rebuilding, peace, and an ecological harmony that comes out of these basic conditions being met. Tradition isn’t simply an ancient set of practices, but as Bob Thomas and Forbes have intimated, it’s about *living tradition* which entails the opportunity and potentiality of internally directed development through incorporating new experiences, visions, and ideas from living members while building upon solid foundations.

Ethelou Yazzie (1975) once gave a speech upon what she felt the Diné could and should do in order to address the colonial relationships and realities before them and insisted that:

By tradition women own the land, the herds. They have great power within the family and the clan. Our tradition can liberate us from our restrictive culture. We

must search our lives and get back to our roots. We must regain the place and the respect that once was ours. That place and respect that other cultures took away from us (pp. 7-8).

In it, she identifies that traditional gender roles among her people saw women as powerful, and as leaders, however, the constant influence of outsiders has had its toll. Liberatory ideas have also unfortunately pitted many peoples against each other and the varied kinds of factionalism found in many communities represents an exacerbated condition of divide and rule. A liberatory education is an opportunity to strike a peaceful unity among American Nations who have succumbed to the politics of proletarianization, have become used to the exploitation of their bodies, lands and traditions, and have precious few options left within the imperial matrix to move in any other direction beyond the corral of colonialism. I will discuss later the specific ways NAS and D-QU for example chose to develop and implement traditional and alternative ways of learning and getting an education within the confines of a colonial-imperial atmosphere.

#### *Native Science: Education for Knowledge, Skills and Technique*

Science is commonly translated as knowledge, a noun, but rather it is a process of learning, such as the scientific method. Traditionally, the Greeks called this *skhizein*, or in Latin *scindere* which is the act of rendering or splitting, that is, dissecting information which is an act of power over something which became *scientia*. Common words we use to describe this in English include schism, rescind, and shit-shed, which describe the art of separation or something that is cut-off. Western imperial science is rooted in the acquisition and use of this power and control over others which allow them to make

decisions based on the value of life. If knowledge was valued for the way it was used to heal and help others, then perhaps imperialists would not have committed such grave acts as the extinction of many species of plants, animals and peoples who held and embody this knowledge. Forbes (1973) says “the student can, in no way, acquire insight into the realities of Native American life without a thorough knowledge of values” (p. 215). Yet we know that western science is most prominently lacking of value orientations, how values are enacted after the fact of knowledge production and how the knowledge is utilized in the long run. All of the amassed knowledge, skills and techniques are valueless if they in turn are damaging to individuals, groups and the precious ecological balance we must maintain. Viola Cordova once framed this dilemma this way:

Knowledge, in a Native American sense, is not equated with wisdom. Knowledge with the added awareness of its pragmatic implications comprises wisdom. The ability to clone human beings is certainly a bit of knowledge, but is it wise? (As quoted in Waters, 2003, p. 2).

Forbes et al (1972) puts it this way:

a person should learn skills, and learn them well. Skills that bring forth beauty, that bring forth knowledge, that bring forth harmonious living, that bring forth things which are useful. All these skills and others are important. A person without any skills, without anyway to give expression to the Great Spirit, is an unhappy person, a person who is unrealized (p. 6).

Knowledge, or the acquisition of knowings, is unique to each people and person, and depends greatly upon the value attributed to each and every thing. Relationality, or the idea that we are related to all life, big and small, near and far, is a core idea Forbes

propounds upon (Wilson 2008). For example, Forbes describes in an undated, seemingly late 1990's or early 2000 text, "Ancient American Philosophies: Traditional Knowledge for Modern Times," "how we are direct manifestations of the "Wemi Tali," the All-Where, or the "Natural World" [,] we are like plants growing in Sun's garden on Mother Earth" (p. 1). While knowledge about the "natural world" may be important in and of itself, more important is how one incorporates this knowledge into living with the "natural world" and all our relations. Forbes maintains that our values when actualized are what defines good knowledge and bad knowledge, wisdom traditions and experimentation. Core values such as respect, humility, kinship, and power manifested in utilizing our unique kinds of giftedness for the benefit of the community such as through acts of love, sacrifice, and giving. Each and every person is responsible for their own actions and in actualizing their own power or potential, from which Forbes says "they have to live out the power given to them and which they contain. In living out their power, they can hurt us just as a Grizzly or a Lion can hurt us" (p. 2).

Forbes (2001) interprets the nature of knowledge to be representative of solely of our activities that are bound to knowledge use. The white male scientist as the epitome of knowledge in action is equally bound to this dilemma. "'Nature' and 'culture' are separate and are often antagonistic" is one example that Forbes provides for clarity (p. 106). Nature is seen as something outside of the imperialist, the scientist, the missionary, etc., because they have elevated their sense of power and identity beyond other beings and hence are producers of culture which other beings, are not. Further, he says, "this is in direct contradiction to what First Americans believe, because they seem to see all of life, which surrounds us, as intelligent, inventive, changing, learning, teaching, evolving,



acting, praying, feeling and responding” (p. 107). This is a common thread in imperialist science, religion and belief systems which are constantly degrading other forms of life, but also other kinds of peoples. “The nonhuman world and the biophysical body become essentially “lower” and designed to serve the “higher” element” which is manifest in the numerous dichotomies and dualisms present in such as female/male, animal/man, heathen/Christian or scientist, black or native/white, etc. (ibid). Because of this distinction, knowledge of the nonhuman world goes unrecognized, and is lost. Forbes refers to the traditional Lenape story of the seven youth who have visions of seven stones which are said to have spoken to them (Speck 1937, pp. 171-173). In Onöndowa’ga:’ traditions, the stones are responsible for literally teaching the ancient stories to people (Parker 1935, p. 74). The stone is alive, the stone has power, the stone has wisdom, the stone is intelligent beyond measure. While knowledge is something, at the same time, it is an active perpetuation of a certain kind of relationship with life. Thus, Forbes often focused upon the act of knowledge growing over a lifetime so that it results in wisdom, or experience and actions which represent the highest pinnacle of values, knowledge and relationships combined as they affect living community. Forbes (n.d.) points out that “life is an adventure” and further, “and we should try to be worthy of the gifts bestowed upon us. Each one of us is worthy of respect, no matter what gifts we have”. Further, he says, “we cannot judge, in the total scheme of things, which are the greater acts, the greater gifts, and thus we are humble about our triumphs, realizing that so much of our inspiration comes from beyond our own mental and physical resources”. Forbes (1973b) finds this most pointedly expressed in his students at UC Davis NAS and at D-QU who predominantly do not go into natural sciences because the large gaps in language, culture,

knowledge, values and community. He says most Native students are “not even interested in knowledge for knowledge’s sake” (p. 21). This is because knowledge is dangerous and because as he puts it, Native persons “orientation is towards their own people and what they can do to help their people in any way possible” (ibid). Instead, he says, Native people are focused on “applied knowledge” which will return to their families, communities and territories (p. 108). Theoretical knowledge if not directly applied is useless, it has not been tested and is not valued by others. Its results are empty. Its ideas are already dead. It’s not worth the paper it’s printed on.

Further, and which is most important for so-called knowledge production is the origin of knowledge and its relationship to particular communities, directly. The purpose of D-QU and NAS were essentially to provide Native students with an education that went well beyond the classroom. Most institutions of education are racist and colonialist, that is, they are biased towards these kinds of knowledge which they privilege in their curriculum, mission and structures. The reason this is so apparent is because if you are not actively fighting, challenging and bringing attention to imperialism, sexism, racism, etc., then you are a part of the problem by implication and worse, it means these issues are not on your radar, they don’t exist, they are non-issues. D-QU was formed as Forbes et al (1972) declared in an early communique for Native people, for Chicano people, because, “the worst years were those from the 1880’s through the present. These were the years of intensive colonialism and systematic land robbery. These were the years when white people tried to destroy the manhood and pride of the Indian and the Chicano”, and this sets the stage for D-QU which was formed “to serve these unvanquished millions, *that is what D-QU is all about*” (p. 2, emphasis original). Further,

D-QU was not founded to serve the interests of the white anglo. . . filling job “slots” in the white society. . . to convert Indians to Mormonism, Protestantism or any other church. . . .to generate research funds for white scholars. . . to simply imitate white styles of learning. . . to produce “overhead” for the support of white bureaucracy. . . to destroy the Indian or Chicano student by cutting him off from his own people. . . to serve in the annihilation of Native Nations or Aztlan. . . to serve any imperialist-military-industrial complex. . . to try to push the Indian and Chicano people in any particular direction, except that of self-realization. Does any white controlled college exist that can make these statements? (p. 3, “Why D-QU”).

D-QU is the only college or university to explicitly serve both Chicanos and Indians as their primary student constituency, if these two groups are even separate at all, which is Forbes contention. The original site was applied for after convening members inclusive of Forbes, David Risling Jr. and Jim Racine formed a non-profit, sought legal representation with California Indian Legal Services, and completed the application for a recently disposed Army Telecommunications Center near Davis, CA, with the only other applicant being UC Davis. At first awarded prematurely to UC Davis under the auspices of rice and primate research purposes and with only a few vaguely filled application pages, the leaked story allowed UC Davis Native and Chicano students time to rally for their cause, occupy the site, file an injunction, and build grassroots support (Lutz 1980; Forbes 1985).

The barometer for Forbes (1979) of science was that “science is an approach to life wherein looking again and again in a systematic way opens up the doors of

understanding. Understandably then, science is a very old human characteristic going back to ancient times” and is not the property or invention of imperialism, western society, Europeans or scientists (p. 132). Science, literally means knowledge in Greek, *skhein*, to separate or to discern. Cajete (2000) says “Native science is most akin to what Western science calls environmental science or ecology. And while Native people don’t have a particular word for either of those Western terms, they certainly have an understanding of the practice of those disciplines” (p. 4). What’s most important is one’s relationship to other forms of life. Cajete says all Nations have this knowledge, and this knowledge is built upon relationships, ones that are “ultimately tied to the relationships that they have established and applied during their history with regard to certain places and to the earth as a whole” (ibid). Thus, when we think of education today, we must be conscious as Viola Cordova (2007) reminds us that we are always looking through “frames” or “windows” built over time by our ancestors, filtered through our languages, laws, stories, experiences, and relationships, what Cajete (2000) calls a “culturally mediated lens” (p. 4). Cajete (2000) elsewhere explains that “coming-to-know is the goal of Indigenous science” and he says “is the best translation for education in Native traditions” (pp. 80-81). Forbes (1979) remarks that ancient Native science was systematic and methodical, and “it seems very clear that Indians have long experimented in systematic ways with drugs, herbs, etcetera and have applied the knowledge gained in order to seek not “magic” but clarity of understanding”, what John Mohawk (2008) calls “clear thinking” (p. 133). Science in Forbes view is nothing without a spiritual-ethical core which bounds knowledge to living traditions, for otherwise, it is truly a dangerous

posture to assume you “know” something which is actually destructive. Forbes (1979) explains by example his conclusive framework this way:

The Navajo elders have created a concept very relevant to this discussion. They have constructed a picture of a corn-plant growing out of the earth. The corn-plant symbolizes the human being. Going up through the center of the corn-plant is a core which represents the continuing spiritual-ethical development of any human being. Without that core the fruits will be no good. And so it is with science. Without a spiritual-ethical core, without a balanced life, scientists can become experimenters for Hitlers or Stalins. They can easily allow their technical skills to be sold to the highest bidder, or to use them themselves to seek an upper-income lifestyle at all costs. Science, in modern society, is easily corruptible because it has become separated from ethics. or perhaps we should say that many scientists are incomplete persons, grown-up children who still have the selfish, blind aggressiveness seen in many Western children. Traditional Native science was and is wholistic (p. 135).

Forbes argues that Native Science might rightly be called the Science of Appropriate Behavior. “By Using the Science of Appropriate Behavior Indian people were able to develop societies which could satisfactorily function without jails, armies, police, orders, kings, sexism. racism. imperialism, class exploitation, rape, murder, theft, or age discrimination” for Native Science was concerned with how to live a good life with other life (p. 135). Relationships are the core, which are empowered by carefully culled values, ceremonies and compacts so that “mutual reciprocity” and responsibility are permanent

features of Native science and from which there is “also celebration of life, a key element in seeking to understand how to live a good life” (Cajete 2000, p. 79).

### *Education for Wisdom and Democracy*

The ultimate goal was not to attain a bit of knowledge or some useable skills, but rather the height of spiritual embodiment was a person who acquired wisdom or became a wise person, which is a person who knows him or herself, but also knows the learning-living path from beginning to end and can in turn show another, the way. This is best expressed contemporarily as the teacher’s teacher. Forbes was at a young age, “looking for the wise”, and was often upset that so many young and old persons he met, at school, on the streets, in the hills and other places did not offer him much wisdom or ways to become wise. Forbes (1992c) asks, “what is a wisdom-seeker” and answers the question by saying they are “a man or a woman who seeks to be truly authentic as he or she travels onward in beauty and humility seeking knowledge” (p. 39). Forbes (1992c) directs us to some of these pathways, mentioning for example that “one path often followed by Native People is to learn directly from the animals and from the Earth”, who are the eldest and hence, most wise of earthly creatures (p. 40).

As my wisdom grows from seeds collected  
Here and there, without looking I am  
finding  
In old hotels and on reservations  
In ghettos and barrios  
On little farms and  
in the hills  
Among children and mothers  
With love in their eyes for a little one  
In  
so many different places: Wise men  
Wise women (Forbes 1981b, p. 74).

The search for wisdom was Forbes true love, whether it was walking or running, talking or listening, reading or writing, he was always gazing inward and outward into life’s

owl. He was on a path at a young age, and because he knew the path he was on and where he wanted to go, and what he wanted to become, he sought out others who he could learn from, who matched his genius and desire, his culture and community, his love and sense of right and justice. This was a personal quest, but also, it was deemed to be a quest of a whole community who together could raise such peoples so as to grow old in wisdom and the ability to live together in communion. At the age of 64, Forbes (1998d) reflected on his path, his journey to become wise, and he spoke of it as someone who long been on that road, saying with experience and with some sense of concern that,

For the battle for wisdom is every much demanding as the fight  
for justice, the quest for truth and fair play, which I have tried  
to be following for two score and more years and it  
still has me in its firm grip  
as I seek at the same time to pass the baton  
to young men and women  
not to become lazy but to get on to that other  
quest, the wisdom road (p. 95).

We see here, that the “wisdom road”, is not one easily traversed, and entailed a great deal of triumphs, failures, work and perseverance which even Forbes himself, who is very accomplished in his life at the time of this writing, still acknowledged that he may have just barely started out in comparison to where he could be, that is, fulfilling his potential and power. The “great question” for Forbes (1979a) is, “how one lives in this life” which is guided by the Great Creative Power as he often puts it (a rendition of Lenape, *manitowic*) (p. 6). In Forbes estimation, educational efforts come from the first teachings,

those found in the creation and other origin stories which describe how the world was made, essentially out of nothing. Forbes (1989a) describes its significance this way:

I believe that it is significant that in these ancient oral accounts the Creator arises from the primordial nothingness (obscurity) as, essentially, Wisdom. This divine Wisdom then unfolds as a mental-like process, conceiving things by means of creative wisdom. Significantly, many other Native Americans (such as the Zuni) record this tradition of the mental nature of creation. The process of genesis is also seen as evolutionary, a gradual unfolding of stages of creation (p. 117).

Concern over our evolution as peoples, is a concern over our wisdom traditions, which recognize where wisdom comes from, which is from creation and the spirit powers that created all things. In this way, we are small, insignificant beings, for we are created by the great powers and cannot live with creation, being the land and all the creatures and powers in it. Our creations are even more insignificant if they are not modeled on the Great Creative Power, and it is these deviations which stand in the way of our continued evolution. This superiority complex represents one of these key deviations, most pronounced in the empire-building efforts over the last few thousand years in key places and communities around the world.

Forbes (1980b) relates that one of his most outspoken frameworks, “the greatness of the native or Indian mind” relates specifically to the idea that Indians of the Americas were everywhere a “philosopher-people” and a “race of seekers after wisdom” (p. 17). Forbes (1998a) further, he suggests that wisdom traditions, their communities and persons of origin, are the epitome and foundation of education. They are rooted most significantly in what Forbes sees as “the respect shown for self-determination, *both for*



*individuals and for collectivities*” (p. 12, emphasis original). Forbes is arguing that the supposed “democratic tradition” which recognizes the sacrosanctity of the “individual” and the “collective” is actually an ancient, American tradition, rather than one imported from Europe. Individuals have the power to not take part in a group’s actions if they deem them to be out of sync with their own morality or may injure themselves in the process in an unequal way. This is the basis of Thoreau’s *civil disobedience*. That is, a person or people should not be forced to submit to the will of a powerful group simply because they provoke retribution or death as the consequence, that is, they use their ability to inflict punishment upon you as the basis for agreement or acquiescence. We know this as coercion. Forbes (1971) maintains that at the root of wisdom and democracy is the absolute respect for the individual and group. “The people” must be good, respectful and wise in order to be a benefit to others, otherwise they should probably be on their own so as to injure the least number of lives by their lack of values and unhealthy practices. Thus Forbes (1997) concluded that U.S. democracy is impossible here because “democracy really lies upon respect”, and is in fact, opposed by the current imperial systems founded by the British, Spanish and other colonizing imperialists (D-046, B. 193, “The Greatness of the Native Mind”). Forbes (1994c) says,

One of the great problems in the world today is that key political, cultural and social decisions are being made by men alone, or by a large majority of men, with only minimal participation by women. This presents a great danger for the world because men, by themselves, are not wise enough or balanced enough. It takes both men and women to keep the world balanced and to protect the interests of future generations (p. 1).

Forbes suggests that if women were given equal decision-making power or ultimate power in most traditional societies, then most treaties would be faulted for lack of democratic consensus-making as they most often did not include women in the end agreements. This practice was surely in part to imperial borne patriarchal traditions, what M.A. Jaimes Guerrero (2003) calls “patriarchal colonialism”, but also perhaps as a reaction to early treaties and agreements made with powerful women leaders in the British colonial period such as the Treaty Between Virginia and the Indians of 1677 with Cockacoeskie, a Pamunkey queen and the “Queen of Wayonaoake”. In other words, without respect for the power and ways of queens, democracy is merely patriarchy and while this may be the practice of some groups, it was not of all.

Another pathway Forbes often spoke about was true democracy or rule by the people. This does not translate to majority rule, to voting, or representation. The clearest and most succinct concept in English is consensus. Consensus entails discussion, and in turn, agreement, by all parties. Consensual politics demand that everyone “feels together” or shares the same feeling about a specific action or idea. If there is dissension, the proceeding actions taken without agreement most likely require a kind of violence or a violation of the spirit of agreement, via a consensus making council. Yazzie (1975) describes this among Diné who prior to the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 and the founding of a “tribal council” never had a central council, leadership body, president or chairman, a majoritarian voting system, etc.:

the course of action is that which most agree to be wise. Agreement can take a great deal of time, not only must the majority agree, but those in the minority must be-convinced or resigned to the course of action before any course can be

followed. It is not a majority-rule system that can be decided by simple vote, such as the American system. The Navajo will not proceed either in his pre-history or in contemporary practice until he knows that everyone agrees exactly as to-how-things should and will be done. This period of discussion and persuasion may take hours, days, weeks, months, or years. In our oral history it can take eons (pp. 12-13).

Harmonious relationships are the most important conception which Yazzie and Forbes have framed for us. Although life is the path we are concerned most often with in education, death is also a path, for it is the life we live before and after this one, it is the path of spirit. In one of Forbes (1967f) last attempts to reach whitestream U.S. scholars, he deplored the arrogant and smug assumption that the U.S. was actually a democracy, or that its teachers and schools, curriculum and structures could ever teach what they do not know. He said:

Almost the entire early education of youth, whether in the church, the school, or the home, consists in some form of indoctrination ... indoctrination in religion, in moral attitudes, in general political philosophy and in prejudice and bias. Seldom is youth taught to disbelieve, to doubt, to question, to analyze. Rather, we train our youth to believe what they read and hear as long as it is not contrary to the biases and preconceptions with which we have previously filled their minds (p. 53).

Essentially, we train for blind obedience, and to accept horrors if we are deemed righteous, such as the farce that military action also “spreads democracy”. One key point he feels is missing is “clear thinking and critical analytic reasoning” and this is because:

the mere memorization of information does not lead one to know how to reason with an open mind. This is the great need in a democracy. Facts can always be obtained, once one knows where to look, but basic skills in critical reasoning are hard to develop after years of training in uncritical acceptance (ibid).

Forbes (1969b) suggested that “true education is always cross-cultural and always cosmopolitan” because we belong to diverse communities, replete with diverse persons, creatures, traditions, and in diverse ecologies that need us to respond accordingly, but yet, we are constantly strangled by schools which have a “fixation upon conformity and Anglo-American superiority” (p. 41). At a speech Forbes gave in 1971, he brought up the fact that in California there were literally 500 autonomous Nations who governed themselves predominantly through consensus, where in most localities practically

the entire adult population was involved in the decision making process and this kind of society, a non-coercive truly democratic society [was] based upon local government without any large scale bureaucracies, uh, without a red tape, uh, without any kinds of colonialism or quasi colonialism (“The Native Experience in California”, D-334, B. 43, F. 10).

Forbes had the gall to challenge the entire philosophy of education of the state, a state which had never known or studied any of the authentic democratic traditions within its reach. Fast forward to 1998, nearly thirty years after his original critiques were made, he found the local California state standards to be just as deplorable as they were when he was in elementary school in the 1930’s and 40’s. His critiques have consistently pointed to the fact that democracy could not be taught if actual democratic traditions are consistently ignored:

*The historical standards' focus is upon the kings, princes, elites, wealthy planters, presidents, and other well-known persons who are almost inevitably male and privileged.* The standards would have us believe that the struggles of the peasants, factory workers, miners, and other common folk played small roles in the evolution of “democracy.” Instead, credit is usually extended to a document such as the “magna carta” or some elite empowerment such as the “Glorious Revolution.” Considerable space in several grade levels is devoted to the supposed evolution of democracy, individualism and freedom, but the focus is on the wealthy elites, and always on white people, preferably English. The well-documented influence of Native American democratic practice upon European thinkers such as Voltaire and Rousseau is ignored, as are the countless daily examples provided by Native People’s contacts with their colonial neighbors. The specific contributions of the Great Binding Law of the Iroquois, superbly documented in the writings of Professor Donald Grinde (as well as by Benjamin Franklin) are left aside unmentioned (pp. 18-19, emphasis original).

The Kaianerekowa, or the Great Law Forbes refers to is thousands of years old, and represents one of the emblematic democratic traditions, yet again, this is not further analyzed or brought into the fore despite it being heavily studied, analyzed, critiqued and propounded by many scholars and traditional leaders. However, democracy, or consensus decision-making, is not practiced one way, and there is no one way that is superior to all others. Yet, how can we learn how to live and communicate, love and respect each other, and all life, if we are instead, ridiculed for simply bringing up this basic fact of our totalitarian and imperial states which are in the end, anti-democratic?

The Meriam Report of 1928 suggested that the end of an era was at hand and that total reform of the Indian schooling system would be taking place under the new policy of being able “to remain an Indian” rather than being fed to civilization. Part of the issue at hand which Forbes takes up is twofold. On the one hand, if you don’t allow democratic Nations to retain the means to perpetuate their polities such as with regaining their land base or providing the means to educate their own community as well as allowing the people themselves to critique and dismantle the system which has been targeted for abuse, terror, and genocide, nothing will change in the hands of the imperialists. Although some reforms were allowed, as Lomawaima and McCarthy (2006) have pointed out, these changes were siphoned into the small ponds of presumed “safe” subjects and kinds of teachings such as basket weaving, allowing western sports into boarding schools, and the accompanying marching bands. Those subjects and teachings deemed “dangerous” such as Native forms of Democracy, land stewardship, ceremonial traditions, and language use were defiantly resisted throughout the more than 100 years of federal advocacy of Indian education. In terms of language, the steps that were made included “allowing” minimal Native involvement in the process such as the development of the Navajo or Sioux readers which did include some Native authors, though were often largely “dumbed down” and toned towards patriotic themes which would highlight the supposed blessings of American democracy while totally ignoring Native thought, intelligence and traditions (Lomawaima and McCarthy 2006, pp. 109; Emerson 2004). By the time of the Indian education act of 1972, Reyhner (1989) and others observed that the new reformist efforts neglected traditional teachings and educational practices which were more often supplementary rather than the defining features which “makes it difficult

to integrate Indian language and culture into the regular school curriculum”. What has changed today? For example, do the Hopi have the full range of resources, control and creative capacity (without intervention) to create Hopituh Shi-nu-mu, or “Peaceful People” in their own homelands on behalf of their own communities? Is Hopi tradition and wisdom at the front of public schooling efforts off and on their mesas, and do the mesa way of life provide the basis for education? Democracy, like Science, or Religion cannot be treated as separated spheres of living and learning, and they must be practiced and demonstrated rather than “taught” or “explored” in schools. In 1961 and 1962, Democratic leader, and president John F. Kennedy tested the dichotomy of wisdom and democracy as he almost single handedly plunged the whole world into a nuclear holocaust during the Bay of Pigs invasion and the Cuban Missile Crisis, a fact critic Noam Chomsky (2003) says exposes the consistent lack of critique and awareness the U.S. has of its own history and structure as a terrorist state who in the words of Arthur Schlesinger sought to bring “the terrors of the earth” to Cuba (see also Chomsky 2014). The war against Vietnam for example drove this point clearly home with its 20-year long theatre of terror performed thousands of miles away from the U.S.’ pacific shores from 1955 to 1975.

### *Education to Make Good People*

In total, Forbes imagined education to be an individual pathway through life, which was a family, community and national pathway, where the total process of influence and acquisition of character, values, skills, wisdom, traditions, history, language, laws, etc. was self-perpetuating, and intergenerational. This does not differ

markedly from what Leona Okakok (1989) described of her Inupiaq communities of North Slope Borough School District in Alaska, who summarized education as, “a lifelong process” and “is the sum of learning acquired through interaction with one’s environment, family, community members, schools and other institutions” (p. 3). Okakok (1992) explains elsewhere that

educating a child means equipping him or her with the capability to succeed in the world he or she will live in. In our Inupiat communities, this means learning not only academics, but also to travel, camp, and harvest wildlife resources in the surrounding land and sea environments. Students must learn about responsibilities to the extended family and elders, as well as about our community and regional governments, institutions, and corporations, and significant issues in the economic and social system (411-412).

Basic skills are learned to survive as people of a place, but these are subordinate and practical to the responsibilities of people’s relationships to all creation, inclusive of other creatures or peoples. Forbes (1967b) suggested that if education was a pathway to becoming a person or people, schools should be a stable bridge “between these students and the adult world which they will subsequently enter” and if this is the case, the school “must serve as a transitional experience and not as a sudden leap into a totally foreign set of values and practices” (p. 21). Compare this definition with for example, that found and utilized at Indian boarding schools as promulgated in the *Uniform Course of Study* (1901) and later, simply as the Course of Study. The core goals of educating Indians was to create “willing workers” who would develop a strong “dignity and nobility of labor”, “to speak the English language through doing work”, etc., and while it speaks of “the



development of character” as “the only imperishable object for which we can work”, this is entirely subsumed into the resocialization and mis-education project of preparing them for “patriotic and Christian citizenship” (Reel 1901a, pp. 5-6; Reel 1901b, p. 419). The English language was considered to be the bastion of white power and a key cultural ingredient, it was the language of the school and employees, yet it was one taught while being deceived. On the one hand, “kindliness and truth are most important” to teach, yet this is done while corporal punishment, rape, even imprisonment might await students who speak their language, humiliate personnel, or runaway (Adams 1998; Reyhner & Eder 2017). Education *for* Indian students was conceived as to aid in their development into “self-supporting” citizens as Pewewardy (1999) notes by “white architects” much in the same way African education at Hampton Institute and elsewhere was early shaped by these same monsters (Watkins 2001).

While schools have their uses, they are simply a structure and tool for doing the work of learning to be good people, and may or may not be the answer. Schools, from Greek *skhole* which means to get or hold (in one place), was originally devised by wealthy persons who could afford to have their youth not working the land and instead learning in a leisurely setting. Yet, what we find is that this is still the case for wealthy persons, and yet when applied to “others”, it means the opposite: it is a place of severing youth from family, land and traditions in order to become workers for these same wealthy persons. To sever, this is the ultimate purpose of the Indian boarding schools. The maxim extolled by Pratt (1892) was simple: “transfer the savage-born infant to the surroundings of civilization, and he will grow to possess a civilized language and habit” (p. 56). This was spoken at the time of the Land Severalty bill which would keep land out of

individual allotment grants for a specific time period which went against his project of individualizing and intermingling Nations into total absorption. He argued vehemently that as white imperialists “we make our greatest mistake in feeding our civilization to the Indians instead of feeding the Indians to our civilization” (1892, p. 57). The goals of education are drastic and destructive when coming from outsiders, but as I will demonstrate further, are equally disastrous as we have learned the ways of imperialism, the ways of the missionary, the ways of the scientist, the ways of the white male slaver, and teacher so that in many instances we have become just like or worse than them. We have become our own monsters, our own civilizers, our own terrorists. Or, transposed in the words of Pratt, we are feeding ourselves civilization, and our children to civilization, for in Commissioner of Indian Affairs T.A. Jones (1901) eyes,

Education and civilization are practically synonyms. ... The Indians who have made the most advancement are those who have assimilated the white man’s educational methods in greater or lesser degree. To civilize, therefore, is to educate, and to educate means the breaking up of tribal customs, manners, and barbarous usages, and the assumption of the manners, usages, and customs of the superior race with whom they are thereafter to be thrown in contact (p. 9).

This brings up the basic point of any socialization (call it education or civilization) project, which is that like democracy or Christianity or racism, it can be taught but never realized.

Pratt for example was summarily excised from the school system he helped develop in 1910, yet, even his students like Carlos Montezuma extolled the BIA for this because he too had come to believe that Pratt’s mission was just, and righteous.

Montezuma was an early advocate for an Indian university, yet he also succumbed to the language of “civilization” and argued that Pratt and his ilk were the epitome of civilized life (see “Speech for University” and “Blockades to Indian Civilization”). Forbes respected Montezuma and others of his time yet was critical of the affluence which has impaired many leaders ability to see through the supremacist and destructive values and practices of the empire-builders. When Forbes (1967) gave the keynote at the first statewide California Indian Education Association held at North Fork, he emphasized the fact that there were real issues and problems within original Native Nations of the state, as well as in the urban centers of relocation and migration where many recent Indigene now lived such as Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco, and Sacramento. He reiterated that colonization was a lived a reality, that alcoholism, corrupt political and religious leaders, that traditional and new enemies, that an educational system designed and dominated by white outsiders, ad infinitum could be boiled down to one idea:

there is a fundamental thing wrong [says slowly, carefully]. Now I believe that the most basic problem in education, as I indicated earlier this afternoon for those of you who were here, stems from the fact that Indian people are a conquered people, and they are also a colonialized [people], that they have been ruled by aliens for too long, their decisions have been made by aliens for too long. Indian people have been corrupted by all of the influences that come from a colonial experience (“CA Indian Edu.: The Effects of Conquest & How to Overcome Them, Programs for Change in Indian Edu.”, D-334, B. 43).

Forbes was not afraid of what he considered to be his truth, for what he considered the real problems of education, and of captive nations and persons. Forbes straddled many

spaces and sites of colonial oppression, and who used his knowledge, privilege and access in order to challenge, critique and inspire what he considered to be leeches feeding upon the masses. In one of his many short stories, Forbes (1994) discusses his positionality as an educational leader, a scholar, and advocate for justice and transformation through the voice and prism of a fictionalized account of one of his hundreds of speaking engagements he gave across the U.S. and world. In it, the Indian presenter shares with a “mystic twin” he met at the convention before his speech that he was:

. . . in a war but not with guns. A war of words and ideas. I’ve got to give a speech today --in an hour--and I’m going to say a lot of things that some people won’t want to hear. I guess I’m a little tense and upset about that. I may be all alone in front of an audience, probably most of ’em hostile. . . .it’s a national scholarly meeting--historians, anthropologists, and so on-- and I’m going to tell them just what racist, colonialist bastards the majority have been--that’s all (p. 327).

The mystic twin was surprised, yet appreciated his authenticity and responded to him calling himself “pretty radical” with, “. . . “you’re mad,” she said, “absolutely mad. . .but then, in this society that means that you are sane, truly sane!” (ibid). Ahkwesahsne and Kanatsiohareke leader Tom Porter (2006) describes for example that many of the problems his community and family experienced was in part learned at Carlisle Indian Industrial School, which Col. Pratt founded in 1879 as an experimental resocialization institution of education, yet he also explains that the following generations now perpetuate many of the learned characteristics such as child abuse, speaking English-only, and a lack of loving relationships on their own children, and now, without attending

boarding schools. Porter's answer? "Carlisle in reverse" (p. 385). Forbes (1968) answer, was similar, as he suggested, that what is truly needed is a revolution, that is, a genuine return to healthy, viable, loving communities, not simply better schools, because:

although what happens in these kinds of schools is important, what really counts is what takes place in the Indian community, because all of these other things depend upon what happens in the Indian community. You either have a liberated Indian community that will fight for the kinds of things that I've been talking about here. Or these things will not be achieved. I think that although it may sound kind of trite in a way, I think that many Indian communities in the United States that have experienced an extreme form of conquest must go through a process of being reborn. One could almost say the traditional way that perhaps many people need to go through a real ceremonial re-induction into being Indian once again, in the fullest sense, or being a part of their community once again. Other communities might not need to do that, but in some way, whether it will just be an awakening of the individual or some kind of more elaborate process that might eventually evolve in Indian communities as they begin to rediscover themselves and want to make themselves whole again, the Indian community needs to experience a rebirth. This rebirth is already taking place in many areas, but this needs to happen. There needs to be a rediscovery of the greatness of the Indian heritage. Of the tremendous value of what the American Indian people have to offer not only to themselves but to the society at large ("Educational Liberation", D-334, B. 43).

Forbes, conception of education was that the community as a whole, that the whole person and people, must surrender themselves to these truths so that they could honestly tackle them, honestly face their problems, and become the people their ancestors once portended. How do we do this? What does this look like? Where do we go from here?

Three key ideas emerge from this framework of education: 1) Nationhood, Peoplehood or Community, or we have to know who we want to be, 2) Imperialism, Colonialism and the psychosis they embody and teach, and lastly, 3) A commitment to healing and decolonization through an authentic, integrated, immersive and transformative educational environment which brings everyone together, full circle. This can only be done by the people themselves.

## Ch. 5: On Personhood-Peoplehood and Nationhood

The behavioral pattern systems of human groups are like currents in the ocean. It is possible to point out generally where a particular current exists, especially at its center or strongest point, but it is not ordinarily possible to neatly separate that current from the surrounding sea. Human cultural traditions flow together in much the same manner as currents and any attempt at charting boundaries must be regarded as only leading to rough approximations. . . . A culture, in the singular, is always possessed by a particular societal unit or “people,” if the term “culture” is to refer to a living, functioning, integrated whole. . . . must at least include some sense of “peoplehood” (shared by all individuals) and a common means of oral communication (a single language or, at least, one language available equally to all). . . . The attempt to distinguish specific cultures one from another must always be fraught with difficulties even if socio-political units are regarded as the “container” of the culture. This is true because it is not always possible to clearly separate one “people” from another . . . (Forbes 1968a, p. 117).

### *Locating Forbes within a Matrix of Peoplehood and Coloniality*

Key to understanding Forbesian thought as it developed over his lifetime, one must look at the *core* of what he deemed essential to life, and in turn, to the development of people as a manifestation of this core. We might argue that our ideas become circular, or within a closed system of logic, reasoning or understanding (justification) once they are established. But we must also make room for that which does not fit into our preconceived notions, that which we experience in life and leaves us imprinted, stained,

touched and forever changed. I believe that by looking upon Forbes core values, coupled with his attempts to distance or temper his own beliefs while also recognizing them, that he adapted a pragmatic approach to understanding life and all its manifestations, a view into a whole people and person. This does not mean that he was without flaw or that his system was ever perfected or that his way of thinking and analysis (his logic) should be mimicked by others exactly. Rather, his lifelong attempts to make himself heard, paired with his attempts at social change, justice and to have new visions offered many people an example from which they too could take their stands, find peace and understanding, and work to overcome the challenges they faced. This chapter is my attempt to deliver Forbes core to a larger audience. This is found in his prolific texts (spoken, written, prepared, created) dealing with what might be called the essence of peoplehood as manifest in living communities.

Forbes was not raised in a whole, ancient, and traditional community bearing and maintaining a deep theology of place and nationhood. He was raised as the second generation in Los Angeles, born in Long Beach, living his first 9 years in a barrio in El Monte del Sur, at work with his family in and around Los Angeles, attending public schools and eventually in conservative and white dominated Eagle Rock which he soundly rejected and left never to return after he graduated from high school. Given his circumstances, Forbes developed the “core” of his ideas and relationships with the world as he knew it yet he often found himself constantly battling against various authors and authorities. Forbes (1997c) describes instances of his own “core” development in a poem more vividly than other sources, he says:

I can remember



it was out  
back of the house  
near the Pepper tree  
and I was asking my Dad  
something that had been  
on my mind  
“Daddy” I asked  
“it’s true isn’t it,  
that I really have  
Indian blood?”  
and he said  
“Yes, it’s true”  
and I felt so good,  
so deep down glad (p. 95).

Alienation creeps in between the pages, and the trauma reinforces his dilemma apparent: it’s hard to be confident about who you are surrounded by not only unrelatable others, but also people who inferiorize and privilege simultaneously. Forbes conception of community, peoplehood and nationhood were influenced by the world around him, the people he lived with and amongst, the major political and social events of the times, especially during the 1930’s through the 1950’s. The economic depression lasting into the 30’s, Roosevelt’s New Deal, Relocation and Termination policies, the new fascism of the Third Reich and Japan, followed by McCarthyism’s polarizing atmosphere were major factors. Finding solace in Jazz, in trains, in family and friends, in the earthen

mother's caverns and caves, Forbes was saved from a lifetime of trauma. He further developed these core conceptions over time as his knowledge grew, as he travelled further away from home and returned, back home and to homelands lost or left behind. This chapter hopes not to dwell on a *bildungsroman* or a synthesis of biographical moments and epiphanies but rather upon his ideas in the flesh, in the word, and in the text which he shared with others and became his form of communion. Rejecting Christianity, Forbes developed his own spiritual humility and rootedness which allowed him to relate to others, to accept the plurality and diversity of life, and to help raise up the voices of the voiceless, the neglected, and the undermined.

### *The Struggle of Personhood*

Personhood is the attainment of physiological, psychological and social competence as it is defined by a given culture. The attainment of different levels of personhood is marked throughout the life cycle by rituals, rites of passage and by other recognized markers. The concept of personhood not only includes the external markers decided upon by a culture but includes aspects of the internal, i.e. how the individual experiences his or her personhood (Appell-Warren 1988, p. 6; See also Appell-Warren 2014).

Although Appell-Warren's definition of personhood might work for anthropology, it does little to incorporate itself as a living definition, especially among traditional communities, such as in the U.S. Constitution or Black's Law Dictionary. The U.S. constitution contains the phrase "person" 58 times, and the phrase "people" 15 times making it the most consistent verbiage with reference to living beings, this is inclusive of amendments.

“Man” is constant in the original articles of the constitution as well as the amendments, however, the word woman or women is not used once, instead amendment 19 uses the word sex, which originally in Latin was a reference only to the genitalia not a cultural form gender. In rooting its original meanings however, there are no clear and substantiated usages of a folk variety and etymologists look to either Latin’s *persona* coming from *personare* or “to sound through” from per- “to/for” and *sonare* “to sound”. In the U.S. constitution, only white men were allowed to “speak” in convention and thus had their voices represented in government, to the detriment of all “others”. The term person however has its most exhaustive use within the corporate legal framework, from which “persons aggregate” was used to define a corporate body. Thus, the constitutions use of person most definitely relies and aligns with this usage. A person is capable of forming a corporate body, but a corporate body is not able to form a person. Further, the definition above relies upon the vagaries of anthropologists use of the term “culture”, essentially, anything cultivated or cared for. The Late Latin *agricultura* immediately comes to mind as the most practical usage and in Old English, *eorðtilþ*, or earth-till comes close to its basic definition. My own definition that I will use for this chapter is rooted in the conception that personhood is dependent upon peoplehood, and peoplehood is dependent upon community, or a unity of relationships and these series of interdependent relationships are in turn bound to creation and the creative powers of the universe, a universe in eternal transformation and movement. These are not static notions but ones which change according to the seasons of creation let alone movements which disrupt the cyclical orders of the multiverse or the worlds of many worlds.

The analysis of Forbes conceptions that follows are rooted in his own perceptions, which I will demonstrate are based upon Powhatan-Renape, Lenape, Mexica conceptions, and his training as an anthropologist and historian in the Boltonian tradition. However, we find that Forbes often places his personal views at a distance from what I refer to as ultimate respect by centering other's views and the diversity and plurality present at all times in the context of community. Forbes grew up among a plethora of peoples in El Monte del Sur, in the surrounds of Yangna-Los Angeles and in Eagle Rock. Unwilling to assimilate directly into the milieu of white and conservative Eagle Rock, Forbes ventured far and wide in order to maintain his sanity, to continue learning, and in his great search, as he calls it, "looking for the wise" (Forbes 1992). Of course, my own views play a major role in the development of this research, the thesis I have put forth, and the direction of this script. I am concerned however with demonstrating that Forbes views are not the majority, that he doesn't see eye to eye even with many Indigenous people, California Indians, Mexicanos, Hispanics, Black folks, whites and Asians, Chicanos or Angelinos, Rappahannock's, or any other resemblant group. This I will argue is because of his impressive belief in pluralism and diversity and his respect for others, which is rooted in his analysis of ethnocentrism, racism, colonialism, sexism and the materialistic ideologies which hound his every encounter in 20th century California. Basically, "personhood" cannot be separated from peoplehood, as we are born and grow up within a socializing environment of various peoples. But why is there is such a debate about the "individual", their rights and responsibilities, their ideas about themselves without reference to the "group" or the "people"?

## *Identity*

Forbes consistent use of person(s) or individual(s) signify for me that he trusted these words to have prominent meanings used in daily conversation and usage, that is they were the most common terms he heard from Englatino speakers. In a single instance, much later in life, Forbes critiques the use of the term identity very clearly and suggests it's not what people think it means. Forbes (2001) argues persuasively that devoid of an understanding of Latin or Latin-based language, Englatino speakers have created their own private definition of the term. Originally from Latin *idem* meaning "the same", it came into Englatino via French *identité* (circa 1640) and is used to argue that something should be "regard[ed] as the same" but initially contained the skepticism necessary not to use simply "the same" or *identitas* "sameness" as its meaning in Latin is consistent. Thus, this term is a modern colonial invention, used to take seemingly similar people (such as people judged by body color, or appearance) and made "the same". Thus, in this way, all original Americans, no matter their distinct Nationalities would be regarded as "the same" as others simply because war was proclaimed upon all peoples of the island as in the term "Indian" is applied to all peoples of the Americas. This was done as a rule because religious conversion to Christianity did not always preclude any kind of apparent (visual) distinction that colonizing Christians (for the first few hundred years, nearly all invaders were Christians) were able to discern from sight. Thus, completely diverse and distinct Nations were converted in the minds of the colonizer into "the same", that is, they gained the qualities of the non-Christian by mere presence. Dichotomies are powerful, difference is powerful, yet so is sameness.

Forbes (2001) admits that “I think we must discard some assumptions common in euro science, beginning with ideas of what constitutes a person’s identity” (p. 198). He lists many of these such as the idea that “Spaniards were far more *mestizo* than Mexicans and yet they were never treated as a mixed people” (p. 197); that identity has been reduced to “childlike dichotomies”, that “religions [as] (closed) systems” discriminate hastily against members and non-members so that Native peoples are “locked in deadly struggles with missionaries who have demanded total submission” when this is impossible in the real world of diverse peoples while amongst their own peoples is a total failure (p. 198). This is in stark contrast he says to “ancient American tradition[s]” which are more all “encompassing”, “pluralistic and inclusive epistemologies” from which he has high hopes that eventually “Native People may yet succeed in “civilizing” even Mormons and evangelicals” (p. 198)!

Personhood and peoplehood more appropriately describe the image he conceives as best representative of the dynamic and relational qualities of Indigenous perspectives. He defines these understandings as “comparable to a river of relationships in which many streams enter and mix unevenly, with some becoming stronger and others weaker as the river of life flows onward” (p. 198). This perspective compares favorably to the core theoretical construction of influence (Latin, *influencia*), which would suggest that a person’s sense of self, family, community, and peoplehood or nationhood is primarily about the kinds and strength of the influences they have in their lives, that which are rooted in the generations and their current experiences. Forbes elucidates the core of his conception of personhood-peoplehood, that is “to see it *as a series of concentric circles of belongings and relationships*” (p. 199, emphasis original). This echoes Wilson (2003)

who argues that relationality and relationships are the core mediums of a people's existence (p. 70). Cajete (2000) says "the Native individual is spiritually interdependent with the language, folk history, rituals, and geographical sacredness of his or her people" (p. 86). Lastly, Forbes (2001) says, "at the core of the series of circles would be the extended family, a kinship unit of overriding importance, and, in fact, a key element in all Native social, economic, and political life" (p. 199). Forbes' conception of personhood-peoplehood is close to Thomas' (1982) in the "tap-roots" which included concentric rings of history, language and religion, and the adapted versions of Holms (2000) who replaced religion with ceremonialism and added place/territory as a foundational element. All of these maintain that "blood" and other markers of "race" are incompatible with traditional notions which are inherently non-essentialist, that is, all of the rings are connected, but no two bear the same relationship as the others and can hardly be weighed upon as the final arbiter except from within the community itself. Anton, Miller and Myers (1986) argued that broadly, all communities perform five functions they labeled using contemporary western sociological theoretical definition of "social institutions" including, education, government, economics/production, social organization and spiritual/cultural support (p. 13). My own version of the matrix and nexus of peoplehood is inclusive of all of these areas with the addition of art-science as a necessary process and production method or form that relies upon distinctiveness but also mimicry and creativity, allowing for a pluralism of possible persons and peoples with responsibilities and bearing relationships (Cajete 1994; Cajete 2000).

Identity has historically held the meaning "sameness" and still does in most Latin-based languages as well as in Germanic languages, rather than what is supposed as

someone who is self-proclaimed or self-made. Forbes (2001) suggests that this sameness might be based on the idea that a person must be “the same person from birth to death, something very useful to empires and authoritarian churches” as examples of who would utilize such a juxtaposition, one that makes sense in terms of the proliferation of “races”, “species” and “castes” (p. 199). Forbes (2001) perspective here is expansive, because he shows that a person does not automatically maintain their nationality from generation to generation, let alone their race, as these are passed down, but even then, this is an imperfect process susceptible to a myriad of possibilities such as loss of parents, abandonment, adoption, exogamous marriage, disease, genocide, forced conversion, captivity or servitude, castization, and other processes of social change which may lead to resocialization etc.. Race is made to reinforce an unchangeable difference, such as the ability to be enslaved, or not able to marry white people, or own property, or to be part of another nationality. The place of race is clear when it concerns the concept of identity, as they both exact a sameness where one does not exist, even when there is clear evidence to the contrary such as language abilities. The curse of colonialism and its manifestations such as whiteness with its implied racial superiority and inferiority complexes will be elaborated upon greatly in the following chapter which deals directly with this predicament head on. This chapter’s purpose was to demonstrate the complex nature of Peoplehood-Nationhood from traditional American perspectives, which still persist despite serious changes to most communities’ worldviews and relationships.



*Heart, Face and Foundation: Core Values, Gifts and Relationships*

Forbes decidedly studied many peoples, their social organizational structures and ways of relating with each other, their homelands, their knowledge, their institutions and all recognized relations. In borrowing from the Mexica dictum, *in ixtli, in yollotl* or “with face, with heart”, he came to understand at least one way of constructing a people-person (Leon-Portilla 1963, p. 175). Cajete’s (1994) interpretation of this idea included the addition of a “foundation” which he says is about “discovering one’s true face (character, potential, identity), one’s heart (soul, creative self, true passion), and one’s foundation (true work, vocation), all of which lead to the expression of a complete life” (p. 23). The “core” is the heart and the outer layers are the face, both are manifestations of the same thing or they should be, as the rind is to the orange, which although seems rigid in its form, it is also porous and is as much a part of the inside layers as it is an outer layer. Gonzalez (1968) describes the richness of this concept as it was spoken to students, who he says, “in addressing someone in this manner, a man was recognizing in him the most important attribute of a mature person, *omacic oquichtli*. Being master of a face and a heart, he has integrity” (p. 437). Related to this was that a person and a community sought to rely upon this holistic and balanced relative, investing greatly into this as a lifelong developmental process manifested in the idea of recognizing one’s destiny was to encourage and follow “dueños de un rostro, dueños de un corazón” or dreams of a face and dreams of a heart (Leon-Portilla 2004, p. 149).

Forbes, ever looking to his Mexicano brothers and sisters for insight, and to raise their own spirits, he consistently invoked these concepts. At a Chicano conference organized around the theme of “Alternative Education as a Vehicle for De-colonization”

held at the University of Texas at El Paso, on April 25, 1975 Forbes spoke openly to the crowd. This process of acquiring a face and heart, Forbes relates, who was a long-time student of Mexicano Nahuatl:

means that you develop yourself in such a way so that you are always the same in whatever social situation you are in. You're not one kind of person when you're arguing with the university president. You're not another kind of person when you're out in the barrio. You're not another kind of person with your wife and kids, another kind of person when you're with Chicano militants. You're always the same person because you have an integrated ethic; you have a spiritual nature that expresses itself the same way all the time. Of course, I don't mean that it's unchanging because as one learns and as one goes to knowledge, you grow and change. What I mean is that twenty-four hours a day each day, people can depend on you. They can depend on you because you have a face (Forbes 1979b, p. 107-108).

Now, all of this might seem like semantics, or the abuse of rhetoric, or some fluff of the poetic arts, but Forbes meant it. The construction of this heart and face, its essence, was built upon core values which were lived and performed. You can't depend on someone's word if you cannot attest to their concomitant actions and follow-through. The best examples of this are found in models, at home, in the world, among other living creatures who too, have a consistent heart and face. That is why the role of the teacher, the *tlamatinime*, one of many titles for their educators, would focus upon character development and on developing a whole, genuine person. This person would be a real benefit to the people as Forbes says, for they can be relied upon.

Cajete (1994) explains this concept relative to his own experience and interpretation:

the community is the place where the forming of the heart and face of the individual as one of the people is most fully expressed. Community is the context in which the Indian person comes to know the nature of relationship, responsibility, and participation in the life of one's people (p. 164).

Forbes (1974c) had previously presented the Nahuatl paradigm at the University of Manitoba's XLI International Congress of Americanists, held in Mexico City, Sept. 2-7, 1974 and who suggested that the "face" or public persona was very important to develop:

Native American cultures are extremely concerned with "character" development, that is, with the acquisition of a face or true personality. Development of character in American societies differs from some other traditions but that great emphasis is placed upon being true to one's own heart or unique spirit. "Sameness" and conformity is seldom forced in American societies (pps. 8-9).

Forbes (1979a) also reflects upon the power and goal of developing the inner guide or heart foundation, which includes the concretization of core values. Forbes suggests this characteristic, the *yollotl*, is what supremely directs a person's authentic self:

So we see that it comes back to intentions and to the heart. Coming out from that are actions that have to be judged. For example, a person might tell us that they pray all the time. And yet we might see them go out and exploit other human beings. We might see them live off money derived from literally eating of the flesh of other people in systems of coercion. We might see evil all around them and do nothing about it, and they tell us that they are "religious people." That

doesn't mean anything because they don't understand the meaning of religion which is basically living it twenty-four hours a day. So they have no religion, really. Or, let us say their religion is what they do, not what they say they believe (pps. 10-11).

Forbes readily equates the heart with a person's spiritual core. His critique targets those whose words defy their actions. A person's intentions will always, eventually, become apparent because the truth has a way of manifesting itself, being observed, and bearing strange fruit. Cajete (1994) notes, as I would believe Holm and Thomas would with regards to the Peoplehood matrix and the Tap-roots of Peoplehood models, that this is not a solely native American idea because we all share in the most basic foundations from which we have developed differentiated and unique expressions of peoplehood-nationhood. Within this framework, Cajete boils this down to a maxim similar to Deloria's "power plus place equals personality", which is, "culture is the face, myth is the heart, and traditional education is the foundation for Indigenous life. All cultures have Indigenous roots bedded in the rich soil of myth from which the most elemental stories of human life spring" (ibid, p. 41). Cajete's view suggests that the "agreement" made by a group of people happens at the level of mythos, where a unifying story integrates everyone and everything into a shared experience. For Rotinonshonni and Kanien'kehá:ka people this is the four epochs of the Sky World, the Earth World, the Peopling, Migrating and Struggle stories, and the Great Peace. Some adherents to the *Gaiwiiio*, or the good word of Handsome Lake fit these teachings into the fourth epoch as well. Forbes (1968a) utilizes his Powhatan people's unity to be not a static culture but rather a unified story when he says:

Thus we can correctly speak of “Powhatan Culture” as existing today even though a large number of the current behavioral characteristics of the Powhatan people of Virginia are of European or alien Indian origin. In fact, it would not make any difference if virtually all of the traits of the Powhatan were of non-Powhatan origin, so long as the Powhatan people maintained themselves as a viable, distinct socio-political group with a “history” (largely internalized) of their own (p. 119). Forbes “history” is Cajete’s “myth”. What’s most important in Forbes (2000) mind is that we should “grasp that ways of life are always dynamic and that teaching, learning, and changing are features not only of the human species but also of other living things” which we cannot arrive and a permanent definition of “traditional”, or an essentialist paradigm of “authentic” free of transformation and redefinition (p. 119). Indeed, Forbes addresses this question directly in the context of contemporary politics of recognition, saying:

the notion of “a culture” which we have been sold, has been very harmful, not only in making Native peoples feel inadequate, but also in exacerbating many fights between different groups within a native nation, groups which may legitimately reflect divergences within their former ways of life, but which fight over who is really “authentic”, under the mistaken belief that their nation had a single, monolithic culture (p. 120).

Many Nations, if not most in Anowarakowa were not governed by a single centralized, law, leader or governing structure which they obeyed without question, without divergence or distinction. Next I will discuss what does this have to do with “kinship”, “membership”, with “blood quantum” and other inclusive or exclusive determinants of the “nation” and of “culture”. These represent often the new “core” of the Nation and

ultimately who has power, or “sovereignty” in Deloria’s equation and is an important question Forbesian analytics can shed light onto and increase our awareness of the factors and issues of great influence.

*Boundaries of Peoplehood-Community: Culture and Together-Doing*

Forbes (1985) looked at what others were saying about the concept of Peoplehood, especially Vine Deloria Jr. who made popular his perspectives first in *Custer Died for Your Sins* (1969) and *We Talk, You Listen: New Tribes, New Turf* (1970) which clearly outlined his paradigm. For example, Deloria (1969) says on peoplehood that a group is distinct when they not only move and live together, but when they abide by the same laws, as schism is often the cause of many groups who go their own way if they don’t want to follow the rules or decisions of the majority group. The law is not the police as they are commonly named when they show up unannounced, and for Deloria, “law was rejected as being force imposed from without, whereas peoplehood required fulfillment from within the individual. Insofar as there were external controls, Indians accepted only the traditions and customs which were rooted in the tribe’s distant past” (p. 103). New laws could be developed or adopted through schism more easily than by staying with the group. So, what is the most important aspects of peoplehood in his mind? “Peoplehood is impossible without cultural independence, which in turn is impossible without a land base”, Deloria says (1969, p. 180). Today this situation has been turned on its head, as many groups do not have an adequate land base to produce anything independent, that is, without interruption. A people’s identity is constantly attacked while forced to live and work amongst unknown others. What people are

allowed to be is stereotyped caricatures, wooden figures, ancient people who fit the image of Whites “feathered friend” to use the phrase of Floyd Red Crow Westerman.

Deloria (1970) says we,

must not fall into the same trap by simply reversing the process that has stereotyped them. Minority groups must thrust through the rhetorical blockade by creating within themselves a sense of “peoplehood.” This ultimately means the creation of a new history and not mere amendments to the historical interpretations of white America (p. 44).

In order to tell a “new history” people must be using at least one language for communication, as well as have some shared historical roots which they identify with and explains their existence. Today this is difficult because imperialists who continue to control Native Nations development and ethnogenesis hold back these movements because as Deloria explains, “we have never had a “peoplehood” in this country because we have always been tied to a barren conception of man”, namely the ahistorical and prehistoric, the uncivilized and savage people, if and when even considered people as often Native Nations are considered sub-human (p. 156).

All of this seems to jive with what Forbes is saying except there are key differences. Forbes (1998e) argues against Deloria’s notion that the “natural sovereignty of groupness” is enough to make a people for it would allow “corporations” or “unified bodies of people” to be equative. His critique of Deloria’s conception of sovereignty was “in essence Deloria equates the existence of peoplehood, ethnicity, and nationality with sovereignty, regarding the sheer survival of a group as evidence of sovereignty. This could be confusing, since it leaves us without a term to describe the state of a people

when they do, indeed, acquire real political sovereignty perhaps after a hard struggle” and who are in need of a way to describe their new situation (p. 252). Alaska Natives for example after the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 were “allowed” to form corporations rather than gain reserved lands because this fit most closely with the corporate structure of the U.S., not because of the “natural sovereignty of groupness” (Williams 2009, pp. 180-181). Forbes is skeptical also because he knows who claims to have the original sovereignty in this world, European male kings as divinely (self) appointed rulers of the land and people. That is, “the term sovereignty becomes pivotal for Deloria; however, he does not equate that term with its dictionary definition of “supremacy” or even with the modern secondary meanings of “independence” or political “autonomy.” Sovereignty, for Deloria, is inherent in any group that has been dealt with as a group by the dominant structure. Thus, it is its “groupness” that creates the potential for sovereignty”, says Forbes (ibid, pps. 251-252). For Forbes, sovereignty is clearly a framework of an imperialist usurpation of the common people, whether of Alba, Catalonia, Roman or other origin, in its originality, as it comes via Latin *superanus*, literally, “over [lord]”, supreme or greater, it always has denoted an elevated status above perceived “others”. Part of Forbes limiting of the power of sovereignty is that it necessarily recognizes the supremacy of imperial states and reaffirms the negative aspect of “tribal sovereignty” which as framed by Deloria were entities which had a “a status higher than states”, however, negated equality by the imperial states, the U.S. and Canada who are the prime examples. In the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (1995) it affirms Forbes weariness, and while it recognizes Indigenous Peoples as entities with “rights”, Article 46 clearly maintains that imperial



sovereignty as manifest in “States” are the ultimate arbiters of power, sovereignty and status:

Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, people, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act contrary to the Charter of the United Nations or construed as authorizing or encouraging any action which would dismember or impair, totally or in part, the territorial integrity or political unity of sovereign and independent States.

It clearly negates for example the Navajo Nations or Lakota Nations ability to be free of the U.S. imperial state, especially if it involves reclaiming their traditional territories.

This is the only mention of “sovereign” status in the entire document, meaning, it clearly does not recognize Indigenous Peoples as equal to “States”, thus limiting Deloria’s equative definition to be “states” in the lower-case sense, meaning, U.S. states are subject to the “Supreme Law of the Land”. While the Colonies turned States when they founded the original confederacy, now U.S.A. were the new sovereigns, it was the white population of slave owners and landowners who had both formed the original states and empowered an imperial government to look out for their interests. The fate of the U.S. states was made horrendously realized in Lincoln’s war for the Union of which numerous edicts and actions which assumed the states independence to be illegal and subject to Washington’s federalism.

Forbes (2000) study of the essence “culture” caused him to determine that in the Eurocentric, Christian, scientific and imperialist visions of the world it has become divorced from its original relationship and dependency upon an everywhere, an all pervasive “nature”. This has led to the development of conceptions of people’s which are

antagonistic to the “natural world”, the “wild” for example is seen as something beyond the cultivated landscapes of people, a clear European-Germanic concept akin to Latin-Roman “*salvaticus*” or forest-woodland peoples being backwards, lawless, untamed, uncontrollable entities like the creatures that live there as well. Forbes concludes that “the kind of culture concepts which have come to dominate current Eurocentric thinking are derived from farming or herding peoples who have become cut off from full interaction with the world beyond their village or town area” (p. 108). They no longer see themselves as practicing a kind of cultivation akin to other creatures or processes already happening, but instead are doing something superior and above the rest of creation without equating destruction as a unique form of these aspects. The separateness concept was so strong that when imperialists came to Anowarakowa, they conceived of themselves as superior peoples, as supremely different so as to relegate non-Christians, non-citizens (city folks), non-agriculturalists, etc., to be “Away from People” who “became “the Other” just as did Native Americans, Africans, and other human groups, [who] all could be exploited because in themselves they were “valueless”, only acquiring value when commodified by imperialism as “raw materials”” and it was in this way that each “other” was unable to possess the land in the same way as the imperialists who claimed their power of possession usurped its owners by right of discovery, by “ceremonies of possession” and other base acts (p. 109, Forbes 2001; see examples in Seed 1995). The land and other creatures who form a symbiotic whole are imagined as “uncultivated”, “less cultivated” or “uncultured”, for their cultivation has not been transformed by the superior creatures named above, hence, “the modern idea of “culture” has shifted emphasis from the *process of cultivation* to the *results of cultivation*” by the

self-proclaimed superior group (Forbes 2001, p. 115, emphasis original). For Forbes, any definition we have of ourselves must equally apply to others, which commits ourselves to respecting the sense of peoplehood and activities of others and leaves out any sense of superiority and differentiation beyond important and named specificities which become unique qualifications, but do not lend themselves to outright superior/inferior constructions. He suggests, a redefinition of “culture”, one he bases upon his experiences away from home, saying,

I have been much impressed by the--Dutch term *samenleving* (together-living), used as a synonym for the French *société*, that “together-living” expresses in a dynamic way what we want to mean by “society” without being led into the illusion of a fixed, separate, concrete entity, an illusion which has baffled and befuddled so many Eurocentric writers (p. 116).

Thus Forbes conception of peoplehood, groupness, of “together-living”, of community, might in Spanish be rendered as *conviviendo* or *comhaciendo* that is “together-living” or “together-doing/making” which is not far off from its original construction in Proto-Indo European forms as *ko-moin-i-* or *ko* “together” and *moi* the suffixed form of *mei* “to change, go move”. The term *communing* seems to carry this meaning without creating the stasis implied in community and society. At any rate, he offers these critiques and analysis so as to help people determine their own self-definitions, which usually are encapsulated in a name of a people rather than as a descriptive verb, so he is mostly looking at the criterion for peoplehood. Should it be based upon political independence? Kinship? Self-definition such as names? Recognition by other groups? External

definitions of “culture”? Imperial conceptions of sovereignty, superiority and inferiority?  
Christian definitions of the believer and non-believer?

Forbes points towards recognizing each other as practitioners rather than believers, as people with freedom of movement, to change, to add or augment, to mix or intermix and to be unique. Thus, he points that most Native Nations conceived of their nationality and nationhood as a dynamic practice which may or may not be subject to one set of laws, territorial bounds, leader, or singular practice. The term “way of life” describes this without suggesting that one cannot change their path or practice. For example, he notes that rarely are people so homogenous that they do not exhibit any influences, practices, or relationships which make them undifferentiated from each other or other peoples. Indeed, intermarriage or exogamous relationships is considerably the norm for almost all peoples and through time. Similarly, Forbes points out that even the most seemingly secure boundaries and borders of nationality, territory and specific practices have always undergone some degree of change, of influence and redefinition or are based on a practice of sharing space, resources, and in exchanges. Forbes most insightful understanding comes from his analysis of “religion” which he considers never as a static belief but rather as a living practice, something you do 24/7, 365 days of the year, awake or sleep or in-between, your religion is how you behave, and is determined by your actions not your confessions. Thus, if we hope to take our discussion of peoplehood into the realm of education, or of drawing out the potentiality of our people, we must consistently teach to appropriate behavior and actions which define our living relationships rather than precepts, laws, facts or mere information because we have to focus on behavior not beliefs. So, while Forbes talks greatly about “values”, he always

brings his discussion back to how values are enacted, are lived, are working inwardly and outwardly upon all life, and which demonstrate dynamic relationality. Forbes (1968a) concludes that a people's own definition is what matters most:

In short, so long as a people possess a sense of identity, of "peoplehood" (by means primarily of kinship ties and a self-consciousness of their own distinctiveness from "aliens") they can be said to possess a culture or way of life. It follows then, that the origin of the various specific traits is irrelevant as regards the question of whether or not a people possess a culture of their own (pps. 118-119).

Thus, the anthropological discourse concerning "traits", expressed often as material or symbolic "culture" are irrelevant compared ultimately to what a people thinks of themselves. As Edward T. Hall (1959) has noted, "culture is communication and communication is culture", however, the people who are communicating with together are in instance representative of a core group, while it must be recognized that even this "core" can be seriously altered and the "group" is open to diffusion, adoption, transformation and really, unlimited potentialities and possibilities (p. 191). Thus, any definition of "culture" abstract from a people's conception of "living-together", which often is not ethnocentric, must certainly be recognized as bias, subjective, and a personal or collective agreement that is fluid, adaptive and actively moving along. Yet what about peoples who seem to be stunted, disorganized, unhealthy, unbalanced, destructive and unengaged?

Forbes (1968a) points out that two things may be going on related to imperialism, first of which is that as a "people's social organization disintegrates, so too will the

culture disintegrate” and related to this, a “conquered peoples who do not control their own destiny may not possess a way of life which they feel to be an integrated way of life” (p. 120). Forbes (1975b) argues that Native Nations have become “captive nations” within an imperial and colonial nexus of relations, which includes racism, Christian hegemony, global capitalism-imperialism, etc., all of which put a person and people in their place even when away from the center of their homelands and local existences precisely because these have become manifest beyond the federal boundaries. There are plenty of “runaways” within the system of captivity, however, where is there to run to now which is truly outside this or a closely related or modeled system, as even African “states” that have undergone “decolonization” resemble the imperial states they liberated themselves from in many ways. Forbes (1968a) says that imperial impingements and influences must be recognized and so I quote in full his largest description of the conflicts present in a “culture” view of people:

we must understand that an independent or at least quasi-autonomous people ordinarily is free to accept or reject alien behavior patterns or products. They can, therefore, maintain a culture which is integrated and which is felt to be “their own.” They are in control of the traits in question, and they are free to determine the manner in which the new trait relates to older elements of the culture.

Conquered peoples, especially if experiencing a process of social disorganization, cannot ordinarily accept or reject alien behavior patterns. Thus when their culture changes it changes in a kind of haphazard, un-systematic and socially disturbing manner (as when, for example, Anglo-Americans appropriate native economic resources, reduce the natives to a state of poverty, and force the latter to adjust as

best they can). Because of the fact of conquest, many modern Indian groups, although possessing a modern culture, do not feel that it is an integrated and harmonious whole. In point of fact, such post-conquest cultures are often collections of contradictory or irreconciled traits and it can be said that the group possessing such a “culture of conquest” is the victim of its culture rather than the master of its culture. The resolution of this situation can only come about when native groups possess enough self-confidence and “power” to control the selection of their own patterns of behavior. (Such a process does not depend upon the rejection of alien traits but rather upon their “rationalization” within a harmonious system). The possession of an integrated culture is perhaps crucial for the psychological well-being of any class of people. Only when a way of life is harmonious, integrated, and rationalized can the individual understand his relationship to other individuals; and only then can he know what kinds of behavior are acceptable or desirable under what circumstances. It may well be that much of the alienation and anti-social behavior found in modern mass cultures stem from their being relatively non-integrated (non-understandable) (pps. 119-120).

Forbes has obviously gleaned from Bob Thomas’ discussion of the reservation as an “internal colony” and Native Nations to be predominantly utilizing “powerless politics” compared to imperialists. Further, the lack of being a “master of its culture” is akin to Thomas’ notion of the “deprivation of experience” which many Nations attempt to survive while trapped in so many ways in a system which strangles their free movement, historically, socially, politically, geographically, religiously, etc. (Holm 2005, p. xi). As

remembered by Holm who was a student of Thomas, he summarizes his view saying, “in the colonial relationship the colonized are never allowed to experience change on their own terms” (ibid). Key to testing these paradigms is the location of five core ideas: territory-space, kinship-relations, language-history (oral traditions), ceremony-religion which represent the essential core of Thomas’ tap-roots and Holm’s peoplehood matrix, and with the addition of a political field, governance or law which originally is conceived to be integrated with the other four.

### *Territory*

This land called America, or North and South America, *is a very, very old land.*

Not only has this land been existing for millions of years but for many hundreds of thousands of years living creatures have been nourished on this land-including human beings-Anishinabeg (or Indians) for 40,000 or more years.

And yet the Europeans called this “the new world,” Why? Perhaps because it was so well cared-for, so beautiful, so loved-it was, in short, young-looking and healthy. It had not been made old by human greed. It had not been exploited ruthlessly. Instead it had been lived on by people who regarded life on this part of the Earth as *a sacred experience of caring for all life*, including our Mother the Earth herself (p. 15, Forbes 1974, emphasis original).

Expressed early in this work, the core matrix and nexus of peoplehood always depends upon something that is reliable, on the sources and sustenance of all life, the land-water-air, Anowarakowa. This is a people’s homeland, territory, place of dwelling or abode. We are always living upon or within a location, that is specific and central to



our existence and all life around us, for we form a rippling circle in a sea of relatedness. Further, this idea is at the core of every people's existence, whether they recognize it or not. Thus, those that pay little credit or thought, or who make no references to "where they are from" offer almost nothing in terms of practical experience in life, because they do not purposely reflect the life-worlds that made them, fed them, and raised them. Globalized imperial exploitation has widened this experience as many peoples are now consumers of other lands and livelihoods, that is, for example, people in the U.S. survive on Mexican bananas and coffee every day without feeling in the slightest way to be "Mexican". As consumers of other lands and peoples, a base alienation replaces our foundation.

Forbes (1996) offers the perspective that originally, we are and were peoples and communities deeply embedded and formed of the wetlands we call home. He says, we are of, "whole tribes  
from whom we stem  
from entire watersheds  
and basins,  
even from entire continents  
since migration  
is ancient  
as well as recent" (p. 83).

Migration is not a recent rite of passage but a very old one. Whether we come out and up from previous worlds as did the Diné thanks or down from a star-world like the Rotinonshonni, or even the recent journeys made to far-off places like Los Angeles due

to relocation programs or because of war, or on trails of tears and sorrow, death and loss at gunpoint such as during the forced removal era: people are movers. However, it is not the moving itself, the migration that tells the story, it's the people who do the talking. So, tracing a journey does not create the story. The story is maintained by the people themselves because it tells them about who they are, where they have come from, where are their homelands, and where they are going. Thus, there is no such thing as a geologic history, for it is a people's conception which interprets the "land" utilizing whatever "evidence" they deem important and in turn fits ultimately into their larger story they tell themselves. Cajete (2000) says "science is always storytelling" and the collective information or knowledge (science) we use to describe this unique experience is also, always changing and moving along with the people (p. 143). Core to the concept of any people is how the people are one family or a conglomerate of many families. In the past, traditional conceptions of the people did not always result in a unity that was forced, coerced or centralized. In California, the examples here are astronomical, as in, the peoples are so many they are like the stars in the sky. Although we may place them together in a constellation, a grouping of stars (California Indians), it is only through their own attraction and care for each other that many people would unite or cluster together, and perhaps only for the briefest of times. The specific places where people lived were their central relationships, sometimes more central than associated language speakers or fellow ceremonialists such as in the case of the Sun Dance who might live hundreds of miles from each other. The connection of a people to their homelands is sacrosanct, that is, it is something that has been made sacred, and is constantly regenerated through the prayers, interaction, and investment of the people. So, removal from a homeland might be

a journey to another place but it may not sever the original consecration the people embody as people of that specific place. Many famous examples exist of peoples removed far from their centers, from their homelands core, perhaps to the peripheries or beyond such as the Israelites or Palestinians who both insist on a right to return or to remain (Thomas 1971).

People often name themselves based upon their homelands which they recognize as imperative to their development and growth as a people. *Kanien'kehá:ka* for example literally means People of Flint Stone Place, and is a reference to the flint filled Kanienkeh-Adirondack mountains. Other members of the Rotinonshonni confederacy such as the *Onöndowa'ga:'* or People of the Great Mounds, *Onyota'a:ka* or People of the Upright Stone, *Gayogohó:no'* or People of the Great Swamp, *Onönda'gaga'* or People of the Hill Place, *Ska:rù:rę'*, literally the Hemp Gatherers, and possibly shares the same root word as that for English and then whites, *krirù'rę?* meaning Cotton Gatherers. Near where I grew up was one of the first authors of a California born native American, Pablo Tac (1841) who reported that he was from the village of *Quechla* and his people were the *Quechnajuichom* or “People of Quechla [a Stone]” and who is known to be part of the *Payomkawichum* or the “Western People” in contrast to the Iipay who were the *Quichamcauichom* or “Southern” People (Tac 1952, p. 93; Tac 2011, pps. 181-182). Sacred homelands are often what defines people far into the future because the lands form the core of their stories from creation of the universe, through to the creation of the people. The lands cycles, ecology, creatures, seasons and sources of life provide the basis for which derives the ceremonial round of dances, songs, sacred acts, movements, prayers and talk which in turn make up the foundations of ancient law, governance of

relationships, and the way to keep things in balance, harmonious and peaceful. Kinship with all relations is established, and specific territories become the most ancient homes of many families and clans.

Many are intimidated by the calls of removed peoples returning to ancient villages and homelands. Many are intimidated by the calls of the lost and wandering peoples returning to places alive in their stories. Many are intimidated by the calls of the migrating masses who are simply making their rounds, coming back unannounced, but right in time for the harvest. Forbes recognized that the home is a place of power, whether it exists only in the stories, songs and texts we carry with us or they are actual places we continue to traverse. Specificity is everything because with migrations we are travelling in certain directions, perhaps during certain parts of a solar or lunar cycle or passage of time such as the seasons. These travels may also be cyclical or involve an automatic return when one cycle or passage eclipses and leads directly into another. When we are talking about thousands and thousands, if not millions of variations of living in the sky-land-water realm, specificity is everything. This is one of the reasons why traditional communities maintained themselves as peoples of specific places, sometimes we might call them regions, or give them other kinds of references but essentially, we have adapted and survived because of the life-giving abilities and relationships developed in place. Holm's discussion of territoriality in relation to peoplehood is important because he implies a homeland, not simply a place that doesn't enable a group to exist, but *the places* which form the core of one's peoplehood-nationhood. So, while calls for nationalism abound, we must be weary if these calls do not signal a specific place, a homeland, and in turn conjure up the stories of those places

which lead them back home, as migrants or sojourners, as people of the place. Given over 527 years of ongoing imperialism, whereby homelands have been confiscated, desecrated, and subject to pillaging and abuse, we must deal with these realities at the same time.

### *Kin and Clan Relations*

We can imagine the Indian social world as a series of circles. At the purely human level the inner circle consists in the family, usually an extended family. This is the most solid and enduring unit and, in a real sense, is the key political reality. Even today, Indian politics is family politics and one cannot understand the functioning of a community without knowing who is related to whom, and in what way. (p. 2, “Native American Philosophy: Social and Political Implications,” Forbes 1983b)

Forbes says “the basis for a nation or a people is kinship. A nation consists basically in those people whom you consider them to be your relatives. . . . And that’s the core, that’s the basis for what constitutes a people, or a nation” (1974, p. 26). This point is echoed by Holm (2005) who says, “the maintenance of shared tribal relationships and kinship patterns was perhaps the most prevalent feature of Native American life that ran counter to the intentions of the vanishing policy” which sought to disrupt communal-kinship relations that maintained Native Nations despite genocide, disease and servitude (p. 44). The problem with much of English is that it’s people had been thoroughly degraded over time to the extent that the common terms used today, such as family are derived most recently from the imperialist notions of Roman-Latin, such as *familia*

“servants of a household” and *famulus* “servant, slave” which replaced Old English *hiwscipe*, literally, home-ship or belonging to home, ultimately derived from the same word for hamlet, ham, home and/or village. The term kin “kind, race, tribe, child” is related to kinder or child, also king and kindred, and is formed from the popularly strong root of *gene*, which forms the basis of “generations”, “genes”, “genesis”, “cosmogony”, “genuine”, “genius”, “germ”, “german”, “germinate” as well as “indigenous” and “endogenous” as found in Old Latin *gnasci* and late Latin *natus* as in “natal”, “nation”, “native”, “nature” and a host of related words who all imply the original gene, or properties of “birth, to be born, to beget”. Essentially, these words imply our birth into this world as part of creation. We can find that in the colonization of the English and other peoples, original terms which derived from non-Christian and non-colonial origins were replaced by other terms to transform the status of free peoples into serfs and other degradations through the development of exploitable families-servants. The common word for women in Anglo-Saxon England was Queen, which then became an exclusive title of a single woman who married a King, another exclusive title derived from them being the head of a kinship group. This process demoted all other persons so that there were no longer any queens save but one, and there were no other equal kin to the King. In Gaelge (Irish) they have retained their original terms for woman, *bean*, and *fir/fear* for man, whose Old English word *wer-vir* survives in “werewolf” which are still used in other Celtic and Germanic languages. Giving us the words “virtue”, “virile”, and “world”, terms signifying the power of life. The decolonizing of English is in dire need and could be aided with an addition of these traditional terms such as queen and were. It is well-known that there is an inherent degraded definition identified by feminists in

man/woman, which derives itself from the Christian ideology of patriarchy that places man above woman, and woman as derived from man, which is the origin story of inequality. Anyone who discounts the role of religion and a groups theology or worldview upon a language and nation has not seriously studied their own twisted tongue.

The term clan is an appropriate ancient term derived from the common origin of *planta* in Latin or plant in English, which has survived in Gaeilge today as *clann* and *clannad* both meaning “family, tribe, offspring” and of course, the Gaidhlig (Scottish) term used so often in English. It must be noted that *colere*, Latin for “to plant”, the root word of *colonus* and colonize, literally means an offshoot of original plant, or a new plant and plantation, as in the English colonization of Ireland is called the Plantation. This word is also the origin of the term behind the white supremacist organization Ku Klux Klan who attempted to redefine their sense of family-kinship according to whiteness (white blood, culture & Christianity) rather than traditional notions of an interrelated people via ancestors and inherited definitions such as being part of a group or place. These traditional notions of clanship were all augmented with the coming of Christianity and the rise of chieftainship and kingship in the Celtic isles. The term was applied by anthropologists to Native Americans because it was the closest idea they could find in their own traditions from Europa, rather than it being the appropriate one, as even Rome is said to have formed out of three different tribes or clans. Forbes, who was raised as a Christian but kindly rejected its patriarchy, its history of colonization and killing, its imperialism and peril, sought out traditional notions whenever possible. Published in 1995, his poem “Kinship, the Basic Principle of Philosophy” sums up clearly his

perception of kin and clan, saying, “for hundreds of years, certainly for thousands, Our Native elders, have taught us, “All My Relations”, means all living things, and the entire Universe” (p. 144). In a traditional American sense, a people’s clans originated shortly after creation so that they would understand their connection to each other, all life, and in some cases, to specific other peoples. This expansive notion of kinship and clanship is inclusive and, in many cases, allowed for the adoption of new peoples and persons directly into the ancient system, giving them new names and titles, which secured their place as relatives, as kin and clan despite their lack of mention as one of the original clans. This is clearly the case among the Diné’ who are said to contain four original clans formed by Changing Woman but had allowed for the incorporation-adoption of up to eighty more clans, some of which have been subsumed by larger clans or have failed to regenerate themselves in recent times. Indeed, Judaic origin stories maintained an Aadham-Abrahamic lineage from creation to today which Christians adapted, but not wholly adopted. In Rotinonshonni mythos, the first epoch of creation also established the clan system.

Colonization however is not separate from Imperialism, which is the source or mother plant-clan-family. Thus, the term in Eire and in Anowarakowa is used to characterize a “biological” and “ecological imperialism” in the vein of Alfred Crosby’s (2004) study of the same name which focused on the creatures and species brought by Europeans to the Americas in order to transform the landscape through a kind of biological warfare. By using the clan or colere “planting” metaphor, we find that colonization is not always a destructive process or practice in itself, as demonstrated by the numerous surviving Indigenous colonies or “offshoot” communities found throughout



the world. For instance, a Kickapoo offshoot moved to Chihuahua, Mexico, also we find the Laguna Pueblo communities in Barstow, CA and Albuquerque, CA, or the Yuima of Pauma, the Yoeme-Yaqui of Yaqui Pass and Wells, CA, and many other groups who for the sake of survival migrated into other's homelands as their own homelands were invaded and occupied by foreigners. Indeed, the Six Nations at Grand River know full well that we are on Neutral lands and that our "real estate problem" is that we were dispossessed of our homelands surrounding the finger lakes and through to the mountains of Ganienkeh on up to the St. Lawrence river. Many Native colonies have sprouted in major urban areas such as Los Angeles, San Francisco, Denver, and in some cases surrounding boarding school sites where many families made homes close to where their children lived or family worked. Deloria (1969) advertised "recolonization" as an option for Native Nations (pp. 263-264). The intentions behind the move and the relationships developed afterwards are the key to the distinctions we need to make. Are these migrations from a diaspora of the dispossessed? Are these movements backed by imperialist thefts and laws, invasions and "westward expansion" motives? Indeed it can be argued that many Europeans fled as part of a diaspora and dispossession to Anowarakowa, but we must recognize the powerful positions they adopted once they arrived or if they were border colonies such as the Scots-Irish filled, or the Mennonites and Finns after the Minnesota invasions in the 1860's, these groups rarely recognize how they benefited from dispossession and white supremacy. This is why the United Colonies must clearly be seen as its own Empire rather than simply as an offshoot of its British parentage. Further, the shedding of traditional kinship patterns in order to own private rather than communal property is key in this new relationship along with the political

leadership patterns that came with ruling others in a hierarchical society. As the Albuquerque and other colonies formed by Laguna Pueblo people demonstrate in contradistinction to imperial colonies and outposts, as Carpio's (2004) study demonstrates, "the Laguna railroad colonies were created as a way for off-reservation community members to maintain cultural and political connections while away from the pueblo. These Lagunas remained bound to the pueblo, thereby perpetuating Laguna culture, history, and language" (p. 75). Further she concludes succinctly the differences are sharp:

The relationship between Laguna Colony and the pueblo has demonstrated a strikingly different use of the colony as a means of cultural preservation. Imperial colonies facilitated political and economic expansion as a "new political organization created by invasion," exploiting and subjugating indigenous peoples. Colonies, as hegemonic structures, "became imperialism's outpost, the fort and the port of imperial outreach" [Smith 1999, p. 23]. In America, European powers used settlement colonies toward the economic exploitation of indigenous resources and the utilization of cheap land and labor [Osterhammel 1997, pps. 10-11]. Spanish, Mexican, and American colonization arrived through European colony structures invading indigenous lands. In the Southwest, the numerous indigenous nations understood the destructive capacity of colonial settlement. The Pueblo of Laguna utilized this concept not for hegemonic expansion, but rather to counter white America's continuing colonial pressures on their land and culture (p. 76).

The Laguna Pueblo presents such an alternative, and demonstrates the original conception of the colony was to maintain connections with the parent community, and in this case, specifically inclusive of the parallel paradigm of clanship relations. Their adaptive structure may have been a result of their earlier move near Acoma mesa where the people there allowed them to plant themselves in the shadow of Mt. Taylor after the Southwestern Revolt ended in the late 1680's.

The importance of a lineal and adaptable (adoptive) clanship system cannot be underscored in maintaining right relations and close relations among a people or nation and their homelands. For example, among the Rotinoshonni, the clanship system is held together by an *Oiá:ner* or “good woman”, literally, “she is good”, often translated as a clan mother. She is the property, home owner. She carries and owns the family's seeds, fields and foodstuffs. She is the owner and bestower of names upon children. She is the owner and bestower of titles of representation and leadership among men, the *Roai:ner* or “good men”, who are also subject to critique and removal by their *Oiá:ner*. These titles are the only permanent titles of leadership outside of the principle leadership position of *Atotarho* (Kanien'kehá:ka) or *Tadodaho* (Onondaga), who is elected by consensus of the entire council of the confederacy of Six Nations out of the possible Onondaga members, who are the central firekeepers (the Tuscarora as the sixth nation votes via their adoptee, the Cayugas). Going back to the creation where all life is related, honorary titles are bestowed on the most important life givers which denote their kinship. For example, the earth is noted as *Ionkhi'nistenha Ohontsiake* “our mother [earth]” or *Iethinistenha Onhwéntsia* “mother earth”, the moon is *Iethi'soatha ashonthehnehka karahkwa* “our grandmother”, the sun is *Kiohkehnehkha karahkwa* or *Shonkwahtsí:'a Tiohkehnekha*

*Karáhkwa* “our elder brother”. These are literal and metaphoric meanings derived from the stories of creation which detail our origins. The clan system is highly definitive in that the three base clan groups represent the three primal ingredients of all life: water (beaver, eel, turtle), air (snipe, heron, hawk), land (wolf, bear, deer). In the *ohenton karihwatehkwen*, or the “words that come before all else” all the most precious and important aspects of creation are mentioned and honored through identifying their gifts and relatedness and respectfully placed in a synthetic universe we recognize and honor. Where I was raised in southern California, I was completely amiss as to the deeper meanings of the clan system as I did not know another “wolf clan” member in a few thousand miles, that is, until I met local wolf clan members from other tribes where we readily identified ourselves as brothers despite our differences. The power of the clan system and expansive notions of affiliation are most profoundly circumvented when we acknowledge that these would even extend into historical or current enemy groups.

Forbes (1979c) explains that kinship is not only a mythological foundation, but also its “based upon the concrete observation that each one of us is dependent upon the same things. And that each one of us--all living creatures--are born the same way” (p. 4). Further he elaborates his perspective arguing that from the standpoint of our physical, corporeal existence our connections to every kind of living being and lifegiving property, saying,

. . . if we lose our hands, we can still live. If we lose our arms, we can still live. If we lose our legs, our noses, our hair - all kinds of other things - we can still live. But if we lose the air we will die immediately. If we lose the water, the plants, the earth, the animals, we will die. We are more dependent upon those things than we

are upon what we call the body. As a matter of fact, we don't really have a body separate from these other things. We are rooted just like the trees. Our roots are a little bit different - they come out our nose and mouth and other openings and through the openings in the skin. Without those roots which we carry with us all the time, we would die immediately (p. 5).

In this expansive view, Forbes makes the connection that white people, and the colonizing world has created a false sense of independence which guides their mythology, their science (knowledge), and the stories they tell themselves. He says,

the white society is the one that is mythical. The white society is the one that has invented the idea that human beings are independent and separate and that a person can take credit for what they do, that a person can say, "I did this and I did that." In fact we are utterly dependent all the time, not only on these basic things but, of course, on all the other forms of life that help us and inspire us at every moment in everything that we do. So everything is like a big family. We are children of the Great Spirit, children of Mother Earth, children of the sky, and so on. We have that relationship, that kinship is part of our identity. That is knowing who we are. In spite of everything we might think about being born even to a particular woman and being fathered by a particular man, that in fact is only a passage way. It is only a passage way that the Great Spirit and the creative powers of the Universe have given us come into this life. And even though we honor these people and are dependent upon them, in a real sense they are not our true parents. Our true parent is the Great Spirit (p. 5-6).

He also maintains that “nothing that we do, we do by ourselves. We do not see by ourselves, we do not hear by ourselves, we do not breathe, eat, drink, defecate, piss or fart by ourselves. We do not think, dream, invent, or procreate by ourselves. We do not die by ourselves. That which the trees exhale I inhale. That which I exhale, the trees inhale. Together we form a circle” (p. 6). We get a sense from Forbes vision of the universe that the “universe is a family” (ibid). His perspective allows for many possibilities but also demands that traditional notions of the cosmos be upheld because they uphold the real experiences of the cosmos as a living, united community, of one turning and returning body of life, of one family or garden. We may wish to pick out the debris of Forbes argument as I am most positive he had a great love and respect for his own parents and family and did not mean to imply that his parents “were not his true parents”, but that his parents also had “true parents”, that of a creative power or spirit powers which at some point, and every point, has initiated ours, and their creation, our collective primal birth and being. Perhaps what is happening, and the confusion we find amongst many peoples today is that as Forbes (2001) maintains that the continued prevalence of the “mixed”, “metis”, “mestizo” or hybrid person-people is the result “primarily because of an enduring colonized mentality” (p. 194). People are not maintaining ancient relationships and kinship practices, have lost their inherited clans, are removed from their homelands, are not speaking American languages, performing original ceremonies or dances, or have knowledge of their true and enduring histories, myths, songs and migrations which bind them to all creation and to their original parents, families and greater community. The plantation of foreign ideas and relationships has had a dramatic, traumatic and painful effect, so much that many youths imagine themselves to be “white”

or simply “American” without the slightest understanding of being dispossessed or suffering intergenerational genocide, denationalization, linguicide, and ecocide. Thus, the core of Forbes, as is Holm’s conception of peoplehood is that all healthy people require an integrated sense of kinship, a circle of relationships which bind us to all other living things, but also most important for a conception of nationhood, it binds a people-nation to each other in a cohesive, responsible way which perpetuates all other relations. This is in contrast to imperial forms of family which demand servitude to the empire, state, government, church, etc., above all others. Also, this is distinctly diffuse from conceptions of “race” who are not created in the beginning, but are made and unmade in order to fit into imperial conceptions of difference and hierarchy.

#### *Ceremonialism, Spirituality, Religion and Cosmology*

In order to think critically, that is, to discern the boundaries, borders and rounded edges of language, we must get at the root behind it, in thought and mind. These are indelibly attached to the spirited being. As many elders remind me, “your thoughts are a prayer” and “whatever you think, it can happen.” When I would return home between classes and semesters, my grandfather would remind me that he would pray for my education each night. He would remind me every time I saw him, “we are praying for you” and “I always keep you in my prayers”, and “you must live the prayer.” To pray is to think, and to think is to pray. And to think is to live, to be able to manifest our spirit, our intentions, through our bodies. “The world and all that it contained were the products of the mind and bore everywhere the marks of mind” is how Vine Deloria Jr. (2013) summarized it (p. 243). Forbes (2013) in speaking on “The Nature of the Universe”

suggests three main parameters from which to understand all existence. First, “it is common to envision the creative process of the universe as a form of thought or mental process” echoing Deloria Jr. (p. 61). He goes on further to add that “it is common to have a source of creation that is plural” or that there are at least two sides to even the most basic facets of life (ibid). For example, In Mexica (Aztec) thought, the founding unity of everything is *teotl* or spirit, yet, this is formalized through *ometéotl*, “two-spirit”, or more formal, as in *ometecíhuatl* “two-spirit-queen” and *ometeuctli* also spelled *ometecuhkli* “two-spirit-power”. They dwell in *omeyocan*, the spiritual realm behind everything which was centered on the power of the *huehueteotl* “old-old-spirit” or ancient fire also called *xiuhtecutli* meaning the “turquoise/green-power” which is a reference to growth, time, the seasonal growth-decay cycle noted in the *xiuhpohualli* 365 day calendar, the daily growing cycle (Portilla 1963, p. 53; Lockhart, Berdan & Anderson 1986, p. 154; Lockhart 1992, p. 48-9; Anderson & Dibble 1961, p. 215). Third, Forbes says this is “perhaps the most important aspect of indigenous cosmic visions which is the conception of creation as a living process, resulting in a living universe in which a kinship exists between all things” (p. 61). In this way he adds that the great creators of everything are unlike us earth peoples, they are greater than us, they precede us, and are identified most often with other beings such as Coyote, Spider-woman, Raven, White Buffalo Calf Woman, etc. Forbes (2006) points out elsewhere that in the Lenape language, similar to Anishinaabemowin (Ojibwe), the term for the great creator is *Kiche Manito* (or a variant thereof, such as *gichi-manidoo*) and *Ketanitowit*, meaning the Great Spirit, or the Great One Who Exceeds or the Great Exceeding Power, which exists as part of the *Wemi Tali* or the All-Where, the EveryWhere. Harrington (1921) notes that nearly all of the Lenape



he had spoken to, had agreed upon a supreme power, a *mani'towuk* or "Great Spirit" (p. 18). Harrington further notes that among the Shawnee for example, the Great Spirit was restrictively a woman, *Paboth'kwe*, from which he concluded that these ideas were certainly not the result simply of acculturation to Christian ideas or missionary work (p. 20). For the Mexica, there are many ways to describe the creative forces of the universe that give birth to mind-thought and then to creation, and are as such, creative powers. They include such poetic forms as *Tloque Nahuake* "the far and the near" and *Ipalnemohuani* "the giver of life". The Kanien'kéha (Mohawk) term most commonly used for Great Spirit of Creation is *Shonkwaia'tíson* or "he made/finished our bodies", or the more personal term, *Takia'tíson* "you who made my body" (Porter 2008, p. 425-426). This denotes a spiritual characterization that is personable, we can talk to our creator, it is made up of "mind", of "spirit" as are we, for we are one and the same. We are related to all things and in this way, all our relations bear kinship terms and names as a facet of our recognition. In the Kanien'keha language and cosmology all life is bound in a family way. We are all related in this way. Cajete (1994) says this is a pronouncement of a theology of nature, a spiritual ecology which includes the "ensoulment of nature", that is, we recognize that all life is ensouled, not solely five-fingered beings (p. 37, 83, 86). Many other peoples have similar ideas, that we are the products, the bodies manifest of a great mind-spirit. The Diné talk of the power of *Asdzáá Nádleehé* "Changing Woman" who also has other names and references such as White Shell Woman and Earth Mother. She was the great creator of the people, of the original four clans of Diné, and who guided the *Diyin Diné*, the Holy Peoples to lay down the laws through their original children, to create the first *hooghan*, the four sacred mountains, and the ceremonies which

guide the Diné people (Aronilth Jr. 1994, p. 9; Aronilth Jr. 1992; Todacheene 2015). It was through this thoughtful process, the Diné way of life was instituted. The fundamental laws of the Diné people have been recently codified, revealing a great deal of the basis for their way of life, which was summarized as the basis of the Navajo court systems developing western legal code:

The Holy People ordained,  
Through songs and prayers,  
That  
Earth and universe embody thinking,  
Water and the sacred mountains embody planning,  
Air and variegated vegetation embody life,  
Fire, light, and offering sites of variegated sacred stones embody wisdom.  
These are the fundamental tenets established.  
Thinking is the foundation of planning.  
Life is the foundation of wisdom.  
Upon our creation, these were instituted within us and we [the Diné] embody them (Navajo Nation 2001).

According to the Hopi'tuwa, they were created after everything else. At first there was nothing, endless space, not a shred of life, until it was all made out of "the mind of Taiowa the Creator" (Waters & Fredericks 1963, p. 3). It has been transcribed that what follows was "then he, the infinite, conceived the finite. First, he created Sótuknang to make it manifest, saying to him, "I have created you, the first power and instrument as a person, to carry out my plan for life in endless space. I am your Uncle. You are my

Nephew” and so he proceeded to carry out his divine plan of creation, making relatives of everything (ibid). Clearly, first came the great thought, and then the words of power, of creation. Indeed, the Akkadian-Babylonia-Sumerian, Hebrew and Christian creation stories speak of a great power who first hatched a plan, then spoke the world into being. In many examples such as among the Payomkawichum (Luiseno), the “western people” were created last, and were told to learn from all the other people’s already present where they make no distinction between forms of life except with a respectful name, that is, there is no hierarchy or supreme form of life, everything is given the same respectful form, everything are people (Hyde & Elliot 1994). In the Kanien’kehá:ka version of creation people were made last (Porter 2008, p. 22). In the story of the coming of *Atsi’tsiaka:ion* “old/mature flower” also called Skywoman, she falls from a sky-star world and is saved from drowning through the help of many other beings, notably for all of us, the great turtle who allowed her to rest on its back for all time. The earth mother we live on today is her body combined with soil found in the great ocean that existed in prior times. Later this is combined with the creative work of her twin sons who made all green growing things, the mountains and so on to create our fully formed Anowarakowa “the Great Turtle [Island]” (Porter 2008; NAITC 1984; Parker 1923; Parker 1968). The Lenape or Delaware have a similar story, and believe they live on the back of a Great Turtle (Danckaerts, Sluyter, & Murphy 1867, p. 158, 268). The Nanticoke have a similar story of a Skywoman falling to earth (Jones 1829, p. 92).

Cajete (1994) frames the original notion as a “spiritual ecology” which is a tripecta relationship of ceremony, territory and kinship and is expressed in the principle of “unity in diversity” (p. 42). Spirit-Mind are at the core, but are also manifest through

everything else, making everything akin to each other. Creation, the universe or nature (that which was born) exist because of their cyclical movements of creation, transformation, destruction, and creation. Cajete describes five core ideas which define a people's ceremonialism. First, there is no "religion" or espoused doctrine beyond that which is actually lived, practiced and sought. Second, "language as prayer and song" which are defined by the spiritual element of breath-wind are powerful mediums-tools. Third, creation through any determined act or artistic development is a spiritual process akin to the original creative powers and processes. Fourth,

life and spirit, the dual faces of the Great Mystery, move in neverending cycles of creation and dissolution. Therefore, ceremonial forms, life activities, and the transformations of spirit are cyclical. These cycles follow the visible and invisible patterns of Nature and the cosmos. In response to this creative principle, ritual cycles are used to structure and express the sacred in the communal context of traditional Native American life (p. 44).

And fifth, "Nature is the true ground of spiritual reality" and "Nature is Sacred and its Spiritual Ecology is reflected throughout" (ibid). For Rotinonshonni, the way we honor and recognize this drama which we are clearly an important but not the central character is through the daily recitation of the *Ohenten Karihwaterkwen* or "the words that come before all else". John Mohawk (2011) explains "that talk is what everyone who his sane in the world should agree on" and from which it characteristically ends each rephrase with the saying, "now our minds are as one". "The Words" name, honor and contextualize the most basic sources of life from People to the Grasses to our elder brother Sun and the whole of creation. While it may seem like an essential list, it is also a

mnemonic device for living with the world because everywhere you go, everything you do is constantly interpreted through the framework of “how is this essential to life” and “how do we depend on this for life”. Each person will have their own version, but as a public recitation, it must ultimately touch the cornerstones of all life rather than be a selfish grace of personal piety. The land, the spirituality ecology provides the foundation of ceremonialism, and is a core source of our stories, especially the ones we tell ourselves. Religion, in Forbes mind is something you live, not something you profess, and in this way, whatever one professes is meaningless in the face of their actual relations and actions and further, it is bound to a sacred, landed-experience (Forbes 1975a; 1977). Holm (2005) provides this analysis from which he purposely replaced “religion” or that which is lectured/taught with ceremonialism or the cyclical activities which pay respect, seek to harmonize, and otherwise bind people to the sources of life, saying:

the emphasis that Native Americans placed on religion—whether for preservation or syncretism—was not merely an effort to cling to the past or even to maintain the distinctions between themselves and whites. Native American life centered on the knowledge that all things were connected and that the extraordinary things that occurred in life could not simply be ignored or explained away as meaningless or unreal. Anomalies in nature were understood as realities that fitted into a universal order. The Native American respect paid to the supernatural, the ceremonies that renewed the relationship between the tribe and the spirit world, and the belief that the universe was a living, organic entity made it quite impossible for Native Americans to view societies in mechanical terms. Peoples

could not simply remove an aspect of life and replace it with another as one could a cog in a machine (pp. 43-44).

Forbes (1970) makes it clear that in his view, and in the view of Powhatan people “the “church” was life itself. Religion was practiced twenty-four hours a day and since all life was considered sacred, the “out of doors” was a holy place” (p. 4). You cannot separate what you say and what you do, in-door from “out of doors”. In this way, those that practice imperialism and colonization, this is their real religion. Forbes (1975a) provides the following example:

Religion is *living, all of living*. It is not Catholic, Protestant, or Buddhist. John Jones has a John Jones religion and Betty Smith has a Betty Smith religion. Each person has of necessity, his own personal life and his own individual religion. There can be no conflict between science and religion because a scientist’s life and his beliefs are his religion. We can say that bad scientists have bad religions but there is no conflict as such. A scientist who cuts up animals for research is acting out his religion. His religion allows him to kill captive creatures. It may seem bad to us but it is his religion. He is not a Catholic, or a Baptist, or an atheist. He is a scientist-who-cuts-up-animals. That *is*, his religion, or part of it (pp. 134-135).

Thus, in the early founding of the U.S. republic, the capture and exploitation of American and African peoples was as much a part of their religion as any other part. The theft of America was their belief system put into practice, and the consolidation of this great theft into the territory of the U.S. is confirmation that this is still the dominant religion of U.S. white males, the same group that was legally capable of owning land, people and queens

from 1640-today. Thus, those that dissect life or build bombs in the name of “science”, this is their real religion. In this view, there is no difference between “science” and “religion”, for your way of life, is your actual ways, not what you say or hope or harken them to be. As Cajete reminds, “all science is storytelling”, and I would rephrase this to identify an important maxim: we are the stories we tell ourselves, and we are our story. This brings us to the next tap-root of peoplehood: myth, history, the oral and literary traditions, our stories, the story we live out, and the story we tell ourselves.

### *Oral Tradition, Language, History, and Myth*

History for Forbes provides a window into the past that is often ignored by colonizers who would rather discount-disrespect others perceptions and stories, for again, we are the stories we tell ourselves. Forbes (1974a) argues formidably that the native American story of America is the most important story we have, for it is the only one which describes its creation in full:

Europeans have been here in North America for only about 400 years (at the most). Since human history in our land goes back, at least 40,000 years we can say that 99% (or more) of American history, and of the American heritage, precedes the earliest European settlements along the Atlantic seaboard. In California Europeans have been in a majority only since about 1850, so about 99 34% of California history is primarily Native American. In spite of the sophistry and propaganda which has sought to make the native American race a foreign group in its own homeland, we can say, in truth, that there is an American people, there is an American Way there is an American heritage. It has been- developing

and evolving on this sacred soil for probably at least 1600 generations and it is not dead. It is relevant, it is practical, and it is the unique message of- this land (p. 2).

Of the most ancient stories the Onöndowa'ga:' have is a story about how stories came to be. Essentially, a young orphan hunter comes upon a storytelling stone. One day after he has been successful hunting, he rests up against a massive stone, which suddenly begins to speak to him. The stone asks him if he wants to hear a story, of which a payment is required, to which the hunter agrees. The hunter visits the stone many times, telling him all the stories of his people. He eventually shares the stone, the gifting way, and the stories themselves. In one version the stone itself instructs the whole village of people where the hunter had originally come from, telling them: “Some of you will remember every word that I say, some will remember a part of the words, and some will forget them all” (Curtain 1901; Parker 1923, pp. 97-100). The gift of the stories, of language, oratory, of ideas, of song, of poetry, of history is a unique one. This message of the unique giftedness of each person is duplicated elsewhere, as in the story of the coming of the four sacred ceremonies which describes how four young boys steal away from their family into the woods, only to be instructed by a powerful spirit who shares with them this truth:

No one man will ever be able to remember all these things. Thus, they will be shared among the people, and from the people will come the next ones who will learn them. So, you are to keep your eye on the little ones as they grow up because, as you do, you will see that certain ones have an interest in these things. You will see that they have the gift for picking up the songs, dances or speaking.



You will watch and work with these children to teach them all these things.  
(NAITC 1984, p. 10)

This is one of Forbes gifts as well. He was a hunter of stories, of evidence, which is part of the story, from which whole stories could be constructed, so-called history. Forbes considered himself a poet in his later years more than a historian and he was an amazing public orator who was a “walking library”, had an incredible memory, and a whole plethora of stories to tell.

The many great epochs of traditional oral narratives describe the creation of the world, especially America or Anowarakowa (which sound not too dissimilar), but also include the peopling of the Americas, describing many ancient and recent migrations and numerous other details, characters, and ideas which only make sense in this place, on this land. Forbes (2010) argues that the English imperial historian frequently begins their history of Anowarakowa on the East Coast or the Spanish imperial historian begins at Hispaniola-Cuba or in the South with the invasion of Mexico-Tenochtitlan.

Since there commonly is no attempt whatsoever to tell the story of the settlement of the Americas by Native Americans, except perhaps for a very brief reference to the Bering Straight[sic] theory, and certainly no attempt to reconstruct the history of the First Americans, we are presented with the fact that United States history is not the history of the land called variously North America, “America,” or the United States. Instead it is a racially focused history telling the story of only one great people and their institutions (p. 12).

The issue of course is that the history of the Americas is subsumed under an imperial narrative of growth, one which is really a conglomeration of other people’s stories as the

U.S. did not exist before the late 1600's except as seaboard colonies created by England and was known up until the 1800's as one America rather than as a disconnected North, Central or South America (Forbes 2000b). According to Rotinonshonni stories, the surviving of two creator twins, Tarenyawagon destroyed the monstrous Stone Giants of the world and showed the peoples how and where to live, from which we find the five nations of the Rotinonshonni speaking similar but distinct languages in their respective homelands. Even after 500 years of contact and war with the Columbian Palefaces or *Aserroni* "knife-makers", they are not an integrated part of the epochs, which might be because of ongoing imperialism and disruption, but also possibly because they have not given us a break to tell new stories.

Forbes (n.d., probably circa 1975) authored an unpublished chapter on "Mythology and History", however he did not seem to ground himself in a particular Lenape or Powhatan cosmovision and instead viewed mythology often as "fantasy" in order for groups to "protect themselves" and as "necessary for the sanity of human beings" (p. 2, D-046, B. 205). Further, he suggests negatively that "human beings have always more or less sealed themselves into a mythological womb of fantasy and half-truths, perhaps as a shield against reality" (ibid). It was around this time in his life that he had a major epiphany, a spiritual awakening as he calls it from which he later begins to seriously question imperial history, anthropology, and ideas and instead began to rely upon traditional myths and stories as legitimate sources of knowledge and power (Forbes 1978, p. ii). This is possibly due to his own history-anthropological training, his early rearing in Christianity, and in western-style schools which espoused objectivist imperial scientific constructions of the world as superior and capable of non-bias logic and

reasoning, a point Cajete (2000) challenges as untenable as we are all subjective participants and which Forbes somewhat relents to when he says “unfortunately, the various ethnic and religious groups must inevitably interact with each other in the real world, and every scholar, every human being in fact, is ultimately affected by these interactions” which he calls a “mass mythologizing” (ibid, p. 3). Thus, he himself struggled to decolonize his own thinking about history and myth, which are talked about by imperial scientists and historians as being separate concepts when in fact, they are different kinds of storytelling based on different kinds of evidences and traditions rather than one being better than another. It is in this instance that Thomas’ (1990/1985) understanding of a “sacred history” informs Forbes newfound view. Perhaps, as Thomas (1990) suggests because of the impact of colonization and imperialism upon all peoples and their interrelated tap-roots, “their sacred history has become stories told simply to entertain” and as such, are devoid of the nuanced meanings, lessons and understandings the elders who related them once knew to be out their core to be ancient teachings (p. 16).

Holm, Pearson and Chavis (2003) explain “sacred history” this way:

A group's sacred history is told in the vernacular not only to give each member of the group an understanding of where they come from but also to impart to them proper behavior and the ways in which they maintain group cohesion through ritualism and ceremony. Sacred history also details kinship structures, the meaning of ceremonies as well as when they should be performed, and how the group fits within a particular environment. A people's sacred history is equally an explanation of its own distinct culture, customs, and political economy. Law is derived from within the peoplehood matrix (p. 14)

Further, they say in relation to ceremonialism or religion that “sacred histories normally explain why and how a ceremony is done” and “the ceremonial cycle is linked by way of language and sacred history to a particular environment and ecology. It makes up a group's “world” and directly affects its worldview” (pp. 14-15). Cajete (2000) relates that stories of creation and emergence provide the mythological superstructure or foundation for ceremonial life, for everyday behavior, and give people the laws they are to follow, a kind of “ecological compact” which includes of their special relationships (p. 38).

Countering the imperial view which suggests that sacred histories and tales are “just stories”, Cajete says “the stories are alternative ways of understanding relationships, creation, and the creative process itself, as that process is involved in the underlying thought, as well as in how the tales are represented” (ibid, p. 44). “A people’s origin story maps and integrates the key relationship with all aspects of the landscape. Hence, the origin stories of a people are presented via symbolic language, story, art, song, and ritual” where “Native stories relation the evolution of the people through time, space, and place” (ibid, p. 75). Forbes (2008) revisited traditional stories of creation after 1975 with much more enthusiasm and sensitivity. In his review of the Mbya story which he relates in part, he concludes upon four basic aspects which it shares with other traditional stories that in turn provide a model of the universe for people:

First, the sacredness of human speech constitutes part of the essence of our souls (with great implications for the sacred nature of ideas and speech as a core part of our very humanity and the importance of not using words abusively or for evil purpose). Most significant of all, for our present purpose, is the early creation of the principle of love for human beings. Love, in short, did not arise by chance at a

late stage of evolution, but rather was created as an essential attribute of the Universe prior to the existence of humans. The creator gave rise to Spirit-Powers and to humans, in part, to actualize the Idea of Love already created as a fundamental principle. The Universe was born in Love (p. 5).

This stands in stark contrast to stories taught in imperial schools and churches which have somehow incorporated European historical traditions while neglecting American stories. Forbes (2008) says, “the “heroes” of European historiography, the heroes of the history textbooks, are usually imperialists, butchers, founders of authoritarian regimes, exploiters of the poor, liars, cheats and torturers” which detail the “fabric of European thinking” and demonstrate the lineage, or sacred history of the U.S. mythos as described in the farce of “manifest destiny” and “sea to shining sea” (p. 38). “Tragically, *the history of the world for the past 2,000 years is, in great part, the story of the epidemiology of the wétiko disease,*” the wétiko, which I will clarify in the next chapter is a consuming imperialism that has clouded people’s “original instructions” and cosmovision for themselves (p. 46, emphasis original). He is particularly speaking of European, Christian and Western civilization history, the primary story imperialists tell themselves about themselves, depicting their heroic rise to superpowers as righteous, divinely ordained, and now, based upon scientific evidences, discoveries and ingenious developments rather than invasion, genocide, rape and pillage, theft and deceit. Traditional Rotinonshonni lore for example tells us that we have struggled as a people, that we had become so depraved and sick, that we were murderers and people-eaters and had to choose our “original instructions” and to establish a democratic tradition, the Great Peace and the law of the longhouse which is rooted in consensus and open communication, in a ceremonial way of life, in our kinship

relations, and language of love, in order to survive. We again are confronted with our old dilemma, our old stories coming true again, as we have become socialized into believing the Euro-Christian historical tradition of killing as our own without making it our own. Key to any people's stories, is how they talk. The oral tradition is the foundation of history, is the foundation of sacred texts, and in many stories, follows the work of "thought", and in the sacred word, creation manifests itself, things happens.

### *Language, Literacy and Literature*

Throughout his career Forbes advocated and wrote on behalf of Indigenous language maintenance and revitalization, but also for all peoples who might have their only language, originating from the colonizers such as Spanish or English, respected, supported and nurtured. Settling whatever "nature" vs "nurture" debate there ever was, there is nothing outside "nature" or our many worlds and thus we are nurtured by nature. Language is our path, our voice, our silence, our journey. In relation to the debilitating effects of colonization and imperialism, Native language speakers were well adept to adaptation through influence and incorporation of new ideas, words and concepts. Forbes (1981c) had this to say about the state of Native languages, which he understood as containing of the most advanced aspects of peoplehood by translation "how intimate is the relationship, between colonialism and language status", from which he concludes:

It is not possible to consider native language apart from those processes which have resulted in the present dominance of English in North America and Spanish and Portuguese in Latin America. Before the white invasion, Native American peoples possessed an extremely rich and varied language heritage. All of the

languages had highly developed oral literatures. All of the languages were constantly innovating-developing new words, new phrases, new expressions, and new patterns of pronunciation (p. 14).

Elsewhere Forbes (1979d) notes that Native language use until recently exhibited a few notable expressive features that represent the pinnacle of their development in the community:

- A. Most Indian people were bi-lingual--many learned more than two languages and spoke them fluently.
- B. Anishinabe people developed the "sign language", an extremely useful means of communication.
- C. Many Mexican groups developed systems of writing and many North American groups developed forms of writing using symbols which were either memory-aids or representations of whole phrases, thoughts, or words. The Micmacs, the Delawares, the Otchipwe and many other groups could keep records by means of carved, painted or beaded symbols.
- D. Oral Literature, aided by carved, painted or beaded symbols, reached a very high stage of development, with vast amounts of knowledge being preserved and passed on (p. 2).

Cajete (1994) makes this point as well, arguing divergently that the multiple linguistic forms such as oratory, poetry, song, story, and others "was highly regarded by all tribes as a primary tool for teaching and learning. This was because the spoken or sung word expressed the spirit and breath of life of the speaker, and thus was considered sacred" (p. 33). A people's sacred words and language have been perhaps best expressed by Mexica

elders who referred to them as *in xochitl, in cuicatl* “with flower, with song”, which draws reference to of the most beautiful creations, one of earth, one of people, and is manifest in their combined blooming, poetry. Cajete (1994) calls this the manifestation of a “mythopoetic” tradition which provides a core tap-root:

The messages conveyed through these stories had the power to heal and bring resolution to conflicts because at its core, poetry illuminates, transforms, and mirrors the heart and soul of both the individual and a People. The presentation of these messages went beyond words to include sound, dance, music, games, gesture, symbol, art, and dream. In this way, thoughts, teachings, and emotions were amplified. Every word, every act, had meaning and energy. This allowed Tribal myth and poetry to become part of a larger context of situation and human expression, thereby, making the presentation of myth and poetry a true expression of the sacred breath within humans and all living things (p. 131).

Cajete concludes that “Indigenous mythopoetic traditions represent the most developed and continuously affective forms of education” available today (p. 133). Language and myth are invariably tied and bound together. Although we may remember or have stories which originated in another language, a great deal is lost in translation and therefore we must recognize the newness of the stories which have taken on a new language form. In this way, Indigenous English forms must be taken to their extremes, so as to become wholly and uniquely their own, and so they are able to express the richness of feelings and stories that contribute to an integrated sense of peoplehood, and ultimately of power over every aspect of their lives.



Forbes (1981d) considered “the battle for and against native languages is a crucial, fundamental battle”, one that every single educational effort should grasp and focus upon, for a language is the key communicator, and *the* major tool of a people to both differentiate themselves as well as translate the experience and thought of a people to each other (p. 16). The adoption or adaptation of external languages is seen through imperial eyes as a step away from a static or bounded sense of peoplehood, however, the choice is always a considerate and strategic action. Many boarding school students were subject to captivity, exploitation and abuse in places where their languages were threatened with punishment and derision. This did not always result in the adoption of the new language wholesale, and the new language learned did not ever mirror those who taught them as they instead were influenced equally by peers, by the numerous dialects they were exposed to, and to the community usages they returned to. Forbes says “an Indian without an Indian language, or an Indian group without a native language, is on the way to a new identity” but this does not disqualify a people from claiming and possessing that language as their own, or as separate from the native tongue of their parents or peers as is evidenced by the numerous new languages that were invented out of the experience of the people which anthropologists and linguists would like to label “creole”, “patois” or dialects (ibid, p. 16). The continued use of native languages for instance, if used solely for defensive or insulating purposes “tend to gradually die or retreat,” just as those used secretly or in only one particular aspect of social life demonstrate clear waning processes as they are no longer developed, adapted or reinvigorated by the people (ibid, p. 17). This is most clearly seen in songs, and especially in language forms that become simply textual reproductions in books because

the static nature of the repetitious features often negates innovation and transformation. Given that a majority of Native persons and in turn communities speak either English, Spanish or Portuguese, Forbes (1981d) offers three suggestions in order to retain or develop Native language use, including developing a textualized or symbolic (ideographic) writing system, the learning of a pan-Indian or trade language such as Chinook, Quechua, Nahuatl, or Diné Bizaad as examples, and lastly, creating a new language (p. 20). How does education fit into this situation? Forbes (1981d) says the failure of most efforts which involve outsiders do so because “the changes did not have the endorsement of the elders and spiritual leaders and did not involve the masses” (p. 23). Also, he suggests that two basic approaches can and should be taken towards using education as a vehicle for language revitalization and development, these include teacher training and the creation of new language rich materials (p. 25). As for teacher training, he says, “we do not mean primarily the training of school teachers, but rather grass-roots Indian teachers. These teachers can be religious leaders, housewives, young people, nurses, midwives, or any other motivated persons” of which he argues that they need only the desire to work with their people to take part (ibid). The second aspect includes “a mass literacy movement which is also a liberation movement because once the people learn that they do not need white-controlled institutions for education, they can go on to do many other things” (ibid). Although Forbes stresses writing, I would argue that this not necessarily the first or best option as it seems the curriculum or subject material is just as important as the codification and dissemination process for you cannot force people to read or write in their language, they will not simply do it out of sheer amazement or fear of loss. Thus we see that Cherokee, Creek, Inuit and other groups

which develop their own writing system inherently want and do learn it with a greater degree of success and pride. What seems to be needed always, which he intimates elsewhere is that leaders and the core of social activities must use the language as its primary or sole tool of communication, especially in those areas which are constantly battling for space and places such as economic and governance, education and entertainment but also warns of languages being strictly used for defensive or secretive purposes. This is a struggle for “psychological liberation” not merely marketable skills or isolation, for the imperial economy constantly values and devalues Native languages depending upon its effective incorporation of peoples into the empire, as was the case with the use of Native languages as catechizing tools by Christian religious sects, or the use of Native languages by federal programs which aimed rather to acquiesce resistance and present themselves again as friendlies rather than enemies such as in the Navajo readers. After the 1973 convention of the California Indian Education Association, Forbes put forth the recommendations of the working group he had with regards to language in which the point was made that traditional sacred sites were in effect, the original sanctuaries, the churches of the language, and they must be repatriated to the people so their languages have their home again (Forbes 1973c, pps. 116-117). The language is seen as being homeless or exiled as much as the people because although one can take their language elsewhere, if it is too far from the original sources of its base vocabulary and ideas, it may not be a great fit or as useful as another language. Holm, Pearson and Chavis (2003) summarize how and why language is a sacred medium of communication this way:

Having a distinct language, of course, sets a group apart in and of itself. But a group-particular language, by way of its nuances, references, and grammar, gives a sacred history a meaning of its own, particularly if origin, creation, migration, and other stories are spoken rather than written. Language defines place and vice versa. Place-names, for example, essentially bespeak a relationship with the environment or describe an area within the context of a group's sacred history and culture. A particular group's language is, more often than not, liturgical as well as colloquial. Religious ceremonies are usually performed using a language that is familiar within the group. On the other hand, language can be symbolic, and ritual language might not have meaning in any other context than in a particular religious ceremony. Even English has been adopted and made an essential part of a given people's sense of group identity (p. 13).

So, although many people deny that English or Spanish can be a sacred language of a people, they are, and will continue to be, and especially so if a people can develop it in their own way, make it their own, and have it work for them rather than against them. Often my students are perplexed that I consider English a sacred language until they begin to consider the fact that they speak a unique form of language, that their parents spoke English to them (if that's the case), and perhaps instead of being called English, it may be Ebonics, Navajo or anything else it might be called as the Hawaiian, Gullah, and other examples demonstrate clearly that it can become localized, distinct, and remade in beauty. The first English speakers for example were not Christian, nor necessarily imperialists, they were made that way through time and in the deep roots of English lie indigenous stories, names, and power which the above forces couldn't stamp out. Such is

the case that the pagan word for spirit, got/god became the dominant term for Yahweh rather than Hebrew, Aramaic, or even Latin terms such as Deus, which in itself, earlier described the Roman polytheistic vision of the world rather than a monotheistic one. Language is a tool, albeit a sacred one connected to the holy winds and the “breath of life”, and whatever one does with it, they must be careful of its power to heal, or harm themselves or others. “Language is not primary; it is simply an equal part of the matrix” is how Holm, Pearson and Chavis (2003) summarized their understanding (p. 18).

### *In Summary*

Forbes, uses his barometer for “a people” early as a child and recognized “plants” and “animals” as people, spirit-beings, the Eagle Rock, and the site of D-QU, the great waters, Attan-Akamik, the Mexicanos and Indios, Tibetans and Palestinians and so many others. Hernández-Avila (2011) pointed out in her memorial for him upon his passing, that he truly recognized “people” everywhere, he recognized life and respected the diversity, the plurality and the cosmopolitan world as it has always been. The prescient that our diversity is becoming replaced by the ceremonial traditions and ideas, history, language and lands of others reminds us that we cannot get discouraged but rather should remain hungry for our ancient ways and wisdom. Forbes ideas I believe “back up” the notions put forth by Holm, Thomas, Deloria and Cajete with regards to recognizing that everything is related, and in turn, everything is important for healthy people or nationhood. Forbes recognized that a people are always living relation to specific places and become people of a place, or many places, all their lives, so much that in cumulative, a person’s ancestors have passed on an adaptive medium to all places on land and sea.

We have homelands with clear boundaries, but also shared territories, in the specific, and which many regard as given to them by the spirit-powers of those places, if not something greater and more powerful. Ceremony and the maintenance of an interwoven spiritual ecology binds people to the cycles of death and birth and rebirth which is living condition of mutual reciprocity and constant balance of relationships which foster and are life. Forbes identifies that every people have to find their niche, while the opposite is true that we have witnessed continuous warfare for hundreds if not thousands of years, in some way or another people survive because of these “persistent” qualities as Edward Spicer had first suggested and Thomas agreed. Yet, these are all so intimately bound together, we cannot separate the words we say, from the thought, or the body, or the place, or the time which they are spoken, from the historical, ceremonial, territorial or other qualities that equally imbue themselves upon the speakers of any people. The fact of basic multilingualism at all times, the world over, suggests that we are prone to both develop our own languages and learn the languages of others. Those “others” include all the kinds of life and peoples we can imagine, all of our relations, have a voice, have a way of speaking, of communicating, with each other, with one another, as relative in some way, and only distance or recognized intimacy as any real distinction.

For Forbes, plurality was the norm. Multi-lingual and cultural people were not an abstract or extreme condition. The distinction between Native and immigrant groups is always a political or legal one, but also a territorial, historical, linguistic, ceremonial-religious, and clan-kin based relationship. One cannot understand the dimensions also without the introduction of private, corporate or federal property law, racism, patriarchy, materialism-consumerism, pathogens and other ill effects of the imperial relationship.

Unquestionably, Native Nations or in a Forbesian tongue, native American Nations, Anishinaabe or Onkwehonwe throughout Anowarakowa have had to fight for their lives in innumerable ways since 1492 in order to survive. Some peoples have become invisible to the imperialist or at least, have attained some semblance of equality, which are the anti-imperialist states of the Americas from Mexico to Cuba to Venezuela and Chile. Forbes recognized that while dominated by white elites, most peoples in the Americas as wholly American, not European in any way, despite what monuments the elite have built in their mimicry of the empire-builders. One of these was centered in Mexico-Tenochtitlan, and was a confederacy called the Triple Alliance which consisted of the Mexica, Texcoco and Tlacopan People-Nations. Unlike Rome, these Nations retained their autonomy, as did other Nations who contributed willingly or through force and coercion to the capital's influence. Although they were influential throughout various parts of contemporary and post-invasion Mexico, their greatest influence would come *after* the invasion and members of the Triple Alliance and allied others from Tlaxcala, Xochimilco, Quauhquechollan, and elsewhere began to travel and spread their language, culture and ideas well beyond Mexico (Asselbergs & Restall 2007; Asselbergs 2008; Asselbergs 2011; Johannesen & Hastorf 1994; Le Clézio 1993; Weatherford 1988; Weatherford 1992).

This brings into question the concept of “indigeneity” or “whose an Indian”, as Forbes will show, if it's not about blood relationships as the ultimate denominator, then what is it. Holm, Thomas, Deloria and Forbes all mention kinship but it does not figure in their minds as the ultimate determinant, despite Deloria and others hesitancy towards “Mexicans” who he refers often to as a minority while Thomas and Forbes argue that

Mexican culture is clearly an indigenous alternative to whiteness (Thomas 1971; Forbes 1970; Forbes 1973). The next question I propose to test this hypothesis, is the case of “new peoples”, ethnogenesis, for we cannot understand an “old people” without its opposite. Further, we cannot understand “old peoples” without reframing our understanding to include a colonial and imperial present-presence as Forbes calls “small nations”, “captive nations” within a largely imperial-colonial matrix of relations, laws, spaces and administrative envelopment.

*Captive and New Nations: Native Americans, Americanism and Pan-Indianism*

A people, united by a common language and having a particular ceremonial cycle, a unique sacred history, and knowledge of a territory, necessarily possesses inherent sovereignty. Nations may come and go, but peoples maintain identity even when undergoing profound cultural change (Holm, Pearson and Chavis 2003, p. 17).

“Civilizations are not the enduring human systems communities are!”(Cajete 1994, p. 166).

Forbes is one of the primary individual promoters of the term “Native American” in the 20th century, after the most prominent movers and shakers, the Native American Church. In the 19th century, colonial whites sought to indigenize their politics through the creation of a Native American party, however, the whole western half of the United Colonies today remained entirely in the realm of Indian Country and white’s seemed to



have backed off and focused on creating clear distinctive groups which reinforced whiteness rather than nationalism. There was no confusion with “First Americans” who were continued to be called Indians from 1840-1845 when the party established itself in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and in New York City, electing a single mayor. There weren’t any Indians in this party as their goal was to limit voting to “native-born citizens” as they feared growing political power of newly arrived immigrant European populations who would gain the privileges of white males. Thus, we can summarily dismiss this attempt at nativization as a subcultural refuge of whites similar to the Whigs (who also produced an American party), Free Soilers and Know-Nothings who foresaw the development of political parties and perhaps the current two-party system the colonies have mostly adopted since the election of Republican president Abraham Lincoln in 1860. It seems, since the unCivil war in the 1860’s that, outside of Theodore Roosevelt in 1912 (Progressive) and Ross Perot in 1994 (Independent) a third-party candidate has never breached the two-headed monsters’ hold. Indeed, this was the platform of Ralph Nader and Winona LaDuke’s bid for the 2000 presidential election, who constantly pointed out that George Bush Jr. (Republican) and John Kerry (Democrat) were rooted in the same corrupt system of exploitation and political relationships.

In my research, I have only found contemporary usages of Native American to be synonymous with Indian or First American populations. Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz (2005/2016) noted that to her knowledge Forbes was the originator of the term that Indian people have been using today, as a purposeful attempt to distance themselves from Indians originating near the Indus valley or Indian subcontinent of AfroEurAsia. She says, and I quote in full, “Jack introduced the term “Native American” for American

Indians, although he preferred simply to use “American” to refer to Indigenous Americans of the Western Hemisphere and force all other groups to hyphenate” (p. 23). This was a part of what she considered to be his own “Native American-centered theory of colonization that viewed Chicanos as Indigenous Americans” (ibid). My own research suggests that Jack used the term as early as 1960 when he attempted to establish a Native American Studies department at newly opened San Fernando Valley State College, calling it in later drafts, American Indian Studies instead (D-046, B. 160). As a public usage, he started to use the term in 1961 as part of a new organization he formed, the Native American Movement, also called the Movimiento Nativo-Americano, who distributed a number of publications including a small pamphlet entitled, “Who are the Native Americans?” (Forbes 1964, p. 72; D-046, B.160; D334, B.55, F. Forbes Letters of Reference 1978-1996). Thus, since 1960, he was the main public scholar reproducing this new coinage, as his attempt, which he describes later, to distance his people from the now more populous “Indian” population from the Indian subcontinent, the real Indians in his mind. He also popularized the term *Aztlán*, which will be discussed below in further detail.

Indeed, Forbes (1972b) is willing to question his own commitment to the term when he quips that, “many of us have started to use the name “Native American” and certainly that is better than Indian, but why “American” in which at this point in time attacks the etymology of America as related to Amerigo Vespucci” (p. 31). He suggests a number of other options including *Anishinabe-weki* (The People:Algonquin), *Caboclo* (Copper-Skinned People:Brazilian), *Okla-Houma* (Red Land People:Creek), and *Macehual* (Common People:Nahuatl) (ibid). Part of his contention rests on the idea that

many Indians were becoming denationalized/de-tribalized, and adapting like others through a “pan-Indian” identity and formation of new social relations with similar peoples. Forbes declares that “virtually every country of Anishinabe-weki has people of Indian race, who are no longer truly members of tribes or other traditional communities. These people need a name for themselves. They need some basis on which to organize to achieve justice” (ibid). This is the real crux of Forbes contention, which I suggest is rooted in his own experience and those others in similar situations. Forbes was attempting to organize a new group who was racialized as Indians but de-communalized, occupying a sort of limbo social sphere, strata and geography. This might produce a resistance movement, but does it qualify as a nationality?

Forbes great work to establish D-Q University and Native American Studies at UC Davis with its American-Middle Continent-Hemispheric focus and other obvious efforts such as *United Native Americans* (1968) and the *Native American Movement* demonstrate his sincere desire to unite all Indigenous-defined (in whatever ways they make this connection) groups. So, while white people, neo-immigrants and others claim to be Americans, Forbes hoped that Indian people would battle them for this name, for names are powerful. Thomas (1965) notes that “Pan-Indianism” was developed originally by imperialists when they invented the Indian, but it was not until the totalizing effects of the reservation system when different Nations were forced to live with one another and then finally with boarding schools that it became an internalized reality rather than an external pronouncement. The Ghost Dance and Native American Church were prime examples in his mind of internal efforts compared to externally formed Indian boarding schools, while he says “Pan-Plains” Indian identities are what many associate with Pan-

Indianism as found in many Indian centers in the cities, in Pow-Wow circuits, and new organizations such as the National Congress of American Indians especially after wartime, termination and relocation efforts of the 1940's and 1950's pressured many to move to cities. Thomas believed that "Pan-Indianism is the creation of a new identity, a new ethnic group, if you will, a new "nationality" in America" which can strengthen or diminish its ties to traditional indigenous homelands and communities in the city and develop new relationships beyond both unbounded arenas (p. 82). Border towns represent and predominate reservation communities because they demonstrate the flow of power, resources, and relationships to historically draw people away from impoverished (financially, but not culturally) social centers.

The Phoenix Indian School published a newsletter entitled *The Native American: Devoted to Indian Education* beginning in 1900 through 1931 and thus we see that this term was influenced by Indian students yet aimed at a receptive white readership. While this term was used for the title, it was never used to describe Indian people throughout the course of its thirty years of publication. For example, Chilocco Indian Agricultural School called their publication during the same time, the *Indian School Journal* while other Indian boarding school publications such as *The Indian Helper* and *The Red Man* were the products of far eastern Carlisle. The Native American Church of Oklahoma was granted a state charter and became incorporated on October 10, 1918 in order to provide some legal protection, a new organization to communicate and work together, and to consolidate resources. The charter included the language of Christianity, reflective of the authors rather than its constituents, and maintained their purpose to be, according to article II:

to foster and promote the religious belief of the several tribes of Indians in the State of Oklahoma, in the Christian religion with the practice of the Peyote Sacrament as commonly understood and used among the adherents of this religion in the several tribes of Indians in the State of Oklahoma, and to teach the Christian religion with morality, sobriety, industry, kindly charity and right living and to cultivate a spirit of self-respect and brotherly union among the members of the Native Race of Indians, including therein the various Indian tribes in the State of Oklahoma (as quoted in Stewart 1987, p. 224)

Many of the first “organized” or rather, institutionalized forms of Peyotism did not use the term Native American, some of which did not even mention peyote in their articles of incorporation. However, various Lakota-Dakota-Nakota groups organized themselves almost restrictively with this name as their headline calling themselves the Native American Church of Allen or the Native American Church of South Dakota, or the Native American Church of Porcupine (Stewart 1987, p. 230). In contradistinction, the Society of American Indians which had incorporated in 1912 was one of the major anti-peyotist lobbying groups in the U.S. Although having a few non-Indians in their ranks, it was by far and large, Indian members such as Gertrude Bonnin who testified consistently against the holy medicine. Stewart’s (1987) key study on the subject, notes, Richard H. Pratt, founder of Carlisle Indian Industrial School (1892) had been “testifying for the Bureau of Indian Affairs” and was an “important witness” against peyote and NAC incorporation (p. 221). It is unclear of the motives for the use of “Native American” at this time, however, it is hinted by Stewart that James Mooney, an ethnologist for the Bureau of Ethnology at the Smithsonian Institution not only offered key testimony in

support of peyotists but also was a point person in the creation of the articles of incorporation for the first church organized in Oklahoma in 1918. For his work on these early cases, he was summarily barred from doing field work ever again in Oklahoma and died but a few years later of a heart attack (Stewart 1987, p. 222).

The use of the term Native American had been understood to be accommodationist, for they attached with a Church, and this clearly meant a Christian orientation. Not all peyotists were Native American Church members, or Christians, but even those that were did not always identify as clearly Christian. Star Road Geronimo Gomez of Taos Pueblo shared later in life (1936) that after he was persecuted by leaders of his community for participating in peyote ceremonies that he felt justified for his participation. He reflected on this experience, saying:

I am not doing anything wrong. Only thing I do, as far as I know, I pray to the Great Spirit or the same God that intelligent white men pray to today. Now we have a Catholic Church here. The same church that is used among the white people. This Native American Church is the same thing, only we do this in our own simple way of believing in God so that we shall be better men to mankind. Is there going to be the same put on the Catholic group that is put on us who practice in the Native American Church? (as quoted in Stewart 1987, p. 203-204).

What is curious is his defense of the Native American Church as an Indigenous derived belief system, which is also challenging to some of the Pueblo's leaders, who have feet both in their own societies and kiva's but also in the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church was known throughout this early period of the spread of peyotism in New Mexico and especially at Taos, to have taken a strong stance against it, fearing most likely, they

were losing members like Star Road who preferred “our own simple way” instead of those prescribed by the foreign church.

To continue, Forbes use of the term was bolstered as mentioned previously through the new organization he developed, the Native American Movement which coincided with his time teaching at San Fernando Valley State College from 1960-1964. Forbes (1994e) says of the group when speaking of its relationship to the history of the Alcatraz island occupation that, “the Native American Movement was organized in the Los Angeles-Ventura area of California, bringing together Chicano-Mexicanos, Chumash, and urban tribal people. NAM developed a series of militant position papers” which he had hoped would trigger a “reawakening of the Native American people” (p. 126; see also Forbes 1964b, p. 72). It is clear from his earliest organizing efforts which began in 1960 when he, Carl and Mary Gorman started the American Indian College Committee, the convening group to envision D-Q University and Tribal Colleges, that he had clearly articulated many of his original ideas that formed the bulk of his later work. For example, the text of the pamphlet, “Who are the Native Americans?” read:

The Native American Movement represents the reawakening of the Native American people and the revival of Americanist principles. It is the spiritual descendent of the earlier movements for unity organized by Tecumseh, Cuauhtemoc, Tupac Amaru, Po-pe, Cajeme, Wovoka and other great leaders. The movement seeks to realize justice for Native Americans and all other peoples who suffer from discrimination. It does not draw any color line or exclude anyone. All persons who seek to advance the cause of true Americanism and of American unity are welcome. . . . All who struggle for justice and freedom are

brothers! . . . Every person in the United States and in the Americas who has a drop of Native American ancestry is a member of the Movement if he stands for freedom and justice. . . . (Forbes 1964b, p. 73).

This text clearly outlines his core beliefs and his organizing principles from which terms such as Americanist and Americanism are utilized often as points of departure for his decolonial philosophy of education. Tecumseh, the great Shawnee resistance leader, had his name used for the first Native American Studies department at UC Davis in the form of the Tecumseh Center. One can see the connection between Forbes original naming of Deganawidah-Quetzalcoatl University and in his list of leaders which sought to unite all Indigenous Peoples of the American island, including those with “a drop of Native American ancestry”. This last point is important as Forbes maintains that key Native leaders of the past such as John Ross of the Cherokee, who was labeled on federal rolls as 1/8th, and who grew up bicultural and bilingual, would not make the rolls of many tribes today who have adopted strict blood quantum requirements, calling the practice “pseudoscientific mumbo-jumbo” (Forbes 2001, p. 2).

The concept of blood as a containment for identity has been vitriolic in the last two centuries, especially as regards Native peoples who are the only ones forced to maintain a hypogenetic blood count of ancestors in their veins at all times whereas “Blacks” are assumed to always have an African blood count without measurement. Forbes (1973) made the point that Spaniards and local “Hispanics” or hispanos are much more mixed “racially” than say most Mexicans or Indians. Forbes (1984) also points out that the lenient “one-drop rule” applied to people with supposed African appearances is used in tandem with Indigenous people’s strict requirements, such that in places like



Virginia who invented the first state race laws in 1680 and 1705, and what became the standard race laws of the colonies, summarily applied the one-drop rule on Blacks everywhere, effectively eliminating thousands of Indian recipients of federal funds, protection and aid over the years. This demonstrates that the pen is mightier than the sword when colonial illegality takes solid form.

This concept of blood is beyond the scope of this study; however, real people have been historically considered members without a single “drop” of Indian blood, namely through traditional adoption practices. Such was the case of John Norton, a Scottish born Cherokee descendent (who later found relatives that acknowledged him as Cherokee) that was adopted by the Mohawk, becoming a nephew of Joseph Brant (Thayendanegea), and was so named, *Teyoninhokarawen* (“open door”). He was publicly recognized as a “pine tree chief”, a kind of delegate but without a hereditary title, who learned the language fluently and translated the New Testament into Mohawk as well as contributing one of the earliest versions of the Mohawk creation story, and who also travelled widely and fought many notable battles such as Tecumseh’s offensive at Tippecanoe in 1811 (Benn 1998; Norton 1816).

There is a remarkable difference today, whereas we see the tables turned. Adoption has been siphoned and corralled into federal legal meanings so that many if not most Native communities have adapted, all whilst disenrolling person’s and their families deemed to be lacking quantifiable blood (ancestors). It is up to Native nations to decide how to proceed, however, I have yet to hear of recent cases where non-federally enrolled people become legal members through adoption. This would be unheard of among whites who would demand the same legal rights, such as rights of inheritance among their

adopted members to be fully respected. Performances of traditional adoption ceremonies continue to take place, but without the power to enforce these rights and responsibilities, the “supreme law of the land” has ousted traditional customs, laws and rights to the margins. While some groups have adopted lenient blood lineage policies such as the Cherokee (based on ancestry) or have integrated blood quantum into the original clan system, it still functions as a racial caste barometer. The *hunka* ceremony among the Lakota which makes a person an adopted relative for example is still performed, but its adoptee lacks a legally recognized status because membership laws count blood not clan relatives today. As such, a fully Indigenous person “full blood” can be without a nation if they do not meet minimum requirements of any ancestral nation, yet, they can be adopted legally into a white family and be heirs to their property and status. Kim Tallbear’s (2013) recent study on Native American DNA blood, she presents the concept in a straightforward way, arguing coherently:

Native American DNA could not have emerged as an object of scientific research and genealogical desire until individuals and groups emerged as “Native American” in the course of colonial history. Without “settlers,” we could not have “Indians” or “Native Americans”—a panracial group defined strictly in opposition to the settlers who encountered them. Instead, we would have many thousands of smaller groups or peoples defined within and according to their own languages, as Diné, Anishinaabeg, or Oceti Sakowin, for example. It is the arrival of the settler in 1492 and many subsequent settlements that frame the search for Native American DNA before it is “too late,” before the genetic signatures of the

“founding populations” in the Americas are lost forever in a sea of genetic admixture (p. 5).

It is clear from this discussion that the choice of terms, are based upon who is doing the talking and what are their motives for discussion. White people never apply for jobs with a pedigree of white blood certified by the federal government, British government or anyone else from which sardonically the editors of the *UNA* newsletter *Warpath*, inclusive of *Forbes*, called for a Bureau of Caucasian Affairs and abolishment of the BIA (*Forbes* 1968c, p. 9). *Forbes* clearly attempted to articulate a specific goal or motive, which was to use ancestry as an organizational tool against historical-cum-present imperial-colonialism in opposition to white settlers and other neocolonialists who have organized themselves over time according to notions of ancestry-blood. Africanists such as Marcus Garvey and Malcolm X used a similar tool, that of Blackness, as anti-miscegenation laws and the one-drop rule was already in effect and became an organizing principle. The rise of the Ku Klux Klan for example was an attempt to rebuild traditional notions of family by suggesting people voluntarily join the Klan (clan), which is not anything akin to the ancient systems of social organization possessed by their Irish, Scottish or British ancestors. *Forbes* articulated (1956) in his first published article his claim to Powhatan blood-ancestry as a key impetus for his research and his own bias within his works, one that he articulated ever greater as his life work progressed. Also he clearly expressed a conception of a “Native American Race”, which was not a scientific race, or a single people, but rather a shared experiential group as peoples of the Americas who had 20,000 years or more of diffusion, intermixture and exchange (*Forbes* 1964e; *Forbes* 1971c; *Forbes* 1977, p. 2; *Forbes* 1984b; *Forbes* 1990a, p. 21, n. 2; *Forbes* 1990b,

p. 4, 13, 22; Forbes 1992e). His usage is always in the context of critical analysis of racist discourse such as when Forbes (1990b) describes racial paradigms in the census of 1980, summarizing the issues at length in this statement:

The use of the “Hispanic” and “Spanish origin” categories thus are not only insulting to people of Native American race, representing a perpetuation of the Spanish Empire’s exaltation of whiteness into modern U.S. society, but they also help disguise the crucial racial differences existing between such groups as Cubans, Argentinians, Mexicans and Puerto Ricans. Ingenious arguments must be invented to explain white Cuban success in a white racist society, as if whiteness did not matter. Conversely, the Native American, African and Afro-Native American ancestry of millions of Mexicans and Puerto Ricans is made to disappear as if by magic. Again, ingenious arguments must be invented to explain the slow progress of such non-white Latin Americans in a white racist society, since their physical appearance has been made undiscussable (p. 22)

Elsewhere he uses the term to describe the shared experience of all (Native or First) Americans, such as in his lectures and speeches on “the evolution of Native Americans” (D-046, B. 41).

When Forbes and others created D-QU it was imagined at the outset (recall he began his efforts in 1961) it was a Pan-Indian movement that was seen as transitional to new nationalisms because in part, one cannot be a people without a nation, they are synonymous. His explanation was fully expressed in a 1981 American Indian International Tribunal held at D-Q University where he explains:

D-QU was not created for land-based federally recognized Indians alone, to use the popular slogans of the BIA Indians of a few years ago. D-QU was not created just to serve the needs of a small group of people. It was created in the hope that a Pan-Indian movement, a Pan-Indian community could be developed all the way from Greenland in the Arctic, all the way down to the southern tip of South America. Now that vision, the vision of the unity of all of the native races of the Americas, is a vision that is very, very frightening to the colonial structure because the colonial structure in the United States wants to convince all the Indians here that they are U.S. Indians, that they belong to the United States, and that they should forget about Indian people everywhere else. They want to convince Canadian Indians that they are Canada's Indians, that they belong to Canada, and that they have no relationship with anybody else. They want to convince Eskimos and Dene people on one side of the border that they are different from the same people who live on the other side of the border. They want to convince Papago people who live on one side of the border that they are different from people who live on the other side, the Mexican side of the border. And every one of these governments in the Americas wants to destroy that Indian unity because the borders that exist in this continent are colonial borders. They are borders that were created by outsiders, they were created by the manipulation of the power structure. The border between Mexico and Guatemala is a completely artificial border that was drawn on maps before people even had gotten into the Selva, into the forest to see what the country was like. And the Indian people on both sides of the border are the same people. The border between Peru and

Bolivia divides Aymara and Quechua-speaking people, and so on. Almost every one of these borders cuts Indian nations right in two so that it is in the interests of all these colonial powers to convince Native people that they should belong to and adhere to only that particular colonial power.

So when you get an institution like D-QU developing that says we are Pan-Indians, we are going to work with Chicanos, we are going to work with Indians from the south, we are going to work with Canadian Indians, we are going to work with Indians who maybe have African ancestry, we are going to work with all kinds of native people, then that becomes a tremendous threat because immediately the bonds of colonialism in the colonized mind begin to be broken, even when you start thinking about that (KCP MSS 556BC, B. 10, F. “American Indian International Tribunal”).

The question remains however, is this an actual claim to peoplehood or is this a claim to personhood, an individual marker from which a single person makes and develops, or further, is it an appeal to state development and bureaucratic institutions that wield power? Forbes articulations suggest it's an individual dilemma rooted in the need to return to traditional community and be one of the people. D-QU was purposely developed off a reservation land base so as to promote unity in these contexts. Elsewhere Forbes (1980b) has argued:

D-QU is the only Native college openly dedicated to pan-Indian liberation. What does this mean? From 1970-71 onward the university described itself as pan-Indian, that is, as embracing (in theory) the entire Native race from Alaska and Greenland to the very tip of South America. This concept must have upset those

people who wanted Native people to think of themselves as “United States Indians” whose very identity is dependent upon the BIA colonial system” (pp. 78-79) .

The term Native American is a political term, one that is conceived to be generative in its attempt to bring in peoples and persons who have been dissuaded or removed from the core of Indianness. Today, the term is used in many legislative and legal acts as synonymous with Indians and with Tribes, but is it equative to Nations? The Native American Languages Acts of 1990, 1992 and 1996 all specify that term is also inclusive of Hawaiians and Alaskans which the terms “Indians” and “Tribes” are historically remiss upon being inclusive of the former groups. It is unclear about the many in-between groups such as the landless, untreated and federally non-recognized peoples. Further, Native American in Forbes mind includes all Indians of the Americas irrespective of their status in federal or state identified terms which is similar to Columbus and other imperialists original conceptions that all peoples of America were Indians and the original Americans (see Low 2016; Martinez 2016; Fixico 2000; Forbes 1998; Fixico 1991). The UNA in particular used the language of satire combined with a sardonic tone in their newspaper *Warpath*, where the first mentions of a Bureau of Caucasian Affairs as one example, can be located (UNA 1970, p. 13). Forbes was by 1970 and the founding of Tecumseh Center and the incorporation of D-QU and its struggle not within the local milieu of Brightman who became its factional leader, however, it is clear just in the name of the organization as with the earlier Native American Movement, conceived of a pan-Indian principle of peoplehood and unity, but also for the purpose of anti-imperialism and decolonization.

The term Native American historically seems a particular to Forbesian type people who were not raised in a specific Indian community but rather in the many barrio-type groupings which produced such places as Analco in Santa Fe whose population originally was formed out of Indigenous castaways, servants, day-laborers, and others living outside of the Tewa, Tiwa, Towa's newly confined communities (Forbes 1971a). Indeed, Los Angeles was founded in the main by non-whites atop the ancient Tongva village of Yangna in 1781 (Forbes 2001b). The recognition of *genízaros* by the state of New Mexico in 2007 is an interesting case, where the legislature put down on record that they “recognize the existence and importance of this indigenous group and the presence and importance of its descendants today” (48th legislature, 1st session). If a group has always self-recognized, what is the need for state or federal recognition except to have special privileges or status guaranteed to Nations via treaties? The term *genízaro* originally used by the Turkish Ottomans to describe captured peoples turned into “new soldiers” and is derived from Spanish *jenízaro*, which was applied to the many peoples who were captured or sold into captivity and forced to work for Spanish colonizers in New Spain and especially New Mexico and southern Colorado (Bailey 1966; Gonzales-Berry & Maciel 2000, p. 6; Magnaghi 1994; Magnaghi 1998). The term janissary as brought into English still maintains its original meaning without the local definitions. In the case of New Mexican *genízaros*, many utilized their strength in numbers and adopted skill sets in order to receive land grants such as at Belen and were a force to be reckoned with in almost every pueblo in the state of New Mexico, with an estimated 10-50% of the population in many places. Recognized peoples might gain “rights”, “privileges” and a reprieve from persecution. When does a group become an enemy of the state? The



Japanese of primarily the west coast consisted of *issei*, *nisei*, and *sansei* (1st, 2nd and 3rd generation) when occupied Hawaii was bombed by Japanese forces, and all three generations in a single fearful instance were deemed enemies, were interned, had their lands and property confiscated and dispersed, and were effectively both recognized and dis-recognized by the state as without rights despite the majority being citizens. They were uniquely interned in places like China Naval Base, the Papago Indian Reservation and Mono Lake Paiute Reservation in California. So while they were regarded as more civilized than Indians, instantly, they could become the enemy. So, who has the power? Who created and controls the “state”? Whose standards and laws of recognition, replete with privileges and rights are the “supreme law of the land”? The answer is Whites. They made the “state” and the “constitution” of every single state in the U.S. They created the standard of “we the people”, helmed by white males, and were at every single Treaty negotiation with Native Nations and European Nations. In order to understand ancient and modern conceptions of peoplehood, we must look at the most powerful new “people” in the world: whites. Are they a singular “people” or a political bloc, a privileged caste within the empire, or perhaps, they are simply other’s nightmare incarnate? What does Forbes have to say about whites as a “special” people, somewhat foreign to traditional conceptions of peoplehood?

*Are whites a people, a caste, a state, or perhaps vampires incarnate?*

The Indians are a looking-glass into the souls of North Americans. If we want to dissect the Anglo and analyze his character we must find out what he does when no one else is looking, when no one else cares, when no one is in a position to

thwart his will - when he can do as he pleases. And with the Indian the Anglo has done what he pleased, with no one to care, and with the Indian ultimately too weak to resist (Forbes 1966, p. 3).

This question reveals the plague we are confronted with, one which the racial-based colonial project of the U.S. has taken on since before its formation, but especially so after 1790 and the constitutional convention which ratified a new law for the colonial confederacy which did not name “whites”, yet they were the only ones at the convention, a white man’s convention. Forbes points to a number of junctures and departing joints where we can trace the formation of this nebulous, yet powerful group, the whites, over time. The basis of the question can be divided into a few sub-questions which will be discussed further below: are whites a people, or a political group, or what are they? Does their sense of peoplehood adhere to traditional conceptions or have they invented new terms (namely imperialism and racism) from which to define themselves outside or beyond the historical logic of ethnogenesis? And lastly, where do they draw their strength-power from and should they be regarded as an authentic group with inherent (inalienable) rights to self-determination and nationhood or as something we must overcome and fight against, namely as “white supremacy”? To answer the first question: of course whites are people, born of mothers and fathers, but are they “a people” in the singular? If they are united by racism, the real question then is when and how. I began with the quote by Forbes which exhibits the struggle to exorcise the depths of the white enigma and core, which is in his estimate, is easy to discern based not on what they say, but on what they have done and still do.

Forbes drew upon original Indian critics of white people, especially William Apess (1833), the Pequot-Wampanoag whose text *The Experiences of Five Christian Indians of the Pequo'd Tribe* contained a conclusive essay entitled, "An Indian's Looking-Glass for the White Man". Forbes (1966) original treatise on the subject nearly copied Apess' title, "The Indian: Looking glass into the souls of white Americans". Apess' assessment of whites is uniquely Indian despite his Christian background and work as a minister. He says with regards to education:

I would take the liberty to ask why they are not brought forward and pains taken to educate them? To give them all a common education, and those of the brightest and first-rate talents put forward and held up to office. Perhaps some unholy, unprincipled men would cry out, the skin was not good enough; but stop friends—I am not talking about the skin, but about principles. I would ask if there cannot be as good feelings and principles under a red skin as there can be under a white? And let me ask, is it not on the account of a bad principle, that we who are red children have had to suffer so much as we have? And let me ask, did not this bad principle proceed from the whites or their forefathers? And I would ask, is it worth while to nourish it any longer? If not then let us have a change; although some men no doubt will spout their corrupt principles against it, that are in the halls of legislation and elsewhere. But I presume this kind of talk will seem surprising and horrible. I do not see why it should so long as they (the whites) say that they think as much of us as they do of themselves (Apess 1992, p. 156).

We see clearly from this passage that Forbes understood the true power of socialization lies not solely in institutions such as education and schools, but in the prime through the relationships and modeling of significant and influential others, family and foe alike.

He demonstrates that at the core is an adherence to white supremacy or formerly “Anglo-Saxon supremacy” (pps. 3, 6; see also Allen 1994; Horsman 1981; Takaki 1979). Apress says about this belief that it is rooted in anti-blackness:

Is it not because there reigns in the breast of many who are leaders, a most unrighteous, unbecoming and impure black principle [color code], and as corrupt and unholy as it can be—while these very same unfeeling, self-esteemed characters pretend to take the skin as a pretext to keep us from our unalienable and lawful rights? I would ask you if you would like to be disenfranchised from all your rights, merely because your skin is white, and for no other crime? (ibid, p. 156).

While cultural characteristics were emphasized, or the lack thereof, racial characteristics are beyond apprehension, and hence become a kind of immunity shield no matter the ignorance demonstrated by supposed whites. Apparent in this fiction is that Irish and English and French and Spanish, Jews and Catholics, or any combination of these persons will forego being of these peoples and in turn adopt the racial view, which is enticing given its extreme privileges and power (Ignatiev 1995; Brodtkin 1998). The supremacist view, one sometimes supported in biblical sources has found a new home and protector: white America. Here, whites can continue to be who they were before, but now are also White and gain the benefits of the political relationship, that is the law protects them from servitude and grants them unique property rights at first (owning

Indigenous land and bodies and African families), the ability to immigrate and become privileged citizens (see 1790 Naturalization Act, open to “any Alien being a free white person”). The United States (of whites) reorganized under this banner rather than as an Anglo-Saxon, German, Dutch, or other kinds of ethnic state. Further, they reorganized free of the obligations and treaties of the British empire had to original Americans such as the Royal Proclamation of 1763 and escaped the positionality of “taxation without representation”, a status that Americans and Africans were forced to live under for hundreds of years afterwards. Thus, we see that becoming a new people, with a new state, has untold benefits compared to reforming the British empire. George Washington for example, as the largest imperial land owner at the time, knew that his properties (and slaves) would be tax-free entities after the war! Slavery for example, or people owning, has its origins in classical servitude, or forced labor. Servitude is still the norm, and although slavery is outlawed, one doesn’t need to own persons as an individual, but rather, the state, or the land can be given this task as in the Law of Burgos (1530) which outlawed Native slavery, but not servitude, or forced labor. In California in 1850, slavery was outlawed in the constitution, however, an Act for the Protection of the Indians of 1850 allowed servitude of those deemed hostile, those unable to legally represent themselves (children, women), and those who are to be punished for a crime (of which Natives couldn’t testify in court).

Thus we see that the law may say one thing, but it might be enacted in a wholly opposing or conducive manner relative to those whose interests are upheld, namely, white property owners. Whites were free of being owned and forced into labor, a unique status and privilege. Forbes (2000) traces the trajectory of the white body politic to the

American shores prior to the formation of the U.S. while to the point where Indian dispossession, genocide and servitude meets African captivity, dehumanization and ownership (who has the rights to own another human being, namely Africans and Americans), and at the cusp of the relinquishing of European and Anglo-Saxon indentured servitude. Forbes (2000) points to some of the roots of white supremacist thought given that it is based upon an intolerance and hatred for “others” while also pronouncing a supposed superiority and divinely approved origin for itself, namely the Roman empire and Christianity, who conveniently coalesced after 300AD. Amorphous and shape-shifting identities are not new. The construction of nation-states, international religions (churches) such as Christianity, and other concepts such as “civilization” and its relatives “Christian civilization”, “European civilization” and “white civilization”, but also equally nebulous terms such as “western”, “modern”, “industrial”, “scientific” and the place-based appellation “Caucasian”, literally “people of the Caucasus mountains”, have been used and abused as biased tools of imperialism. The term “empire” for example, or “state” insist that they are both a people’s institution while justifying death and destruction of possible subject peoples and places. The state and the empire can murder the same ones who built it under the guise of protecting itself, as if it’s a separate entity. The “law” for example codified in the constitution also becomes a separate entity, somehow above or beyond “the people” yet continually held in check (or so they say) by human judges amongst others. These unique creations are distinctly European, and white man-made efforts. Yet we find later that Native Nations adopt many of these same inventions: various kinds of Christianity (but not Islam), U.S. styled Constitutions (but not a French styled one or other), U.S. style Black servitude (but not white captivity or

indentured servitude), and many other accoutrements borne out of the special relationships they maintained with U.S. whites.

Prior to the mid 1600's, whites did not exist anywhere in the world. Anglo and Anglo-Saxon does not mean white but rather is an English modified term of one of the colonizers of Alba or Briton, the Angles and Saxons (also the Jutes). I remember clearly talking to my Grandma about this predicament who was a person of Hungarian, English, Irish, Chickasaw, Cherokee and other background who claimed to be "white". Upon further questioning she instead suggested maybe she was a Caucasian, which I retorted with, "you mean from the Caucasus" which she then reduced her identity amalgam to "all mixed up" or akin to "Heinz 57", meaning a whole slew of mixed ingredients. Indeed, this is the predicament of most so-called whites today, they are a thoroughly mixed people, true mestizos in every sense of the word. Forbes (1973a) notes that the Spanish, who employed a racial caste system based upon the "pure blood" or one who had *limpieza de sangre*, were in fact just as much a mestizo group as any. Forbes (1968) notes that first among European immigrants, and then amongst Indians, Africans and Chicanos, a "cult of "Whiteness"" developed in which artificial means (such as the use of powder) were used to lighten the skin, and mestizos sought to be reclassified as "Spanish"" or Anglo, now white (p. 56). He notes that the psychotic obsession with whiteness has led to its opposite, "a defense mechanism designed to prevent too close a relationship with the Negro", echoing Apress contention that anti-blackness was the rule, a rule characterized as a barrier to healthy relations via the "color line" of Du Bois (ibid). Thus, many Hispanos, Chicanos, Mexicans, and other Latinos are deemed in the census and elsewhere to be simply "white with Spanish surnames", which is ludicrous if applied to so-called

denigrated Blacks as “white with English surnames” or Indians or Navajo’s as “white with Irish surnames”.

Whiteness, and the conception of a “white civilization” required a foundation to bind its new flower to sturdy roots. The concept of the nebulous “west”, “western” or “western civilization” were developed for this purpose. Forbes (2000b) says “can have no meaning, in and of itself, since every civilization is going to be “western” in relation to some “east””, which is key to how it is continually utilized for one group and against others as a polarizing framework (p. 210). Edward Said (1978) tackled this in his famous work on Orientalism which reveals how “Occidentalism” or Westernism which was a “subtle and persistent Eurocentric prejudice against Arab-Islamic peoples and their culture” (p. 3). Western civilization according to Forbes is best seen as a “racial, political and ideological enterprise, not an exercise in sound historical construction” much like the development of a white empire or state to represent them (p. 10). Empire-building seems to be behind this conception so much that according to Forbes (2000b) “whatever else it may refer to, includes only white people and, specifically, only European white people. It is essentially the same as the then popular racial concept of albinism (white superiority), except that it is perhaps narrower” (p. 221). Thus the concept came to embrace only those peoples who could fit the limited frame they built, such as the Roman and Greek states (empires) who the founders and prime builders of the United Colonies frequently harkened back to in their ideal construction of a new “empire of liberty”, adopting the ideas and structures but not the diversity as Hellenic and Roman empires were anything but pureblood, white or “western” states. Said (1978) notes that the Orient “helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience” and in



the same way, Americans and Africans were the true mirrors of Whites (p. 1-2). Forbes further points out that this logic is only understandable if we see it as a way to “justify their pretensions as “civilizers”, as the new rich of the western/central European societies sought to develop a fictitious connection with past greatness, extending back beyond the recent surge of local industrial and military growth” which was coupled in the case of the Nazis supposed “Aryanism” to an ancient pedigree (p. 230).

The ancient or divine pedigree myth is a classic one, especially in connection to Christian conversion where neophyte kings such as Alfred the Great at first established a clear lineage back to Woden, the greatest of the Anglo-Saxon deities, while successors contrarily switched over to Adam or Abraham, a feat reduplicated and demonstrated in such works as Monmouth’s (1136) *Historia Regum Britanniae*, the *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, and other pseudo-historical texts. Indeed, it has been shown that imperialism and colonization as ancient practices of people-making in the form of imperialists and colonists, were also keen to invent enemy races such as the Jews, Gypsies, Arabs, Irish and others as far back as the European middle ages before the current nomenclature had taken shape (Heng 2011; Isaac 2004). The “west” and “western civilization” is in fact, a map of racist expansionism, and which gave rise in Europe to its most recent eruption: fascism.

Most think of fascism as beginning in Italy and then in the Weimar (German) Republic but Forbes (1982c) contends that “fascism in modern times first achieved independent (sovereign) power in the Americas” (p. 3). Further he says, “fascism often arises when the wealthy classes or some other privileged group (including in some cases the middle or working class) feels threatened with a loss of wealth or position” such as

the growing free Black, Indian and non-European classes of people that existed just prior to the U.S. Civil War who numbered nearly 60,000 in 1790 within the United Colonies but were again reduced to property with the three-fifths compromise made by slave-owning whites (pps. 4-5, emphasis original). “Fascism is a form of culture and the culture survived the Union’s conquest” after the unCivil War ended in 1865 is what occurred in Forbes (1982c) analysis, yet what was cultivated was an extreme kind of “Frontier Fascism”, which included the common and non-slave owning white man as well as new “white” immigrants who were allowed join the “fasces” or group-bundle such as Finns, Irish, Italians, Greeks, etc. (p. 16). While reconstruction was supposed to occur throughout the union, whites resisted everywhere to the process and it was abandoned by 1879 (Du Bois 1935). It also occurs in his estimate “because of the fear of not being able to grab enough “loot” or wealth. Such a condition emerges in the developmental stages of colonialism and under slavery systems when an avaricious colonial-settler population insists upon enslaving Indians or blacks in spite of the lack of any legal basis . . . and the lack of any fear of attack or opposition” (p. 5).

Fear-based identities are quite common among the imperialists, fascists and kin states who develop unity through concerted actions against enemy others such as Indians and Africans, even if there are few left to fight. Forbes argues that fascism projects the frontiers fear by “bringing into that center [metropolis or capital] of the politics and values of the colony” and results in the “colonial system [which] conquers the metropolis” (p. 5). In any case, fascism and imperialism are uniquely parallel developments. Imperialism supplanted traditional notions of peoplehood amongst the invaders as much as it had ever done to those it sought to dispossess, and this is in great

part to the creation of a new identity, a new sense of imperial-colonial peoplehood which required neo-colonizers to shed many core elements in order to take part directly or indirectly in the spoils of war. Forbes (1976a) points out that imperialism is an ancient tradition and that “an empire when it is built is built for profit for those who are in the driver’s seat and it is also built to last. And people who set up empire’s plan very carefully how to setup the empire, they don’t do it just by chance. Empires are based upon previous empires”. In this way, racism must equally be built upon ancient forms of prejudice inherited from the past. Forbes argues that a core feat undertaken is “to manufacture myths. You have to change reality so that people’s conception of it coincides with the interest of the empire” and one of these enduring myths is white supremacy. White people actually believe they are superior, be it cultural, technological, politically, economically, religiously, scientific, genetic or otherwise. They also die for its cause, making it a sacrilegious tradition as well (Dunbar-Ortiz 2014). Whites are the imperialists, as at first, they were the colonists, while the new waves of colonials must be nearly white, they are allowed to participate and are privileged as if they were the first ones and non-whites can at best be workers. Dunbar-Ortiz (2014) calls these new frontier whites as “settler-parasites” because they literally move from one place to the next, and while some remain in their old townships, they inevitably have built a mobile imperial group which presses its war upon America through new plantings-colonies of whites (p.

Fascism, from Latin *fasces* via Italian *fazzio*, means literally a bundle or group, especially in reference to those who are politically united, in this case, the unifying factor is white supremacy or for the Nazi state Aryan supremacy, in Italy, Italo-Roman supremacy, etc. They sacrifice their children, their ancient tongues and traditions, through

indentured servitude for a new fiction: that of the white group or fasces. Malcolm X (1966) after his pilgrimage to Mecca and journeying around the Christians and Muslims “Holy Land”, he comes to the conclusion and a solution to what he calls the “cancer” of whiteness:

We were truly all the same (brothers) -- because their belief in one God had removed the “white” from their minds, the ‘white’ from their behavior, and the ‘white’ from their attitude. I could see from this, that perhaps if white Americans could accept the Oneness of God, then perhaps, too, they could accept in reality the Oneness of Man -- and cease to measure, and hinder, and harm others in terms of their “differences” in color. With racism plaguing America like an incurable cancer, the so-called “Christian” white American heart should be more receptive to a proven solution to such a destructive problem. Perhaps it could be in time to save America from imminent disaster -- the same destruction brought upon Germany by racism that eventually destroyed the Germans themselves (p. 340-341).

Yet, Malcolm X underestimated the Christian cloak of Whiteness which has become their primary identity rather than a legal designation because although many may claim to simply be Christians, they know they receive the privileges and power associated with whiteness, and is their true religion. White supremacy is not a belief, it’s a political ideology which forms the unspoken basis of U.S. constitutionalism as only Whites met in convention and ratified constitutions through white “popular sovereignty”, a feat denied every other group. At root is their insinuation that they were imbued as a “superior race” which could claim lands of others, especially Americans by discovery, by war, by treaty

or purchase and other invented avenues. Western civilization like whiteness, is illogical. Yet it is this ill-logic which defies everything we know that is so powerful. For example, the creation of castes which are immutable and determinate are key to the creation of whites. They are in essence at the top of the racial caste system, and nothing and nobody can gut this fact. Forbes (1976a) explains that the white caste system was built uniquely by the British, by the Spanish, and others and each had their own way of keeping the white caste in power. In the case of the Spanish before 1812 and the abolishment of the system within the empire, Forbes (1976a) speech on the “Captive Nations” explains,

because the whole emphasis of course is placed upon being White, the degree of Whiteness, the degree of Spanishness is the desired thing. So if you are going to work within that caste system you have to constantly orient your life so that you strive to move from one level to another if you can. And can be done but only by becoming more White in our behavior that is by becoming as Spanish as possible in your behavior. And then it is difficult in most of the empire to rise. At every level of the caste system is given certain favors. . . .So the only way to move up is to become more white, which is really at the behest of those in power to allow or restrict.

In the U.S. this was at the core of what Forbes (1982c) called the “Anglo-Saxon Empire” (p. 11). This brings us to the blood quantum wars of today which are bound to the wars of yesteryear when the degree of white blood was carefully measured for example in the Spanish empire. Those who had more of this blood would be given privileges not afforded to others. While at the same time, those with requisite blood quantum maintained it by both keeping others down and sticking to their own kind,

which was very successful through anti-miscegenation laws which have only recently been repealed. Whites lost traditional forms of kinship such as the clanship traditions of their Irish, Scottish and Welsh forebears, and the replacement by Abrahamic patriarchal traditions did not quench the need for healthy relations, and as such after the Civil War for white power, at the possibility of its total dissolution, the Ku Klux Klan (clan) was birthed. In order to drive this point home, I cite Forbes (1973) summary analysis in full:

Racism in my opinion develops only in the context of colonialism. Racism does not develop on its own. It develops as a part of colonialism it cannot be separated from colonialism, it is a tool of colonialism. Because it is through racism that a colonial system can be maintained. For instance, the caste grading system that I mentioned is a racist system. And its through the caste system by and large that the Spaniard was by and large able to maintain his empire. It was by means of similar racism that the English were able to maintain their empire in Ireland for a long period of time by regarding Irish people as innately inferior, by segregating Irish people, by suppressing the Irish language, by forbidding intermarriage between Irish and English and so on and so forth, by setting up the Pail, which was the zone around Dublin and so on where only English protestant people could settle, and where Native Gaelic Irish were forbidden to settle although it didn't work out that way because cheap labor was needed. But theoretically a society that was structured on racist lines which would endure, of course eventually it broke down somewhat, as most colonial racist systems eventually do. Racism of course then as apart of colonialism or considered on its own also develops all kinds of myths. The most important myths I've already referred to in part in the

grading system but I'll reemphasize them. That certain ethnic groups or certain people of certain ancestry have certain innate characteristics which are inferior. Indians are by their nature inferior, there's not much you can do about. Blacks, they are inferior and so on. This in turn justifies their subjugation. Chicanos are inferior [as] they are only cheap farm labor, and so on and so forth. These kinds of racist stereotypes are not just invented for fun they are invented to buttress and support and justify what is done. We see this most clearly in the way the slave system was setup in the United States (from Forbes Speech on "Racial Myths", D-334, B. 61B).

Part of the issue at heart in Forbes estimation is that whites maintain a filial love and devotion to Europe, its imperial traditions, its languages of colonization, nearly everything European so much that really, they are deserved of the label "Overseas Europeans" to replace white Americans (Forbes 1978, p. 75). Thus, it is difficult to pinpoint a white peoplehood in the traditional sense because cultural elements are uneven. The core today might be considered to be: English (language), Country (an enemy's homeland such as Turtle Island), Christianity or imperial Science (religion), and Western Civilization (history). Other core elements might be patriarchy and white supremacy (kinship), Fascism (democratic, republicanism), Imperialism-Colonialism-Capitalism (economic theft and exploitation, castes-classes), and other traits. Many of these traits are shared by European states, if not all of them.

Allen (1997) points out that Bacon's Rebellion helped forge an Anti-Indian and pro-servitude identity that became the basis of a fear-based white group who were seen as the protectors of innocent settlers (p. 563). In order to do this, a new category, a new

political group needed to be formed, “it was only because “race” consciousness superseded class-consciousness that the continental plantation bourgeoisie was able to achieve and maintain the degree of social control necessary for proceeding with capital accumulation on the basis of chattel bond-labor” says Allen (ibid, p. 448). In order to overcome class alliances, English, German, Welsh, Scottish, Irish, French and other immigrants needed to work on a united front as Indian killers and African capturers.

Allen frames the construct this way:

The solution was to establish a new birthright not only for Anglos but for every Euro-American, the “white” identity that “set them at a distance,” to use Sir Francis’s phrase, from the laboring-class African-Americans, and enlisted them as active, or at least passive, supporters of lifetime bondage of African-Americans (p. 467).

Whites were excluded from servitude while colored peoples were automatically, and intergenerationally held as captives and bonded property, which predominantly in the early period was not Africans but native Americans. Bacon’s Rebellion on the other hand is viewed as the “the path of white empire”, while it was at first criticized because of its lawless beginnings much like Cortes’ rogue invasion of Mexico-Tenochtitlan was, as in the end, they were appreciated by imperialists for their assertiveness and unity, namely indentured Europeans and captured Africans who fought alongside each other, yet against Native Nationals resistance (Allen 1997, p. 204). Forbes (2000c) notes as does Allen that the earliest legal codifications of white privilege are found in the Virginia colony, as specified in the 1705 codes and thereafter. Indeed, Thomas Jefferson must have surely been familiar with these codes as a slave owner in Virginia and thus purposely negated



any mention of “whites” or “blacks” in the constitution lest “states rights” be upset as well as calling into question how the phrase “we the people” might be interpreted beyond a common white consensus. Perhaps he helped to leave it open ended so as to keep the possibility of slave liberation available, however, given his own actions in life, he surely knew that this was not going to happen as a matter of course and only by those who had wealth enough to manumit those held captive after their captors were dead and gone, which he did.

Forbes (1973) calls a person’s true religion, is their actual behavior, and is what they believe in most strongly, which for whites, its an obvious racism (speech by Forbes “Native American Religion: A Worldview” in, D334, B. 61e). While racism was not fully developed in the 1600’s it had certain ethnocentric and supremacist foundations, whereas Imperialism backed by Christian missionization and State development was full-blown. These provided the foundations from which white supremacy could develop as the difference making institution which Christianity fails to do as conversion denotes a change in status, something that racial status negates for the imperialized while protects the imperialists. In terms of ethnicity or peoplehood, we see that if they ever were English or Scottish or German or Finnish, they have long lost these connections in order to adopt the privileges of white supremacy in an imperial and racist nation-state which above all, has protected these inherited rights and privileges. For one, this is how the owning of Indigenous lands is perpetuated and maintained. In England, the state established by the divine right of kings was reestablished as a white parliamentary system which although abolished slavery in 1833, it had already established white rule as the basis for its colonies. Every inch should in any sense of justice or fairness be traceable to

an Indian patent or transaction, otherwise it is in possession by violence or theft or is merely a claim, hence illegal. White people take it for granted that they are in possession of stolen land, are in possession of stolen resources, are in possession of blood money, and other accoutrements of the colonial empire. Niall Ferguson (2005) points out that the largest source of the “white plague” came from the British Empire who “turned whole continents white”, or more precisely, created white empires abroad as neither America, India or any other place they invaded and subjugated are predominantly “white” by any standard (p. 46; see also Ferguson 2004). What is the creation story of “whites”? As Cajete and Forbes have pointed out, the stories whites tell themselves is their official history. While one version exists in schools and is taught to others, a more public one has been generated, whites as vampires.

One of the most interesting relationships is the development of a kind of vampirism alongside whiteness. The most obvious shared characteristics are visual whiteness or paleness, although now with the popularity of the Twilight series we see people of color vampires as well. Also, vampires like white people claim to be originally from Europe, Transylvania or England, or like the Voltari in the Twilight series, from Italy, the heart of the original Roman empire. Culturally, most vampires are depicted as being mixed European, if not visiting or living in Europe for some time, and often they are depicted as being “refined” culturally, that is, of the upper crust-caste of European or white society. Interestingly as well is that vampires live off the blood-life of other people, and worse is that their bloodlust is not defined solely to people. Worst of all however is that they are contagious, one bite and your one of them. They are predators rather than prey, which reinforces the unbalanced competition or exploitative view of the European

world. Further, this contagion grants however many fantastic benefits such as living forever, or at times as in the Twilight series, special powers, superhuman strength, or perhaps heightened cultural attainments. Conveniently, these vampires unlike whites may or may not attain or desire to attain material wealth because they do not desire anything more than blood-life, yet also pronounced is that many do attain vast material wealth as in the original Count Dracula who was a land-baron.

Essentially, they are a bourgeoisie caste of White European cannibal gods or superhumans. The punk rock-reggae band Bad Brains wrote in their famous song “Fearless Vampire Killers” from their self-titled album (1982), a song named possibly after the Roman Polanski film of the same name (1967). Taking an angry and oppositional stance, the Bad Brains say that these vampire predators are now the prey of the people:

The bourgeoisie had better watch out for me

All throughout this so called nation

We don't want your filthy money

We don't need your innocent bloodshed

We just wanna end your world

Well my mind's made up

Yes it's time for you to pay

Better watch out for me

I'm a member of the F. V. K. [Fearless Vampire Killers].

So who are they talking about? Obviously, rich white people, however, they easily equate the vampire as white person, in part because they perpetuate the myth themselves. In

Trudell's (2008) song-poem "Bombs Over Baghdad" he makes the connection with respect to white's egregious acts of violence and war, foundations of the vampire "master predator" state and state of relations a point Forbes (1966) had pinned on whites. Trudell says they are "Vampires drinking blood and oil cocktails

Their violence works it hardly ever fails

Bombs over Baghdad Dancers of Death

Murder in the air with the next breath" (p. 72).

White people as vampires is suggested by Kirkland (2013) to be a self-perpetuating myth whites identify easily with, saying "being White (a racial or ethnic category constructed as the absence of ethnic categorization) means to be simply human, unremarkable and undefined by the color of one's skin, culture or heritage. In their sympathetic depiction of the vampire as 'just like us', many narratives draw upon such normalizing conceptions of White identity" (p. 97). Further, he notes that like racial notions of whiteness, there exists in vampirism a "white specialness" where vampires, like whites are either "superhuman" or "inhuman", yet both categories denote a speciesist or supremacist perspective (ibid).

Whites are incredibly color-blind which denotes a retarding of critical awareness of the violent relations their own racial pigmentocracy perpetuates in reality, a reality the vampire does not engage with either (Bonilla-Silva 2010, p. 26; see also Bonilla-Silva 2004 for his brief version). Can whites exist without white supremacy, or pigmented racialization, or the imperial matrix of relations which empower whiteness?

Some vampires are evil killers bent on enslaving all people, while others are deemed as noble social justice fighters killing only rapists or murderers, or they're shown to be sympathetic to people and instead ingest only "lowly" animal blood as in Interview

with a Vampire, Twilight, Daybreakers and Nightwatch. Often these characters are pitted against each other in the same person, from which the carnal bloodlust is smattered with emotionally developed relationships. Yet sorely what it all boils down to is a kind of whimsical self-control. Some control their urges for bloodlust, others choose not to or cannot however hard they try. This creates a great sympathy for these mostly white characters, because it is perceived that they “have no choice” in the end, which is essentially a naturalization of racism and imperialism, again. These depictions are all framed within the context of imperial white supremacy that has a global reach via media and the exploitation of all possible resources and peoples across the globe. Forbes (2008a) contends that vampires, like werewolves, and other despised European mythological figures “are all part of this matchi (evil) world view (or element) in the European heritage” (p. 78). Vampires, like whites, are viewed as people who are heartless, not unlike the Wiindigoo or wétiko of Anishinaabe and Creek lore who have a heart of ice (or completely objective, purely rational as in Enlightenment and Scientific thought) (Forbes 2008a; Brightman 1998). Again, this is a common conception of the killer, as in the phrase “cold-hearted killer”, for they lack heart, they lack love and empathy, compassion and heart-thought. As Forbes summarizes “the wétiko psychosis is a sickness of the spirit that takes people down an ugly path with no heart. . . . Above all, the wétiko disease turns such people into werewolves and vampires, creatures of the European’s nightmare world, and creatures of the wétiko’s reality” (ibid, pps. 186-187). Essentially, whites are the new vampires and we are the victims of the “European nightmare world”, which they brood over.

In the Twilight series, the local whites are just ignorant not murderous or imperialists while the white vampires, the Cullen “family”, are do-gooders and live up to their “treaty” with the local Quileute people whose homelands they occupy. By transposing the Quileute origin story of their werewolf-ness with that of the killer vampire, the Quileute can be “special” if white imperialists can be special too. Yet, these are two distinct werewolf traditions being merged into one. The white or European werewolf tradition is again a cursed state, brought on by the full moon whereas the Quileute version depicted in Twilight is an at-will transformation, but sometimes seen to be brought on by intense anger or need. This is not what the Quileute people believe at all, this is a white literary invention. The origin story of the Quileute people has the hero figure Qwati turn two people into wolves, but afterwards, there are no more wolf transformations or roaming werewolf packs, no “cold-ones” or vampires exist, nothing like the movies. Are Vampires people? No. This is the myth that is perpetuated in tv, films and literature. They are an invention of the European and white fascination with death, perhaps, their preoccupation with killing and murderous behavior and interestingly enough, a tacit normalized cannibalism or people eating-blood sucking society. Of all the depictions and myths perpetuated by whites, this is the one that seems to strike closest to home about the true nature of whiteness. Whiteness is based on a belief that they are special, especially supreme, and in the end, a superiority complex, either of racial-speciest or cultural formations. Paramount to Whiteness as Vampirism is that it kills people and other forms of life as the fount of their existence, whereas consumption is literal, and cannibalism is always implied as normal. White people and whiteness like vampirism are ignorant of their racist, patriarchal and imperialist foundations. Their

speciest (racist) view removes them from normal humanity. Whiteness is justified by the stories they tell themselves, real or fictitious, fantastic or historical. For example, White people have no origin or creation story of pride to speak of, while Native peoples of the Americas tell numerous stories of the origins of Whites (Erdoes & Ortiz 1984, p. 491; Mooney 1900, p. 351; Nequatewa 1936, p. 51). It's as if Whites have no idea who or what they are beyond the fatal deeds they have performed to become and remain white, there is "no going back" is a common refrain. Whiteness like vampirism is a contagion, a "white plague", and is fueled by the power wielded through imperial occupation and exploitation of Indigenous and non-white bodies, lands, resources and ideas. Vampirism however brings whites into a mythic or surreal paradigm, one which elides the problematic origin of whiteness, which is that it is born out of supremacist and superiority ideologies, which take on new proportions in 1492 through global imperialism. How does this compare to other new peoples such as Chicanos whose origins are not near as clouded?

### *The Chicano Connection*

. . . more than 95% of Mexicans are part-Indian, 40% are fullblood Indians, and most of the mixed-bloods have more Indian than non-Indian ancestry. Mexican-Americans are, therefore, a racial as well as a cultural minority and the racial differences which set them apart from Anglos cannot be made to "disappear" by any "Americanization" process carried on in the schools.

The larger Mexican-American community is in a process of rapid cultural transition, wherein most individuals are acquiring a mixed Anglo-Mexican

culture, while smaller numbers are marrying into or otherwise being absorbed into the dominant Anglo society. An unfortunate aspect of this process is that extremely valuable Mexican traits, such as the strong extended family, the tendency toward mutual aid, the Spanish language, artistic and musical traditions, folk dances, fine cooking, and such personality characteristics as placing more emphasis upon warm interpersonal relationships than upon wealth acquisition tend to be replaced by what many critics might suggest are the lowest common denominator of materialistic, acquisitive, conformist traits typical of some elements within the Anglo-American population. That this is occurring is largely a result of the fact that many Mexican-American graduates of the public schools feel ambivalent about their own self-identity and about cultural values. They have been deprived of a chance to learn about the best of the Mexican heritage and, at the same time, have been, in effect, told to become Anglicized. They tend, therefore, to drift into the dominant society without being able to make sound value judgements based upon cross-cultural sophistication.

On the other hand, the Mexican-American community considered in its entirety is a vital, functioning societal unit with considerable ability to determine its own future course of development. It may well succeed in developing a reasonably stable bicultural and bilingual tradition which will provide a healthy atmosphere for future generations and which may prove attractive to many Anglos. In any case it is clear that the proximity of Mexico will insure [sic] a continual flow of Mexican cultural influences across the border and the Mexican-American



community, as a bicultural population, will not soon disappear (Forbes 1967b, pp. 34-35).

Forbes (1973d) clearly understands what's at stake when he suggests that education institutions in New Mexico for example were retarded from their treaty-bound bicultural-bilingual character, saying that they are generally whitened

culturally biased institutions. Not simply in this or that procedure but at root. . . .

There is no bilingualism despite the fact that Spanish is historically a legal language in this state and in New Mexico and theoretically still a legal language in New Mexico. It may appear to be a minor matter but it illustrates the typical knee-jerk attitude of the people who run the institution. . . . [of] a more pervasive ethnocentrism that runs throughout the institution at more complex levels (p. 23).

Thus, when Forbes helped form D-QU in the 1960's, he and others collaborated incredibly with Chicano initiatives at higher education as much as U.S. Indian efforts because the same white imperialists had marginalized and denigrated Mexican heritage forms without question. Why is this? Forbes recognition of Chicanos and Mexicanos amongst other groups as primarily Indigenous peoples is key to understanding his view of peoplehood-nationhood.

Forbes grew up in his early years in El Monte on a ½ acre flat between the Rio Hondo and the Rio San Gabriel until he was about 9 years old, or 1943. His barrio he explains in the preface to his *History of Native American Studies* (1970) resembled a “Mexicano, Okie, poor-white” rurality where he developed his early sense of identity and relations to other “mixed-blood” or detribalized Americans and Europeans. In one of the few lengthy interviews Forbes gave that was recorded on October 6, 1999, he discusses

the origins of Aztlan with radio host Chuy Trevino, and who was aware that he was speaking to a sympathetic audience. Candidly and in reflection of his childhood in El Monte, Forbes explains his early recognition of the Chicano as Indian, saying:

I grew up in southern California, El Monte. And a lot of my friends, my classmates, the field workers who were in the field next door to my house who came in and drank water from our faucet, I interacted with them all the time, and first started learning Spanish at that time and all these people were brown indigenous people. And so I grew up with an awareness from my earliest age that people known as Mexicanos and so on, were Indian. Native people, I mean. I never had any doubt about that. And so it always took me as a surprise, later on, when some people began to say well these were whites with Spanish surnames or something like that. I never could quite understand that (Forbes 1999, p. 6).

Thus, at a young age, Forbes had made up his mind that he would recognize Chicanos, Mexicanos and Latinos as Indigenous, as not much different from himself. Descendants are not normally regarded as full members of living communities and as such, Forbes was straying from the pack with this idea. However, what community were these people apart of as we are always apart of some primary social relations? Definitely not a white community. Definitely not a black community. Definitely not an Asian community. So Forbes is making a judgement, perhaps it's a racial one, upon the color of their skin being brown. Yet, there is something to color in this world when white people have self-selected their own members based upon color for centuries, forcing others to do the same or be picked apart. By 1812, Mexico had done away with caste-racism legally and slavery in all forms was abolished by 1829. While Texas fought for its independence at the same

time as abolition, in part, to preserve it, a little-known underground railroad route went south to Mexico (Little 2018). Chicanos are always Americans, but they are also always Indians, while not always Mexicans as many had been in the U.S. before *Estados Unidos Mexicanos* existed (Menchaca 1993; Menchaca 2001).

In one of Forbes drafts of *Aztec Del Norte*, the original title was *Aztec Americans* when he attempted to get it published in 1966 (D-046, B. 188, F. 1). In its original preface he explains

I am indeed sympathetic to the Mexican-American people. My son is of Mexican Indian descent, I have other relatives of Mexican ancestry, and my people, the Powhatan of Virginia, have a long-standing belief that several of our most prominent leaders in the 1570-1644 period were of Mexican origin (ibid, para. 5).

Forbes first wife was a white woman who he married in 1956, Barbara Alexander, and whom he met while at USC as she was also a student (Ohles, Ohles & Ramsey 1997, p. 114). The couple then adopted two Indian children, and while not ever having any birth children of his own, he raised them to be proud of being Indian. One of Forbes first articles as a budding writer and student at USC was published in the local paper about one of his mentors, union organizer and Otomi/Italiano/Mexicano leader Antonio Del Buono (Forbes 1964a). Forbes first organizing work as founder of the Native American Movement or Movimiento Nativo Americano (1961) was inspired by the work of Buono, Chavez and the Indigenous rooted farmworkers, cannery, landscaping and construction *jornaleros* who made their living as seasonal or low-wage workers (Forbes 1973a, p. iv). The exploited condition of Chicanos and recently crossed Mexicans and other Latinos was clearly because of their ancestral claims to the lands which they were previously

removed from, either in the distant past or just recently, yet which many peoples continue to survive at the margins through the maintenance of traditional models and ways of survivance. Forbes (1961) published a pamphlet which the organization disseminated entitled *The Mexican Heritage of Aztlan* and which made clear that Chicanos, that Mexicanos in large part are Indians, and of the Native Nations of Mexico:

It is not necessary to review here all of the particular influences of Mexicans in the Southwest between 1600 and 1821. Suffice to say that while the rulers of those areas which had been conquered were Spaniards, the bulk of the people were of native origin. By the eighteenth century virtually all of the officers along the frontier were of mixed ancestry and the troops were usually native, Negro, mulatto, or mestizo. . . . The culture introduced into the Southwest during the colonial period was in great part Mexican, for the simple reason that even the Spaniards had been Mexicanized to a considerable degree. This was especially true in the customs of everyday life, in foods, and in folk traditions; but it was also true in religious and social organization. The religion of the clergy, to be sure, was usually orthodox Catholic but the religion of the masses was a mixture of Catholicism and Mexican religion. In their social outlooks, the masses of the people retained pre-Spanish attitudes which are still dominant in much of rural Mexico. But the foremost contribution of the Mexican to all of Aztlan consisted in the process of unification (the establishment of a common feeling of Mexicanidad) which proceeded under the very noses of the Spaniards. Ultimately, it was not Spain that unified the many tribal groups of the north but was on the contrary the Mexican who intermarried with the local natives and served as the

means for biological and cultural unification. Finally, in 1821, the Mexican republic was established and the process of amalgamation was brought into the open. Mexicanism became the ideal of an independent nation (D-046, B. 53 & 54, F. “Native American Movement”).

NAM emerged also as a response to claims that Mexicans and Chicanos were in fact Hispanic, or largely of Spanish colonial ancestry and thus suspect as merely brown assimilates. This stood in the face of the work of Antonio Del Buono who had fought in the Mexican revolution for *tierra y libertad*, for the land reforms eroded by the rise of corporate industrial agriculture which would ensure access to *ejido* or communal lands, for equal participation, education, self-determination, language rights and support, and other areas (see Article II of the *Constitución de México de 1917*). NAM worked largely on the basis of American ancestry and dispossession, hoping to involve all “Americans” or those who recognized their one-drop or more of Indigenous ancestry as well as being current residents of America. Chicanos, Mexicans, most southern Americans were Indigenous descendants that Forbes recognized in every way beyond mere blood and color. Forbes experience working with Indian communities, organizations, scholarship, in history, law and education and with numerous individuals influenced his work. Unlike Deloria who had little experience with Mexican and other Americans, Forbes was constantly interacting with and seeking out influential persons such as his adopted Uncle Antonio (who had organized farmworkers with Cesar Chavez), amongst many leading Chicano/a scholars and leaders. The United Farm Workers (after the NFWA in 1962) formed in 1965. Cesar Chavez articulated in 1984 that like Forbes, his organizing was full bloom by the 1960’s:

Later in the 50s, I experienced a different kind of exploitation. In San Jose, in Los Angeles and in other urban communities, we, the Mexican-American people, were dominated by a majority that was Anglo. I began to realize what other minority people had discovered; that the only answer, the only hope was in organizing. More of us had to become citizens, we had to register to vote, and people like me had to develop the skills it would take to organize, to educate, to help empower the Chicano people (Address to the Commonwealth Club Nov. 9, 1984).

The Chicano people which he interchanged with Hispanics for the white audience no doubt, are:

urban and rural, young and old, are connected to the farm workers' experience. We had all lived through the fields, or our parents had. We shared that common humiliation. How could we progress as a people even if we lived in the cities, while the farm workers, men and women of our color, were condemned to a life without pride? How could we progress as a people while the farm workers, who symbolized our history in this land, were denied self-respect? How could our people believe that their children could become lawyers and doctors and judges and business people while this shame, this injustice, was permitted to continue (ibid)?

Forbes early argument for Chicano Peoplehood-Nationhood was summarized by an editor Richard A. Garcia (1977) to accompany a version of his text, *Mexican-Americans: A handbook for educators* (1970) as published by the Far West Educational Laboratory shortly after his departure to UC Davis in 1969:

Dr. Jack D. Forbes in this article emphasizes three main points. First, the Chicano people in the United States have a definite cultural history; second, the Southwest of the United States would not exist as it is without the Mexican-Spanish heritage and third, the proximity of the Mexican border guarantees the continuance of the Chicano as a distinct bicultural and bilingual ethnic group in the United States (p. 25).

Holm et al. definitions of a people can be tested in this case alongside Forbes insights by asking the questions: Do they have shared language(s)? Do they have shared histories? Do they have shared religious or ceremonial traditions? Do they have sacred homelands, in the past or present? Deloria Jr. (1998) does not understand or does not want to recognize Mexican or other southern native American and indigenous influences either in the past or present, biological-familial, cultural, ceremonial, legal or otherwise, and complains that:

Forbes's idea of linking up all the indigenous peoples of this hemisphere is the current rage among the white wannabes to claim that their grandparents were so "traditional" that they refused to be enrolled in their tribe and lived in white society, carefully preserving ancient traditions and ceremonies. With this claim they are thus more Indian than most of us who are enrolled members of tribes, and they expect to be greeted without any questions as to their Indian blood and authenticity (p. 29).

Forbes was not talking about "white wannabes", he was speaking of the unrecognized majority and masses of the Americas, the ones who in his argument found in "Only Approved Indians Can Play Made in the USA" (1995) provided an opposite contention:

that the masses of the Americas had more Indian blood than many of those currently enrolled in the U.S., which in his story contrasts the basketball teams from urban Tucson and the Great Lakes. This was a running theme Forbes adhered to throughout his work, frequently referring early on in his writings to an American “race” as an integrated group of peoples found only in the Americas, not a genetic singularity or homogenous population. He also brought attention to the myriad colonial demarcations created thereafter which sought to divide peoples by blood, colonized status as Indios, and religion into caste-like exploitive relations. Forbes speeches to Chicanos were shared with a true affinity and humility for their struggle and a recognition of their ethnogenesis as *la raza* and as a “new nation”. Forbes long advocated for bicultural and bilingual education for Spanish-speaking students recognizing the power stripped of a people who are taught via the schools about one-way assimilation (Forbes 1969b; Forbes 1971c).

Forbes did not limit himself or his views to merely be printed in purchased publications. During a week-long hearing conducted by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights held in San Antonio, Texas during the week of Dec. 9-13 in 1968, Forbes provided outspoken testimony, receiving applause from the audience who the commission instructed to quiet down. He maintained throughout his testimony that Mexicans were a “powerless people” and a “conquered population” although, this did not mean in his view that they were lacking anything culturally, but as a reference to their relationship with White’s as colonizers and what this translates to in terms of schooling and education being based upon the colonizers intent and goals of education for them rather than for themselves. He distinctly explained that Mexicans were a “native population” whose homeland was not separate from their current residences and that they



are not an immigrant population but rather a “native American” or “what the white man calls Indian origin” (p. 24-26). In order to be understood he has to thoroughly explain to the largely white commission the entire colonial history in a few minutes. He begins by saying that the Spanish beginning in 1516:

developed a program which was designed to undermine what then might have been called “Mexicanidad”. That is, the Indigenous heritage, the social organization, the cultural institutions and so on of the people were consciously undermined by efforts to remake the people. At the same time of course the Spaniard as conqueror was given the high status, quite obviously, and people of predominantly native Mexican descent then tended to be denigrated within that colonial situation (p. 27).

This was followed up by “neo colonial rule” during the Mexican Republic and then furthered with the “Anglo-American conquest” explaining carefully by analogy that to “get past the romance and mythology of the supposed westward movement of the pioneers” that “we might look at the German march eastward against the Poles or as we might look at the Franco-Norman conquest of England” (p. 27). Leading his listeners further he maintained that “we would see that the U.S. conquest of the Southwest is a real case of aggression and imperialism, that it involved not only the military phase of immediate conquest, but the subsequent establishment of a colonial society” (ibid). He goes on to list every institution including schools to be controlled by White colonizers from which a Mr. Rubin responds by asking a clarifying point, from which Forbes response I quote in full to demonstrate the length and specificity from which he could speak on these issues:

Mr. Rubin: In your opinion what factors have inhibited the assimilation of the Mexican American population of the Southwest into the larger American population?

Dr. Forbes: I think that is a somewhat misleading question or at least not phrased the way I would phrase it. Let me try to answer it by asking this question instead: And that is, why the Anglo-American population, what factors have inhibited the Anglo-American population from being assimilated into the Mexican Indian heritage of the Southwest?" (p. 28).

It is clear, that Dr. Forbes perspective about Mexican peoplehood, and peoples in general had to be framed and understood in the context of a neo-colonial relationship with the colonizer, a current conditional network which has produced the maladies they were in attendance to discuss.

Forbes (1971a) identifies the barrio of Analco in Santa Fe for example as the first Chicano village site in the Americas, as it had influence from Mexico but contained many of what are called *genízaros* today, or various Indian people's captive or coerced into labor for colonizers. Other such places as Atlixco-Atrisco south of Albuquerque represent a uniquely mixed population, however, heavily Mexicanized and Puebloized today, so much that there are many persons who participate in *matachines* at Picuris Pueblo, Jemez and elsewhere which is not a Puebloan tradition but originally a Christian one, one not practiced or endorsed by the Catholic church or most of the pueblos of New Mexico (Robb 1961; Rodriguez 1996). The struggle for the recognition of the Metis people (especially of the Red River valley) is taking place in Canada as we speak, this is at the same time in places like California, where the majority population will be identified as

Chicano, Latino, Mexicano or another non-white, non-black, non-Asian designation. Forbes earnestly pointed towards this fact in a number of his works which he thought supported the inclusion of Chicanos as a recognizable group *and* for the complete abandonment of the term Hispanic which would leave the term *hispano* untouched and its cultural context, in particular, the communities and villages of New Mexico and Colorado which may have very little in common with their neighboring Pueblo, Diné and 'Ndeh communities and more with the urban and suburban Whites of Albuquerque and Santa Fe (Forbes 1973a; Forbes 1992; Forbes 1996a; Forbes 1996b). Indeed, it seems that *hispanos* have less in common with hispanics who speak only English than their multilingual Puebloan neighbors. Reies Lopez Tijerina suggested the term *Indo-Hispano* in 1966, and considered Chicano's to be a "new nation" by 1967, just prior to the Crusade for Justice participants submitted *El Plan Espiritual de Aztlán* in March of 1969 (Oropeza 2014, p. 195). Forbes reacted to his use of the term and the recent establishment of a Congress of Indians and Indo-Hispanos (Chicanos) and wrote him a letter explaining his position on the term, May 24, 1972, not long before his publication of *Aztecas Del Norte* (1973) :

I realize that its use may be necessary at this stage of the development of the Chicano people of Nuevo Mexico, however, I believe that it is a term which should be dropped in the future. The Native American (Nishnabe) people of today are in great part of mixed-race. Many of us are part-Anglo, others are part-French, and many are part-Spanish and have Spanish surnames. Should we therefore call ourselves "Indo-Anglos", "Indo- Francos", or "Indo-Hispanos"? Our predicament has to do with the whole idea of *mestisaje* and of the concept of the *mestizo*.. . .

*The sense of unity and strength needed for nation-building* and success demanded that they [the Spanish] throw off the social effects of the Arab conquest. Now we must do the same. We must throw off the psychological colonialism forced on us by European imperialism. It is true, of course, that I am an Anglo-Native American mixed-blood racially (a Cholo). It is also true that many Chicanos are part-Spanish (and part-Arab, part-Berber, et cetera). But it is also true that 1) we are oppressed not because we are part-white but because we are part Indian, 2) we will never develop a nation based upon “hyphenation”, and 3) we have our roots in our historic native nations (mine being Powhatan and yours being Mexican). We must not confuse our biological ancestry with our nationalism. (D-046, B. 8, F. “Correspondence from 1972”).

Forbes position was that Chicanos, as having historical roots in native nations could rightly reclaim their indigeneity by becoming a new Indian people. The declaration of *El Plan* itself, is a declaration of peoplehood, which reads as follows:

In the spirit of a new people that is conscious not only of its proud historical heritage but also of the brutal “gringo” invasion of our territories, we, the Chicano inhabitants and civilizers of the northern land of Aztlan from whence came our forefathers, reclaiming the land of their birth and consecrating the determination of our people of the sun, declare that the call of our blood is our power, our responsibility, and our inevitable destiny.

We are free and sovereign to determine those tasks which are justly called for by our house, our land, the sweat of our brows, and by our hearts. Aztlan belongs to those who plant the seeds, water the fields, and gather the crops and not to the

foreign Europeans. We do not recognize capricious frontiers on the bronze continent. Brotherhood unites us, and love for our brothers makes us a people whose time has come and who struggles against the foreigner “gabacho” who exploits our riches and destroys our culture. With our heart in our hands and our hands in the soil, we declare the independence of our mestizo nation. We are a bronze people with a bronze culture. Before the world, before all of North America, before all our brothers in the bronze continent, we are a nation, we are a union of free pueblos, we are Aztlan.

*El Plan* was a declaration of independence, which unlike the U.S. did not entail a military coup or war, and instead would focus on uniting an already convened people, much like whites often went unspoken in the Continental Congress proceedings. *El Plan* covered many of the basic areas of Peoplehood: Territory, History, Family, Education, Economy, Politics, Nation-Building and other areas are present, however Language goes unmentioned, and which its written and spoken in English. Enriqueta Vasquez of the Chicano newspaper out of *El Grito del Norte* called “El Plan” the “Grito de la Independencia” because it represented “the rebuilding of a homeland that has been oppressed and exploited but never completely conquered” (Oropeza et al 2005, p. 91). Are Chicanos to be included as part of the unconquered masses of Indians of New Mexico or are they a privileged group of Spanish imperialism now downtrodden by U.S. imperialism?

Forbes saw the revolutionary potential behind a new majority people which could formulate an anti-colonial and Indigenous consciousness, hence his early formulation for an American Indian University included such titles as an “Indo-American”, “Aztec

American” and “Chicano-Indian” college were developed in collaboration with Chicano and Indian peoples. Forbes declared in a 1962 mimeograph put out by his fledgling organization that Aztlán was the former homeland of the Chicano peoples, a place now occupied by the U.S. since the invasion of Mexico in 1848 and the subsequent signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, whose map contained therein contains place name references to Aztlan as well (Forbes 1973a, p. 17). This has been corroborated by a number of Chicano scholars which predates its common usage after the Crusade for Justice (Corky Gonzales used it numerous times in 1966) and finally its promulgation in *El Plan Espiritual de Aztlan* in 1969 which pronounced Aztlan not as the former, but current homeland of Chicanos (Gómez-Quñones & Vasquez 2014). Marquez’ (2009) study on *el movimiento* in Sacramento clearly situates Forbes and D-QU at this precise nexus, providing invaluable contributions and support to Chicano struggles for liberation, Chicano nationhood and education. NAM, according to Forbes, was founded along with Buono and Henry Orozco in order to bring “Chicanos to the realization of their indigenous heritage” (p. 259). *El Plan de Santa Barbara*, which was put on by the California Chicano Commission on Higher Education also in 1969 pointed out the obviousness of their presence and power, which was that “the widespread use of the term Chicano today signals a rebirth of pride and confidence. Chicanismo simply embodies an ancient truth: that man is never closer to his true self as when he is close to his community.” Reynaldo Macias said that the plan did a couple of things important to the struggle but major in his mind was that it provided “a Chicano master plan for higher education” (as quoted in Rangel 2007, p. 192). Education was a familial obligation and

was considered of the most necessary aspects of creating a united “familia de la raza” as *El Plan Espiritual* proclaimed.

Forbes believed that a process of Indigenization or Americanization needed to occur in order for an anti-colonial movement and identity to develop within Chicanos, unless they might attempt like hispanos or other groups like affluent or light Cubans to simply join the collective “Whites”, an expanding group (Bonilla-Silva 2010). Indeed, this fact of integration and assimilation is a defining idea in much of Forbes work, as he himself struggled consistently to not be co-opted by his accessible whiteness, an idea he did not directly deal with, instead identifying always as an Indian person. Having shared cultural elements did not preclude acculturation nor did the maintenance or development of new relations entail integration. *El Plan Espiritual de Aztlan* was outspoken about the role of color, and of blood for definitions of la raza, for a Bronze nation, for the Indo-Hispano, and Chicano as “people of the sun” for “the call of our blood is our power, our responsibility, and our inevitable destiny”. Blood and race have been retooled to equate to a whole people rather than distinctions within. Class and caste are reduced as well. Gómez-Quíñones (1982) analysis reiterates the basic parameters of the “national question”, asking:

If there is no language distinctiveness and no struggle around language, if there is no significant geographic area of concentration and no struggle to retain previously held land, if there is no struggle to retain culture and, in fact, there is a tendency to cultural integration and assimilation, if there is no significant historical group continuity over generations but each generation expresses greater integration, if there are no class relations and interactions distinct from those of

the dominant society but undifferentiated economic integration-then the claim to being a separate nationality would be dubious. There is no nation in being or coming into being in the social sense (p. 78)

He fails to analyze the case of the Chicano/a Nation in his reading of major Marxists however he provided a Stalinist summary of essential national elements, including “stability, history, language, economy, territory, and culture” (p. 69). Do Chicanos have all of these, together?

The Chicano/a Movement produced a heavy unfurling of Chicano Nationalist movement and momentum in 1960’s and 1970’s into the present from which came Chicano Nation histories and folklore (Acuña 2007; Castro 2000; Fernández & González 2012; Gómez-Quñones 1994; Lafaye 1976; Lopez 2011; Vento 1998), Language studies (Fuentes & López 1974; Galvan 1995; Ornstein-Galicia 1987; Polkinhorn, Velasco, & Lambert 1983), Territory studies (Anaya, Lomelí, & Lamadrid 2017; Chávez 1984; Gonzales-Berry & Maciel 2000; Luna 1989; Peña 1998; Oropeza 2019), Ceremony-Religious studies (Broyles-González 2002; Cervantes 2010; Espinosa & García 2000; Lara 2008), Health and Medicine (Gonzales 2012; Roeder 1988; Trotter & Chavira 1997; Torres & Sawyer 2014); Kinship and Family studies (Griswold del Castillo 1984; Keefe & Padilla 1987; Rodríguez 2009) and many collected works which provide pervasive multi-lensed perspectives of the birth, struggle and rebirth of a Chicano Nation-People (such as Forbes 1973; Steiner 1972). Tracking and tracing a Chicano Nation through time has provided the framework for educational initiatives (Atencio 1988; El Plan de Santa Barbara 1970; Rodríguez 2014). These initiatives have been brilliant and distinct from the 1960’s onwards, especially in California and New Mexico and included the creation



of new bilingual schools, curriculum, universities, Chicano Studies and other creative community education efforts with D-QU being a unified Chicano-Indian effort (Atencio 1988; Garcia & Almaguer 1974; Macias 1975; Maldonado 2013; Reichert & Trujillo 1974).

Clearly, Forbes saw what many others did not want to, which was the ability of Native people to survive under the cloak of new “states”, of new “names”, of new “languages”, new “religions”, new pueblos, relations and places. Menchaca (1993) for example notes that Chicano’s in the southwest were discriminated against *as if they were indigenous peoples*, of which many became Mexican to avoid discrimination or became White, later Hispanic, on paper (pp. 586-587, she cites Forbes 1973a, in her discussion). Forbes (1971) theory of the surviving Indian was summarized this way with reference to California Indian people but also as a general praxis of peoplehood:

A man can be outwardly conquered, and if he opens his soul to the conqueror he can be inwardly conquered as well. But if he keeps his soul, he can remain free although his body is in chains. Conquered but still free, that is the secret of Indian survival from Alaska to Patagonia! (Forbes 1971d, pp. 242-243).

The Chicano connection is unique in that if we look at the four tap-roots of the peoplehood matrix, we may find that Chicanos unequivocally have all of them, albeit in many pronounced ways which may be stronger than some current U.S. Indians (Blea 1988; Blea 1995; Forbes 1973a). Interestingly as Tijerina pointed out and organized around to support the land-grant struggle was the fact that the masses of Indo-Hispanos did have a treaty with the U.S. which defended their pueblos, religion and culture identifying them in a privileged state like Indians and unlike Blacks (Deloria 1969; JDF

D-046, B. 219; Oropeza 2019). As expressed not only in the mythic Aztlan or caves of Chicomoztec, but Mexicanos and Chicanos south of the U.S. still hold vast landbases, are the majority farmworkers in California, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, and Texas, many of whom come directly from Indian pueblos in Mexico or beyond, and have numerous barrios and colonias which are of an Indigenous majority, with at least 14 in California which are unrecognized unincorporated townships beyond temporary farming camps (Baer 2004; Figueroa 2002; Fox & Rivera-Salgado 2004; Mukhija & Monkkonen 2006; Rivera-Salgado 2014; Sánchez-López 2017). In the U.S. there are thousands of peoples from down south who have maintained their languages and lifeways including Oaxaqueños, Nahuas, and other peoples who are of the largest indigenous language speaking communities north of the Andes. Nahuatl is in fact quite accessible, widely studied and preserved locally, in texts and in story-song and may be the new trade language of the Americas as it is also of the core language keepers of the stories and knowledge of *centeotl* or sacred indigenous corn (Riley 2005; Rodriguez 2014; Sandstrom 1991; Vigil 1994; Weatherford 1992). The stories of the Nahua and many other Native peoples are highly preserved, of which there are many new versions from New Mexico to Old Mexico and beyond. And further, in terms of ceremonialism, the Chicanos de Aztlan show a varied but impressive amount of continuously practiced traditions originating south, north, and with many local forms such as the *Matachines* in New Mexico, the *danza azteca*, numerous Peyote peoples are found north and south of the Mexican border, Día de los Muertos, and a whole host of neo-Christian ways which may be regarded as original or distinct expressions such as the infamous American Guadalupana story, traditions and lore (Hinojosa 2000; López & Gaspar de Alba 2011;

Robb 1961). Chicano's clearly have access to all of these possibilities, in multiple languages, places, traditions, and family legacies. Do Chicano's need a political bureaucracy or power over one in order to gain power? Do they need a Chicano State or bounded territorial base? If "inherent sovereignty" (Holm) or the "natural sovereignty of a group"(Deloria) is established by mere survival or "internal conviction" (Lie), what other kinds of litmus tests must Chicanos pass in order to be regarded as a people or nation, let alone a native American one? A closer view of the conception of Aztlan highlights Forbes position clearly and brings to light the debate therein, one which MEChA/ME recently refused to continue.

The purpose of Forbes framing of Peoplehood, is that although he does not use this term but a few instances, it fits well with his cause of trying to offer all Peoples the dignity preserved in the U.S. constitution which was originally only offered colonial Whites in the phrase "we the people". In other words, Forbes attempted to recognize Indigenous peoples wherever and however he could, especially in the case of Chicanos, who unlike many other groups such as the *genízaros*, have organized themselves into a new nationality, albeit, without a secure territory or titles. A key difference is the name itself which by many scholars and local users estimates is derived from a cross between the original *Mexicayotl* and *Mexicano*, with the former being the Nahuatl word for "the people of Mexico-Tenochtitlan" with the x pronounced with a hard "ch" rather than "sh" as in contemporary Mexican Spanish (Mexicano) today. Forbes (1973a) estimated in the early 1970's that there were 50 to 70 million Native American descendants in the Americas, of which that number has perhaps doubled to nearly 100 million (p. 14). Forbes despised the degrading and racialized designations heaped onto subject peoples by

colonizers and their state which manipulated various peoples to fit into the racial caste system they had created. He argued early in his career (1973) that the Spanish conquistadors were just as much *mestizos* as any group of people before or after the invasion and subjugation of the Americas. Forbes (1971) argued that the one of the many “birthplaces” of the Chicano Nation was at Analco (Barrio de Analco de San Miguel), a suburb of Santa Fe, New Mexico, as well as other villages and suburbs such as Atrisco (present-day Atrisco) who as the place-names make clear, were directly developed out of Indigenous peoples of Mexican and Tlaxcalan (Aztec), Tlatelolcans, Texcocans, Caxcanes and other peoples of Indigenous American descent, and founded around 1610 as was Santa Fe (p. 17). Lamadrid (2016) study of the Tlaxcalan influence in the barrio de Analco was summarized this way:

With a scarcity of documents, the Tlaxcalan legacy can be traced in the agriculture that they took to the north, the geometric imagination of their weavings, and a complex cultural heritage that keeps evolving to accommodate the dreams and ambitions of their many descendants. What cannot be located in paper and ink can be glimpsed in the fields, the kitchens, the looms, and the plazas of the north. These are the places in which the Tlaxcalan legacy is enacted and memorialized (p. 160).

The valley and villa de Atrisco on the other hand was named by Tlaxcalans before the Pueblo Revolt (1680) but was colonized by mainly Spanish origin families during the first years of its settlement, however, later it was predominantly *genízaros*, Isletans, Mexicans and other Native origin peoples which moved in and intermarried and in turn make up the current population (Sanchez 2008, p. 15).

Forbes (1999) elsewhere notes that Chicanos are derived also from “many many pueblo Indians, many California Indians, and others, through intermarriage, and otherwise, became ancestors of the present Chicano population. The Chicano population doesn’t only come from what is now the republic of Mexico” (p. 6). For example, the significance of the migration myth of the Toltecs and then Aztecs from Aztlán was important for Forbes (1999) because it established the fact that Chicanos “have their roots in what is now the United States. And whether that’s back thousands of years, or whether it’s only back to 1064, they help to reinforce that knowledge of basic origin and relatedness” and this history and socio-cultural development of a Nation is a long process, one that may have been slightly offset by colonialism, imperialism and racism (p. 10). This was the reason why Forbes brought attention to it as part of the Native American Movement/Movimiento Native American in the early 1960’s. Chicano poet Francisco X. Alarcon (2015) harnesses the history and legacy of Analco and Aztlan when he writes,

“I can still hear  
your prayers  
half in Nahuatl  
half in Spanish  
were you aware  
that going north  
you were returning  
to Chicomoztoc  
the mythical land

of the Seven Caves--  
the original homeland  
of the Nahua people? (p. 101)

As a historian Forbes found that Chicano Nationhood had been a long time coming. Tomas Atencio (1974) used the term “Indo-Hispano”, Chicanos, and *La Raza* interchangeably in his work with the community education center known first as *La Academia de la Nueva Raza* (1970) in order to make clear Chicanos carry an ancient heritage and identity. Like MEChA/ME, its members underwent a deradicalization process whereby they rejected its founding nationalistic approach and in the 1980’s became the Rio Grande Institute. Atencio brought attention to the question: how did the “Chicano mind” (consciousness) develop? In his treatise on *la resolana* (“the sun [side of the home/village]”, the place of contemplation and discussion by village elders) and *el oro del barrio* (the wealth or “gold” of the community), Atencio highlights that “we as Chicanos and Indios through *el oro del barrio*, our memory, combined with ethno-science, have the philosophy to show industrial society the way to a New Man ... a New Humanity” and in this predicts the backlash and response from white’s and others that Chicanos are not really a people at all, but a so-called sub-population unworthy of Peoplehood or Nationhood (p. 16; see also Atencio 1991). An ethno-science is a people’s unique way of thinking and knowledge construction that is rooted in their experience as a community and people on the land (Antone, Miller & Meyers 1986; Cajete 1994). In a news interview published in *The Sun Telegram* (Oct. 30, 1971) Forbes makes clear that the Chicano Nation is not emerging, but rather has been submerged, and noting the incredible depth of the people he says, “the Chicano has one of the proudest histories of

achievement of all peoples and today Mexico is still a world leader in many fields such as art, architecture, and many others” and further he elaborates on the current condition saying, “the Chicano child brings with him all of this potential, all of the achievements of many past civilizations” (p. B-4). Part of Forbes perspective rests on the idea that Chicanos are not a *mestizo* people any more than any other group: they are a complete, full, authentic and vibrant people replete with all the basic elements of peoplehood-nationhood, perhaps save one. This final one is probably more pronounced or realized in some communities than others, and it is the *reality* of political independence or difference. Again, we have to circle back around to the question of sovereignty, this time over a land base to be the issue. In Mexico, New Mexico and other locales there are many communities which function autonomously in terms of economics, education, religious, linguistic, kinship relations as well as politically via traditional forms of law and governance such as the Acequia law or the law of the water-land, and in Mexico, many *ejidos* are self-governing and distinct entities sometimes minutely interceded upon by Mexican authorities. The indigenous led revolution that ended in 1917 in Mexico for example guaranteed numerous rights and privileges to *indigenas* in the constitution which is unrivalled in its declarations compared to others of its time. Thus, one of the major goals of the Chicano movement, the Alianza Indigena, the Raza Unida Party, MEChA and other efforts were an attempt to regain political control over their communities which under neocolonial regimes had made major inroads into their own self-determination and forms of community governance.

Forbes (1973) consistently pointed out that Chicanos were predominantly Native American, that is genetically and culturally rooted in America as original Americans, as

much in his estimates, of 80% of their lineage to derive from Indigenous American ancestors (“The Mestizo-Metis: A product of European imperialism”, p. 6 in the KCP B.1 F.34). He makes clear that Chicanos are not unified by a central government, territory or body of knowledge. Instead Forbes (1973a) says in the preface to *Aztecas del norte* that,

Like other Native American groups, the Aztecas of Aztlán are not completely unified or [a] homogenous people. Some call themselves Chicanos and see themselves as people whose true homeland is Aztlan. Some call themselves Mexican-Americans (or variants thereof) and conceptualize their status as United Statesians (“Americans”) of Mexican background. Others view themselves as “Mexicanos” and look to Mexico as their true homeland. Still others call themselves “Hispanos” (in New Mexico and Colorado especially) and choose to emphasize their Spanish language rather than their Mexican blood. The ancestry of the above groups has one common denominator: they all possess Mexican (Anishinabe) Indian descent to some degree (p. 13).

Forbes (1973) charges that the *mestizo-metis* identity is a product of European imperialism, and while many people accept and promote Mexicanidad as a unifying way of recognizing their whole lineages of European, Native American, African and Arab ancestries, he complains that the bulk of the effort has come from the colonial state of Mexico and is not derived especially from the people themselves. “People who possess a national or ethnic identity, no matter how mixed historically with other peoples they may be, can never be “mestizo””, and this is because mixture does not mean “confused” or in Forbes analysis “outcast”, but rather they are always integrated in some way (ibid, p. 8). Further, he notes that a group is allowed to “change”, it is only the colonial statistician



which seeks to control the movement of a people in order to control their relationships with each other, with their lands, governing structures, traditions, etc. Instead he says, “whether changing because of acculturation, race mixture, or both, they always have retained a community, an identity, and sense of peoplehood” (ibid., pps. 10-11). And this is the key of his argument: racism, colonialism, imperialism, Catholicism, etc., do not in themselves change a people. They are influential. They are drunk, they are ingested, they are learned, they are allied with, but they are in the end, responsive to the people as elements of their identity, meaning, they are owned by and subject to the people themselves. The colonial-imperial racial caste system was a “divide and conquer” institution that sought to do a number of things (which go against people’s traditional way of being) says Forbes (1973):

- (1) it forced many mixed-bloods to identify as “tributary Indians” in order to live on a reservation and be safe from the possibility of enslavement;
- (2) it forced all visibly non-white persons, no matter what the degree of blood, to become a part of a “free colored” caste if they wished to live away from an Indian reservation;
- (3) it accentuated notions of white supremacy and encouraged people to try to be as white as possible (except for those who chose to be a “tributary Indian” and even the latter were affected psychologically); and
- (4) it made people “caste-conscious” and encouraged disunity among the oppressed non-whites (p. 19).

These are external influencers applied by a colonial state, its laws, its repressive, coercive and violent measures of control and manipulation especially via the military, church, and in schools. The liquidation of indigeneity by the European imperialists has taken on extreme measures such as measuring blood quantum (of which they should be fearful the

tables get turned!). At best Forbes declares that Indians and Chicanos are proletarianized, that is landless and are forced to work in the imperial economy as laborers (some for example never leave their homelands and still maintain landed connections as farmworkers, loggers, miners, gardeners, landscapers, construction workers, etc.). Forbes (1973) makes his argument clear, Chicanos are not “cholos” or “mestizos” in the sense of being divided or mixed up (a mixture is thorough and complete, a new integration). He says:

All people are “mestizos” to one degree or another, so for the Mexican or Chicano to say he is a “mestizo” is to say, in effect, “I am a human being.” Moreover in its usage it is to say that “I am an out-caste, a confused, in-between person.” (It may well be that many Chicanos are, confused as regards to the clash between Mexican and Anglo-American values but “mestizo” is not used to refer to that cultural conflict). The traditional culture of most Chicanos is not “mixed.” It is a well blended, fully integrated culture that has been evolving and changing for thousands of years (p. 27).

The cholo (either from the Nahuatl *xoloescuintle* “peeled dog” or Quechua *chulu* “mestizo”) in Forbes mind was akin to the *mestizo* concept in which it is viewed as either a degraded Indian or as a whitened Indian, that is gaining whiteness in color and cultural distinction. Carlos Yushimoto del Valle (2014) is certain that its roots lie in the Quechua/Peruano origin which coincides with its use even among Felipe Guaman Pome de Ayala (circa 1615) history from an Incan perspective as written in the *Nueva Corónica y Buen Gobierno* (p. 402). For example, *cholo* is always used in the negative or castigated way by imperialists, but it has now become a term of pride by many, and as Forbes

explains, there is a choice involved in its usage, “it is, of course, theoretically possible for a person of part-Indian descent to consciously choose to turn his back upon his Indian ancestors and relatives and to ignore the viciousness of past white racism and exploitation”, as many “pretend to be white” but in Forbes honest view he remarks that “the truth is, however, that the Cholos own status is bound up with that of the Indian people” for the basic reason that “in a society which is still racist, no person of part-Indian descent can, ethnically or psychologically, be white” (“The Cholo” p. 17, JDF D-046, B. 204). And lastly, on the individual level Chicanos can be “described as “mestizo” if they look part-European or know of a non-Indian ancestor. Their identity, however, is that of Chicano and the Chicano group, by virtue of its cultural, racial, and historical continuity cannot be categorized as “mestizo”” (p. 30). One of the reasons Forbes persisted so hard in his attempts to raise the consciousness and awareness of and amongst Chicanos was that he realized long before many others that the demographics were changing vastly in their favor, so much that in the 21st century, Chicanos would be the majority population in many states such as California, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Texas and elsewhere. Forbes work on Chicano Peoplehood was regarded as so important that in Julian Samora’s talk at the 7th annual Ernesto Galarza Commemorative Lecture (1992) at the Stanford Center for Chicano Research, he mentions Forbes work first, saying, “very few scholars have dealt with this phenomenon in the United States. Only three come to mind. Dr. Forbes - a professor at the University of California, Davis is one of them” (pps. 1-2). Samora highlights for example that he logged at least 22 unique *castas* or racial categories that Chicanos were subject to by Spanish imperial efforts (p. 4). While on the other hand Forbes (1973a) suggests that Chicanismo and “Chicanos of

Aztlan are currently engaged in the most significant kind of struggle, the struggle of the mind, the development, in fact, of a filosofía chicana, a philosophy of Aztlan” and further this “new philosophy being evolved by Chicano pintos, students, vatos, barrio organizers, farm workers, is of extreme importance” (pps. 297-298). He explains that this a process of national development, of ethnogenesis, and foremost in his perspective is that “first, it is a people’s philosophy (Chicano scholars, college professors are playing only a minor role in the movement). Second, it is a mass movement. . . . Third, it will determine, in its totality, the future direction in which the Chicano people move” (p. 298). Forbes (1974) points out that this development occurred in part because of the colonial and racial processes of detribalization saying “the development of a new Chicano nationality or ethnic group is an attempt to reverse the proletarianization-denationalization process” which was implied in the racial caste systems developed throughout the Americas (p. 22). Thus, in part, Chicano Nationhood is derived from an experience of resistance to colonialism as much as it is a basic will of a people to become a unified body as Tijerina and others have pointed out. Indeed, it is well known that many of the *genízaro* and Chicano villages and barrios of *el norte* in New Mexico joined with the Pueblo Revolt and as such, were already on their way to a unique National identity at this early time. In this way, he imagines that the *mestizo* and the *cholo* can and should look towards the liberation of their people, their lands, their knowledge and identity as a part of the greater struggle of anti-colonialism and Native liberation. This he believes will continue to bring about the consciousness and power of this group, as well as the unification of disparate groups if not into a singular body or people, into a confederacy or alliance which provides necessary support for each other on all requisite fronts. The term *Hispanic* in

English for example, is not quite the same as *Hispano* in Spanish, and was devised rather recently to which Forbes analysis (1992e) refers to an “artificially created group” in the hopes it will serve the purpose of

continuing to empower white Spanish-speaking elites at the expense of people of mestizo, Indian, and African origin and of masking the hierarchical, color-ranked class structure and racial/ethnic diversity within the Spanish-speaking and Latin American origin populations. Another function of Hispanic is to confuse people of color so that they will “think white” and allow themselves to be dominated by white assimilative forces (which already seem to be using Spanish-language television to exalt whiteness at the expense of darker skin colors (p. 65).

Ultimately, Forbes concludes that racism and imperialism are purposeful acts of an empire:

a conscious effort has been made to build a historically European Spanish-based and Spanish-dominated group rather than a regional “Latin” group or a regional “American” group. This is precisely the tradition of Spanish imperialism and of Spanishness that has emphasized Spanish culture and identity at the expense of Native American cultures. It is also in the direct tradition of the anti-Indian patterns of most Spanish-dominated countries, where Indian languages consistently go unrecognized and where Native identity is regarded by the state as undesirable and calling for eradication. In short, we are dealing with a racist-colonialist system, tradition, and mentality (p. 67).

Chicano calls against the term Hispanic are well founded, and likewise recent calls for a Latinx unity are based in part on their dissension from Europe and rootedness in an American home and heartland.

Forbes experienced the divisions prevalent among the various Latino and Chicano groups at D-QU who for example distinguished themselves on the lines of acculturation, language, class (such as among the campesinos vs factory workers), religion and other factors. Yet in a hopeful way, he related the struggle back to the power of people to move in a direction together, to have control and agency over every aspect of their lives, such as in terms of language. While Spanish and English may be used interchangeably, or that others have consistently tried to reign them in and harness them to Castilian Spanish or British or New England or Midwestern English (some Standard), unless people are able to speak and do as they will with *their own language* they will be identified as the servants, the workers of imperialism who will pass on this relationship to their children. At a SEPA Chicano Colloquium on October 28, 1972 a little more than a year after the founding of D-QU Forbes related on this topic that D-QU was developed in order for Chicano's or Latinos or Indians to develop in their own way. In terms of the language issue he said "I think the English language and Spanish language can be changed, it can change, it will take time" and perhaps it's a thousand years, this historical process will be the people's history, not Spain's' or England's', or the U.S. This is the essence and basis of Chicano Nationhood and Peoplehood in Forbes mind, which is that the people need to keep moving in their own direction, however he warns that "Chicanos can develop Chicano power and develop a Chicano nation and be just like Anglos, they could be [an] Independent, separate Chicano nation, but materialistic, [and] modern [like whites]" or

“you can develop some other kind of attitude, and develop a Chicano society which is very different than that” for “the real question is the internal question, what kind of an ethnic group does it want to be in the future, what kinds of essential values” will it imbue and abide by (“SEPA Chicano Colloquium”, JDF D-046, B. 191). Chicanos have numerous language attributes from various kinds of *Español Mexicano* such as *Chilango* (Mexico-Tenochtitlan), but also kinds of English such as *Caló* that are unique barrio forms of the southwest. So while the internal question plagues all peoples all the time, the politics of recognition (Coulthard), or the spectre of recognition (Barker) constantly patrols national development and disfigures it if it can. The U.S. for example historically recognizes statehood as “popular sovereignty” but not nationhood, for a state can be integrated, while a nation demands independence and autonomy.

The course of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, China, Vietnam and other groups to “take power” through statehood is a unique answer to the “national question”, one that Fanon for example and other socialist revolutionaries admit is necessary within capitalist society. However, this status has not always been available to Indian people or African peoples who are viewed as in a state of pupilage still by imperial northerners, Europeans and whites. The Navajo Nation for example has a population near 400,000, the Cherokee over 500,000, while Oaxacans number in the U.S. number near 500,000 and are highly fluent compared to less than 1% of Cherokees. Chicanos-Mexicanos may number in the 30’s of millions while Latinos of Indian descent in the U.S. may be over 90 million, or 25% of the population. Forbes argued that Chicanos could have a state or two or 10 given their population growth, historical relationships with Mexico and the Americas, and the need for political representation that is equal to population, which was

the core reason the colonies broke away from the British Empire as they were at the whim of a monarch and foreign parliament, a military and despot. The path of the state however is always rooted in violence, which is perhaps why Fanon eagerly pursued this path while Forbes suggested that violence might leave a people damaged and ill prepared for nation-building, now malleable and subjugated easily to the cause of statehood (bureaucratic representative govt.) which advocates “peace” despite obvious efforts at internal and external control via violence.

### *On Statehood*

Forbes was critical of the “state” in many ways because there is really no such thing, as a separate entity, separate from the people, despite giving it power and life beyond the people. The “state” has as its progenitor, in the imperial tradition of tribute-taxation and the control of “others”. The leaders of the “state” early institutionalized themselves as deified and divinely ordained male rulers. One of their early inventions was the “corporation”, of which independent persons could be recognized by the government as an economic and political group in ways the church had already attained. The triad of “empire-state”, “church” and “corporations” is significant in that they have always been present as institutional advocates of their power, without which we are dealing simply with equal peoples (Deloria 1997, p. 202; Mohawk 2004). They are born out of relationships among selective people, and promoted through agreement, such as a “charter” or “articles of incorporation”, a “constitution” and “treaty”. The European Renaissance produced such brilliant texts as the *Tratado de Tordesillas* or Treaty of Tordesillas (1493) which was an agreement made by the Spanish and Portuguese



monarchs after Papal edicts declared the Americas to be the property of these “sovereigns” and followed by the Treaty of Zaragoza, with other examples being the Treaties of Westphalia (1648), and Treaties of Paris in 1763 and 1783, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (1848), the Treaty with Russia (1867), and many others, all of which elided Native Nations (Davenport 1917; Osiander 2001; Cornstassel 2003; see also U.S.A “Treaties in Force” 2016). Essentially, states come to recognize other states while nations recognize other nations. The state has been tackled as a subject for thousands of years beginning with Greek and Roman tracts, Chinese and Egyptian texts and discussions over the “nature of the state” and into and through our present day. Proponents argue that the state is necessary and, in some cases, “natural”, while opponents object to its invention, naturalization and deployment. Forbes view is unique in that he does not stand with the “state”, and sees it only as a tool, which is not more useful or needed if the people don’t need or want it. Holm (2007) argues that Native Nations formed something similar to states in the past and present, and that statehood is not a particularly good barometer for health and vitality of a people, as can be seen among the numerous “states” invented in the wake of imperial occupations and decolonization efforts which resulted not in the recovery of people’s homelands but their subjection to a foreign state.

In this way, we can understand that constitutionalism is a recent practice of the creation of “statehood”, as it is the precursor for the creation of new states who seek to join the U.S. which involved the ratification of a collected law body through convention, through a practice called “popular sovereignty” which dismissed ancient rights to territory, instead recognizing imperialist rights to take precedent for as Morgan (1989) pronounced, “government requires make-believe” (p. 13). When Native Nations were

forced into a constitutionalizing process in 1934 with the Indian Reorganization Act, they were not added as equal states like the other U.S. recognized states and were not empowered, that is, given the same status as independent states controlled by white males. Earlier court cases confirmed this reality in the wake of the Indian Removal Act of 1830, whereby they were considered “domestic dependent nations”, in “a state of pupilage” like a “ward to his guardian” as in *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* [30 U.S. (5 Pet.) 1, 8 L.Ed. 25 (1831)]. Yet, they had a “status higher than states” according to Deloria and Lytle (1984), while also in an in between position as they are not respected as totally independent nations nor are, they allowed to have representatives in the federal government like white-formed states. They can lobby on capitol hill, but there is no direct representation other than through federal positions and the bureaucracy made for them. Native Nations are the only group that has a colonial bureaucracy still dedicated to it its “administration”, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Bureau of Indian Education. For example, a majority of Native territory is held in “trust” by the Bureau of Land Management and was taken by the U.S. government and by white “states” between the 18th and 20th centuries. According to the Department of Interiors “Public Land Statistics 2016”, “as part of its trust management responsibility, the BLM provides technical supervision of mineral development on 56 million acres of American Indian trust lands except for Osage lands. All minerals in Indian trust lands are “leasable”” (p. 16). Further, many Native reservation lands are in fact checkerboarded, meaning, there are numerous lessees, private owners, and non-Native entities who own and hold onto Native lands such as churches, for profit corporations, and non-profit corporations as well as federal entities.

Forbes (1974b) basic definition of a “state” was summarized as follows:

A state is a governmental or political unit. The United States of America is a state. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republic is a state. The Chinese People’s Republic is a state. A state is not the same thing as a nation. A lot of people are confused about the difference between these two terms, because a lot of times you’ll see the word “nation-state” used. What that term is trying to say is that theoretically this is a state which belongs to a nation. That is a nation-state. There are a lot of states that don’t belong to any nation and there are many nations without a state (p. 27).

Forbes (1971) explained his own personal perspective and predicament earlier as a Powhatan person, of which he was of the Rappahannock (Renape) and Lenape Nations:

I belong to the Powhatan people, and it’s kind of a ‘nationality’ that’s not fully developed . . . in terms of all the attributes of a European-style nationality: it doesn’t have any ‘State’, its people are dispersed over considerable territory, with many other peoples in between. So there’s no geographical unity. Yet the relationship the Powhatan people have towards each other is comparable to that of a nationality--an Indian nation or tribe. There’s a sense of identification and belonging to an entity that’s almost eternal (*pp. 3-4, Forbes 1971, June 13, University Archives Records Series 12, Box 4 “Science Editor 732-993. 1967 Jan 01-1971 Dec 28”, F. “June 1971”*).

Jeff Cornassel (2003) problematizes the concept of a “state” to show that it clearly is a manifestation, as is sovereignty, by and for the imperialists when he states:

States are thought to have sovereign powers, which means that there is no higher authority than states in the world today. But this is political and legal fiction.

Therefore, from an Indigenous perspective, *sovereignty is the state's claim to have the exclusive authority to forcefully intervene in all activities within its borders--whenever necessary it practices violence on people's residing within its legally recognized borders as they challenge the legitimacy of the state's authority* (p. 90, emphasis original).

This point was hammered home by Glen Coulthard (2014) who argues that the key to being a state is recognition, especially by other states as peoples are subject to already codified conditions of the state apparatus which “have remained *colonial* to its foundation” (p. 6; Coulthard 2007). Therefore, Native Nations were at first recognized as Peoples, as Nations, but were never recognized as States and did not establish themselves with a kind of exclusive “state sovereignty” that past European empires and new states like the U.S. and Canada did satisfy. The imperial and colonial process gave whites the reason for statehood, as they built their initial homes through hundreds of “infrastructural developments” from chartered towns, churches, schools, and governments out of state corporate and religious charters. The “state” is a social contract in the Rousseauian dialectic, but even more specific, it's a racial contract, one created by those who identify as a specific politically united group, where in the U.S., its “whites” and historically white males (Mills 1978).

John Lie (2004) offers a comprehensive definition of peoplehood, which identifies more closely with nation-statehood, or simply, statehood:

By modern peoplehood I mean an inclusionary and involuntary group identity with a putatively shared history and distinct way of life. It is inclusionary because everyone in the group, regardless of status, gender, or moral worth,

belongs. It is involuntary because one is born into an ascriptive category of peoplehood. In addition to common descent—a shared sense of genealogy and geography—contemporary commonality, such as language, religion, culture, or consciousness, characterizes the group. It gropes toward a grouping larger than kinship but smaller than humanity. It is not merely a population—an aggregate, an external attribution, an analytical category—but, rather, a people—a group, an internal conviction, a self-reflexive identity (p. 1).

While it seems Lie hopes to be inclusive as possible, he reneges on challenging the way imperialism has destroyed traditions of peoplehood worldwide, which form the basis for a “modernist” definition. He clearly states his trajectory by admitting that the:

conditions of possibility of modern peoplehood are the infrastructural development of identity transmission (cultural or horizontal integration) and the decline of status hierarchy or qualitative inequality (status or vertical integration). . . . they began in early modern Europe, accelerated there after the French Revolution, consolidated in the late nineteenth century, and then spread around the world (p. 14).

The “infrastructure” is the “state” while the founding codification is through the ordainment and orders of constitutionalization. Champagne (1992) argued for example in the case of the “Five Civilized Tribes” it was not until they developed an elaborate hierarchy, a bureaucracy, a centralized governance and leadership model that they were both recognized by the U.S. and were capable of sub-statehood and escaped inclusion into the General Allotment Act of 1887 (p. 209). However, as Champagne notes constitutionalism was not enough either to resist imperial theft and Native Nations

removals nor did it equate to a secure protectorate status as nations while “white” state development was ongoing.

So while, Native Nations have every attribute of a “state”, they are in fact denied this status because it would conflict with the imperial hierarchical order. Forbes argument is that Native Nations and “tribal territories:

Within the United States are, in fact, already “states.” They are states in the sense that all self-governing political entities are states, and also in the sense that they are among the most basic political subdivisions of the United States. It is true that these Indian states have not been “admitted to the Union”, i.e., they have not been given representation in Congress, but in all other respects they possess the legal character of states. There would, in short, be nothing to prevent the Navajo Tribe, for example, from deciding that henceforth, its government shall be known as the “Navajo State” (D-046, B. 62, F. “unfolded” [The Constitutional Powers of Tribal Governments and of the United States Government in Indian Affairs]).

This perhaps might give Native Nations more respect or perhaps it would signal that they have succumbed to becoming merely a conglomeration rather than a nation, or that a new clique, a status group, has risen to power. Forbes (1994d) argued elsewhere that perhaps it may be beneficial for communities to create “dual sovereignty” states or jurisdictions so as to recognize urban centers or mountainous/border regions outside of the reservation boundaries yet which are within a people’s traditional homelands (p. 260). Some peoples already have triple citizenship such as the Kickapoo (also U.S. & Mexico) and Akwesasne Mohawk (also U.S. & Canada). Further, he suggests perhaps there is a precedence to establish a kind of “cross-boundary sub-state” which helps to unite the

many Nations that are split off at U.S., Mexico and Canadian borders (Forbes 1967g). Alaskan Nations could surely benefit from having a united sub-state in British Columbia, which is after all named after the supreme imperialist, Columbus. Nunavut in Canada is the most recent attempt at statehood by a Native Nation in the Americas which specifically allows for local administration, yet is within the substrate of constitutional legislation and is not considered a band, First Nation or other kind of state.

Trapped in between these various “states”, “borders”, “nation-states”, and bureaucracies Forbes (1974) suggested that Native Nations and other “small Nations” such as the Oaxaqueños who live in Central California who outnumber all Native Nations in the state are actually “captive nations” and denied true self-determination. But what if each group had a state to represent itself, or do they already have all of the prerequisites of a state? Machiavelli was of the most prominent and popular advocates for the State. The earliest “states” were founded as representative organizations of power such as the Greek city-states and the Roman empire’s “*status rei publicae*”. By the time of the invasion of the Americas, there were no “states” per se, but rather those with “status”, such as the people of status, namely property owners in the form of estates owned by nobles and the commons and that imagined by kings and the pope. Thus we see that the “state” is a neo-imperial invention, most definitely used to signify the elevated status of the United Colonies during the first Congressional Congress in 1776, which began however to call themselves states in the 1630’s possibly because of their original status within the empire to be higher than claimed territories but not equal to Scotland for example, and who notably owned Native lands and bodies and were heavily investing into American-African servitude. Thus, the state is not a collective body of practices,

services or functions as traditional Nations and Peoples performed all of these on their own without a “state” framework. Unique to a state, is that its own “statehood” has been elevated above the people, and those who manage, run and work on its behalf have been also elevated. While judges, the president, the military and bureaucrats are not considered above the law, the fact is, they often are beyond the law because they are in a position of power and have the greatest chance at manipulating the “state” for their own benefits. At the most basic level, they are paid to run the state, as much as they are representatives of any particular group of people.

What is most important, is that the state reinforces certain kinds of “status” among various peoples as we see that all “states” have visible classes or castes. Although Native Nations did not generally have classes or castes, they often do now (Black Elk 1983; Champagne 2007; Deloria 1969; Forbes 1982a; Forbes 2008a). Forbes (1979) notes in many instances that the creation of a wealthy or benefitting class of persons among Native communities was aptly promoted by imperialists through bestowing symbolic signs of power such as new titles like that of *cacique*, chief, and kingships and in the distribution of goods, lands and privileges for a select few. Further, the imperial system reinforced these notions of centralization of power and control, and only recognized or dealt with communities who presented a single chief, a representative diplomat (who was able to make decisions or agree without consensus) in the early treaties, and later a president, or other person who could sign contracts such as the Navajo Business Council, which for example antedated the Navajo Nation Council. In the case of the 1934 act, this meant the creation of “Tribal Councils” or in Canada “Band Councils” as of the Indian Act of 1876, which was the only group that the imperial state would negotiate or work



with. It did not matter that these groups did not have public support, were puppets of the state, or were antagonistic to traditional governing bodies, let alone, illegal by their own laws. The U.S. clearly established itself in part to escape British law, which had made treaties with Native Nations, and had been regulating imperialism, which then became lawless and deregulated with the founding of the U.S. who escaped treaty relationships with Native Nations and had a new start by negotiating at first, with the British and France (Treaty of Paris 1783).

The effects of this newly established relationship among recognized “states” was drastic. Howard Adams (1995) summarizes this situation in imperial Canada:

traditional Aboriginal society was crushed into a position of powerlessness and dependency. For example, the position of chief, as an official institution, was created by European colonizers and imposed on Indian society. As a puppet ruler, he commanded his people in the interests of the white master. As a result, chiefs and band councils have become an integral part of imperial authoritarian rule (p. 197).

The loss of status is not limited to men, for as Forbes (2008a) notes that “rigid patriarchy follows the *wétiko* disease, even as the slave system in the southern United States led to a decline in status of English women relative to conditions in the non-slave colonies” (pps. 40-41). Male supremacy becomes reinforced by white supremacy, and is protected by state power and militancy. Thus we find that white women are slowly granted various male “rights”, as long as white supremacy is reinforced, as long as Christian duties are performed, so long as the imperial and colonial mission is maintained. It was the federal state which demanded Indian children as part of its boarding school programs, and it was

the government, its co-workers, the church and military, which made these function, which uncoincidentally was headed by male administrators and a primarily female teaching force except in the industrial and agricultural trades (Child 1998, 77-79; Lomawaima 1993, p. 236). Forbes (2008a) argues that “most white people have failed to ask: how can such a system of captivity be maintained” be it Indian or African servitude, or Indian children via schooling (p. 130)? And in the case of a “system of captivity”, he says

we had state governments awarding human beings to private captors in what amounted to a privatized prison system, with the captors (I refuse to call them “owners”) having a virtually unregulated control over the innocent victims including the power to inflict harsh or even fatal punishment (ibid., p. 132).

So while “state governments” might have performed this deplorable horror upon Indian and African bodies in the past, we find that they continue to do this practice on children as every state contains laws for education and schooling, which make it “compulsory” and “punishable by law”, although there is some variance from state to state which make allowances for private, religious, public, chartered and other kinds of schooling options. All states in the U.S. had passed compulsory education laws by 1918. The state becomes *the* mechanization of a new imperialism. Most treaties with education stipulations declare it to be the prerogative and responsibility of the federal government while some say the government supports local reservation-based efforts at schooling, none of them specify that the individual states or local governments should be doing this which runs in the face of the Johnson O’Malley Act of 1934.

Adams (1995) says “a fact of colonial rule is that a strong state is required to maintain considerable control over indigenous workers” which the U.S. developed its original police squads as terrorizing militias, as hired plantation thugs, and as captors of runaways (p. 198). Further, we see in the case of education, that compulsory schooling laws reinforced the idea that an educated workforce is necessary, however limited or subservient to imperial, state, corporate, racist, and other powerful influences. The state survives primarily not as a house of law, but as a repressive institution which the military and its many wings answers to, from which it can make war on behalf of itself, often without any kind of discussion or agreement on the claim of “self-defense”. It should be noted that one of the first things that Native states have done is establish their own police forces, even before imperial laws are in place such as the Creek and Cherokee lighthorse police (Champagne 1992, p. 114, 136). Reservations and reserves established were always governed by agents of the imperial state, and the killing of Sitting Bull by his own people’s police among many other examples demonstrate the early use of force internally-externally was formidable and widespread.

Now what happens when these manifestations of imperialism and state repression become normal operating standards? While the case of (1882) *Crow Dog v. the State* settled jurisdiction issues in that instance, it led to the Major Crimes Act (1885) which officially brought federal jurisdiction and repression wherever it felt necessary, in particular, for Murder, Manslaughter, Rape, Assault with intent to kill, Arson, Burglary, and Larceny. The list has however expanded even further to include, kidnapping, maiming, also, a felony under chapter 109A (i.e. sexual abuse), Incest, a felony assault under section 113 (e.g. assault with intent to commit murder or assault with a dangerous

weapon), an assault against an individual who has not attained the age of 16 years, felony child abuse or neglect, and robbery. This is virtually any reason, especially when one considers the breadth of the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798 (and the current Alien Enemies Act), the Espionage Act of 1917 and newer legislation such as the Patriot Act of 2001. Native Nationals could be charged of seditious activity legally as “aliens” until 1934 after fighting in World War I, attending boarding schools, accepting an allotment, and opening a business! Other acts and laws have consistently targeted Native Nations in the specific, thus, a state can make war upon “domestic dependent nations” subtly whereas individual white citizens have the privilege of being prosecutors and judges unanimously.

One 20th century that strikes at the heart of state power comes clearly to mind. While the Navajo Nation had the largest reservation base of all other “captive nations”, in the 1930’ they were subject to federal punishment for an apparently egregious crime unlisted in any legal text or court case: sheep overgrazing of their own land! Half of the people’s herds were rounded up and a mass Ovicide ensued with the killing of a million or more sacred sheep (Iverson 2002, pps. 147-151; Kuznar 2008, pps. 140-143; Roessel 1974). The livestock reduction quotas of Collier’s administration are still active, grazing districts have been created, and the Navajo Nation now does the policing for the feds. As Adams (1995) notes, “once the state is established, it maintains rigid colonization in almost every aspect of Aboriginal life” and this includes state enforced standards that are then taken over by local Native governments (p. 203). In the case of leadership, “chiefs” and early established elites might have been planted (by colonizers) or implanted (internal colonizer) themselves into an imperial racial-caste system, basically, creating a

light-skinned petite bourgeoisie of the Native Nations who were elevated above the rest and granted special privileges. Forbes (2008a) says “that is the secret of colonialism” which is essentially a state-enforced practice to “divide the conquered masses (who are usually the majority population) into rival groups, with a small sector (the *ladinos*, or *mestizos*, or light mulattoes in the plantation south of the United States) being used to kill, lash and control” their brethren (p. 63). This of course was the rule amongst imperial states and then was extended upon subject peoples. Thus, states always create a lasting status difference. What we have then instead of a nation, or “nation-state”, is a terrorist state. Forbes (2008a) points out that

the very success of the modern state creates the conditions where its own civilians become the easiest available targets. Terrorism is the result, a terrorism created by the very state that seeks to avoid it. . . . There may be a kind of a dance of mutual dependence between the desperate terrorist and the state security system. They create the need for each other (p. 135).

The U.S. for example has no qualms with overthrowing what it deems a threat, or a terroristic state through its own terrorism such as in the many American coups in Guatemala, Chile, El Salvador and Nicaragua, the theft of Mexico, but also in Egypt, Libya, its support of Israel, in Iraq, Iran, Syria, and elsewhere in more covert ways such as through aiding other groups militarily, the use of sanctions, or providing strategic knowledge and information. The state is only sacrosanct in that it is a military apparatus used to control the populace, and one only needs to change the regime or those in power, or even the constitution in order to establish “peace” and stability, law and order, or in the recent case of Iraq, “democracy”(ibid).

*On "Indian Tribes"*

Forbes (1986c) most succinct definition comes in a study of his own Powhatan Renape People. He defines tribes in relation to other political terms such as a republic this way:

The concept of "tribe" is, of course, a European one and we would be best advised to use terms such as "republic" (for a self-governing state), confederacy or league (for an alliance system), and "nation" (for a larger sense of nationality or ethnicity, however defined in real life by the people themselves) (p. 16).

White people were never part of tribes as "whites", and thus skipped the colonial prerequisite stages of evolution applied to Indians, Blacks and people of color. Instead, they are known precisely for their colonies and states.

The codification of the term in recent colonial history is clearly from its usage in the U.S. Constitution, where in Section 8 which discusses how congress is able to implement taxes, it distinguishes Native Nations, saying Congress has the power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes". The lowercase tribe is not a Nation or a State, it is something else, lesser than. The term "tribe" from Latin *tribu*, that is a group which pays tribute, is a term made popular by anthropologists such as Elman Service (1962) who created a social complexity stratum moving from simple to more complex societies beginning with band, tribe, chiefdom and state level groups. Thus, the U.S. is a state, whereas the Navajo Nation might be imagined as somewhere between a tribe and a state but not a chiefdom. In Canada, the term band is most often used and so it is even more difficult in this hierarchical stratum to achieve statehood. The term was originally used as an akin term to

the three *tribus* that founded Rome which later became the designation for its many tributaries, and in reference to the twelve tribes of Israel identified in the Bible that preceded the rise of the Kingdom of David, drawing from Greek *phyle* “race, tribe, group, people” whose term, like that of Rome, was a subdivision of ancient Athens. In Roman terms, the three founding *tribus* were superseded by the Roman state and empire, and although remnants existed during its heyday, the tribe was no longer the core of the nation but a mythic stepping stone. Thus, State and Empire became analogous deep in the imperial past. Similarly, the constitution as a body of laws made its first appearances in these early state-empires, not in the U.S. Joanne Barker (2011) notes that the idea of the tribe by the time U.S. came to power, and especially after the unCivil War of massive destruction, the tribe was a thing of the past already and did not denote a status comparable to “states”. The U.S. had made treaties of peace and friendship with certain legal caveats which had augmented their status as independent, free, autonomous, self-regulated nations of equals. In treaty negotiations, most peoples are regarded as Nations in the central texts prior to the unCivil War which ended in 1865, yet just prior to, but especially afterwards, these same Nations become predominantly “tribes of Indians” or bands. The record is uneven until the unCivil War where, for example in 1848, treaties with the Pawnee Nation are followed by treaties with the Utah tribe, Navajo tribe, and Wyandot Nation while the 1854 treaty with the Shawnee are referred evenly as a tribe and nation in the same document. By the time of the Marshall decisions and subsequent removal policies and acts the U.S. had in many ways declared itself not just an independent nation, but a massive empire with hundreds of internal colonies now

administered and represented by foreign states, and imagined itself as the great civilizer, by force or socialization.

Barker (2011) says “without having achieved proper civilization, Indian tribes were denied a place as equal members in the “tribunals of civilized states,” stripped of their full standing and rights as sovereigns to self-government and territorial integrity as possessed by “civilized states”” (p. 33). Further, she explains, that the U.S. recognized “tribes” as “dependent and uncivilized” rather than as independent and civilized, to have a diminished status, who require the U.S. for protection, civilization, and support (ibid). Indeed, there is not a single treaty which proclaims a nation's independence after the 1800's but rather their racialized character as sub-nationals to a protectorate, benevolent, and powerful empire is clear (Deloria & Lytle 1984). Holm (2005) agrees with Deloria and Lytle's (1984) conclusion that at best most “tribes” accepted or were treated as protectorates, with special rights and privileges most U.S. citizens and groups did not possess which is the language of most U.S. treaties (pp. 197-198). However, the quagmire led him to conclude that indigenous self-determination was an unfulfilled dream of decolonization still unrealized in our current day.

Forbes (1983) says about the concept of the tribe, that it is “a product of colonialism” and further, that “we must also cast aside the effort of modern state apparatuses to create absolute boundaries between so-called nationalities or ethnic communities, because for Indians the structure of human and extra-human relationships is determined in a different way, and I would suggest, a more empirical way”, which he is thinking of specific, lived, kinship-clanship relations of place (p. 2). Elsewhere Forbes (2003) explains that “after the 1850s, indirect rule was usually replaced by direct rule as



most “reservations” were created and placed under the bureaucratic control of the Bureau of Indian affairs. By the 1870s-90s this had become a virtually totalitarian system” (see also Forbes 1979a, p. 6). The “tribe” is a harkened primitivistic term that when used in the constitutional context denotes that tribes are *not* equivalent to states, and are *not* the equivalent of foreign nations such as Spain and they are outside normal jurisdiction to lay and collect taxes upon. This is the only usage of the term tribe in the whole of the constitution or any of its amendments and is clearly attached to the exonym Indian which is used only two other times in the constitution, in reference to taxes and representation in congress, which Indians do not have. Thus, the term “tribe” has always been an externally regulated and enforced concept. It is never applied to whites, Europeans, Christians or akin groups except in a historical sense, which the makers have progressed beyond, it seems. “Indians”, “tribes”, “bands” have been equated with “nations” and “savages” at the same time, unlike Whites or Europeans who may at worst have a few “bad white men” as mentioned in numerous treaties the U.S. says it would protect them against.

Tribes are viewed as political governing bodies, tribes as bound to geographically significant places, tribes as incorporated entities consisting of members, and tribes as cultural nexus points where people convene and commune. These are just some of the many definitions that exist today. Joanne Barker (2015) notes how corporations were constructed to go above and beyond the empires normal ability in order to colonize the Americas while Native Nations were reduced as primitive tribes, unworthy of their homelands which should be confiscated and exploited by superior foreigners. While tribes were treated in the past through imperial sovereignties as able to make contracts or

agreements with states, by 1871, Congress had succeeded in unilaterally disabling their own vested powers by declaring that there were no “independent Indian tribes, nations or power with whom the United States may contract by treaty” which follows the declaration of Chief Justice John Marshall (1832). His rendered opinion in the case of *Worcester v. Georgia* was that Native Nations like the Cherokee were no longer “independent” or “foreign” but rather “domestic dependent nations” (31 U.S. (6 Pet.) 515). This case was antedated by two other cases known together as the Marshall trilogy because of the continuity in the opinions and outcomes perpetuated by Marshall including *Cherokee v. Georgia* (1831) and *Johnson v. McIntosh* (1823). Numerous court decisions and federal statutes colluded with state laws and acts in order to establish the legal precedent that corporations were more legitimate, that is they were legal entities with rights and powers normally granted to persons, and afforded legal protections. Barker shows that by the time of *Santa Clara County v. Southern Pacific Railroad Company* (1886), the presiding Chief Justice Waite said a year before total enforcement of the General Allotment Act, which privatized and sold off communally held lands after a limited number of individuals gained title or whose lands were entrusted into state hands:

The Court does not wish to hear argument on the question whether the provision in the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution which forbids a state to deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws applies to these corporations. We are all of opinion that it does (p. 118, U.S. 397).

The fourteenth amendment was supposed to protect individual person’s rights, not to allow individuals to organize an artificial body (a corporation) and then proceed to give that artifice rights as if it was a person. However, this makes sense when one considers

that corporations were the founding fathers of many U.S., British, French, Dutch colonies-states. This concept then can apply also to a “state”, as an artificially incorporated body imbued with certain inalienable rights. This comes in the face of whole Nations who had their treaty-sanctified lands and obligatory trusts of multiple kinds, including annuity payments, education, and other provisions completely disregarded, and worse, sold off to these same individuals and corporations who now had rights above and beyond even those whose treaties specified their citizenship in the U.S. The Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868 with the Lakota specified for example in Article VI that after allotment “any Indian or Indians receiving a patent for land under the foregoing provisions shall thereby and from thenceforth become and be a citizen of the United States and be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of such citizens, and shall, at the same time, retain all his rights to benefits accruing to Indians under this treaty.” There should have been no question as to whose rights were to be upheld during the General Allotment Act of 1887 whereas out of 148 million acres of land divested from the total reservation and land trust system, only 48 million acres remained in the hands of Native Nationals. Clearly, the Tribe, who in the past could be treated with as a foreign nation, and whose stipulations were to be treated as equal to the Supreme Law of the Land, the Constitution and its amendments, had been reduced to mere tools, or implements of colonization that could be wielded by non-persons, by artificial corporations whose sole profits could be gained off the territorial acquisitions and accessions made upon Tribal groups.

The case of casinos is informative here as federally recognized tribes are able to make compacts with the government in relation to the “commerce clause” of the Constitution. Up until the 1980’s tribes were prosecuted by the government or were

subject to state laws that prohibited gaming. The Indian Gaming and Regulatory Act of 1988 passed in congress to rectify who could perform “Indian gaming” and what was the role of the government, tribes and states. Finding five says, “Indian tribes have the exclusive right to regulate gaming activity on Indian lands if the gaming activity is not specifically prohibited by Federal law and is conducted within a State which does not, as a matter of criminal law and public policy, prohibit such gaming activity”. State recognized tribes do not fit the “Indian tribe” definition but often fit the “Indian lands” definition, demonstrating that the state is the arbiter of recognition. Forbes (2002a) says, “one can argue, in any case, that all state- recognized tribes automatically acquired federal status when the U.S. Constitution was ratified by the states, which thereby voluntarily ceded jurisdiction to the central government over “commerce with the tribes.” The question then, is do tribes have sovereignty, and is it comparable to states? And finally, where do peoples and nations fit as part of a larger imperial context which recognizes colonies and states alongside Indian tribes and Nations, the British Empire and United Kingdom, the French Empire and République Française?

The question of the sovereignty of a people was taken up time and again by Forbes (1970) who for example noted that like self-determination they must be possible and equitable by large or small peoples, with or without the deadliest weaponry, and with or without what Europeans call the “state” or government. If one truly respects peoplehood, one must respect the way its relatives are treated, and further, it suggests that size does not determine strength as much as sex. Holm (2007) suggests that the original societies of all peoples seem to be a kind of “gerontheocracy” (the combination of *gerontocracy* and *theocracy*) so as to suggest that elders were the real leaders while the

young and wealthy would default to these wisdom and knowledge keepers for the preservation of the whole people (p. 55). This stands at odds with imperial notions of leadership which demonstrably enable aggressive male personalities to prevail rather than those with wisdom, persuasion, honor and humility might be recognized as better indicators of a good person.

In Rotinonshonni societies this was quite the norm. Clan mothers who hold the “titles” of leadership make their own decisions about who is a good leader, and the chosen council of 50 male leaders are led by the ultimate faithkeeper from within the central council fire or Onondaga Nations people which are all lifelong positions. These positions are unpaid, and susceptible to scrutiny and removal by the presiding clan mother at any time whose position is followed (Mann 2008; Johansen 2001; Porter 1975). While some argue that the U.S. constitution’s separation of powers, confederation of colonies-states, caucuses and other accoutrements are representative of native American influence, the same can be said of many other ideas and subjects from Marxism-Communism to Christianity and Aspirin, it is clear at least from the continental congresses meeting notes they were acting clearly within an English imperial framework influenced largely from European humanists traditions (Forbes Grinde 1998; Mohawk 1997). Rotinonshonni law is always contextualized as a wampum law, that is, all major agreements are bound onto a symbolic beaded belt, made of stringed quahog shell. There are literally hundreds of treaties-agreements represented on wampum in the past few hundred years, demonstrating that foreign relations and socio-legal compacts are the mainstay of a cohesive confederacy that survives to this day. The elders are the speakers, readers and beaders of the great wampum law. The Hopi’tuwa, and all of the Pueblos of

New Mexico, the Diné and all of the Nations of California and many others represent unique examples where this holds true in some similar and diverse ways. The issue of superiority is paramount when talking about the supposed “rights” and powers of states, for the male kings of Europe coupled with conquistadors and the “universal soldiers” that Buffy St. Marie speaks of remind us that we are talking about must be named again and again. Forbes (1970b) says,

the world is a hodge-podge of arbitrarily-created states including very few democratic societies and still fewer real *nation*-states. The vast majority of states. . . . choose generally to expand their own power at the expense of other groups. As a part of the desire for power (often justified on grounds of “self-defense” or “national interest”) they refuse to rectify artificial boundary lines or to grant autonomy to minorities. In brief, each and every state is in favor of self-determination only to the extent that its power and influence are not diminished thereby (pp. 673-674).

Where does this leave us in considering the realm of sovereignty, of which there is an obvious hierarchy in the world dependent upon state reinforcement to the detriment of thousands of “minorities”. All states really have numerous small nations within them, some on, near and far from their sacred homelands. Original homelands are a key configuration of Peoplehood that State’s do not always adhere to, as they are more closely aligned to monarchist claims of sovereignty over “others” lands. Indeed the term country, which whites are so apt to use today, means originally “against” as in Spanish and Latin *contra*, as in, contraception. Perhaps state and country, enemies’ territories have coalesced into the current tongue of popular sovereignty in white America. The

United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (1994) of which Forbes was a formidable participant and advocate, declares throughout that States are not Indigenous peoples and it is the States whose rights are to be upheld in case of a conflict between the two. Forbes (1998f) argued that it is time for “it is time for First American Nations to be represented in the United Nations, in the General Assembly and on the Security Council, not simply in NGO status (as non-governmental organizations)” (p. 8). Further, he says, “I think it is time that we seriously push the idea that small nations deserve sovereignty and self-rule” and offers some examples:

perhaps we can begin to make a crack in the system of imperialism by pushing for autonomy and UN membership for Native Nations and such oppressed nationalities as the Tibetans, the Kirghiz and Kazakhs of Chinese-occupied Turkestan, the Mongols of Inner Mongolia, and the Kurds of Iraq, Iran, and Turkey. This would include Puerto Rico (which is essentially the Boricua branch of the Taino Nation) (p. 8).

Yet the passage of UNDRIP did not herald any new Nations to be added from the Americas. The fact that Hawaii was at first labeled a non-self-governing territory, that the Navajo Nation has more people than half of the nations represented at the UN, which is still comparably less than other nationalities that do not have direct representation via a State. For example, Article 46 of UNDRIP clearly articulates the inviolability of Statehood:

Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, people, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act contrary to the Charter of the United Nations or construed as authorizing or encouraging

any action which would dismember or impair, totally or in part, the territorial integrity or political unity of sovereign and independent States.

But what about States that dismember or impair sovereign and independent people-nations? Champagne (2013) says the overall limits and language of UNDRIP which is a non-binding, non-enforceable declaration that at least provides a negotiating point perhaps where none have previously existed in an international forum. However, the cynic in him says:

In many ways, UNDRIP treats indigenous peoples either as citizens of nation-states or as ethnic minorities with certain collective political, cultural, and economic rights and historical claims. These positions are not unsurprising, since they are social groupings that nation-states are relatively well equipped to acknowledge and incorporate into the national political and cultural community. UNDRIP, by avoiding a definition of indigeneity and not recognizing political self-government from indigenous nations, has redefined indigenous nations into citizens and ethnic groups. This reclassification or redefinition of indigenous peoples and nations will not satisfy the claims to territory and self-government that indigenous nations throughout the world generally uphold. In fact, indigenous nations make claims to land and self-government that nation-states are reluctant to acknowledge. Indigenous nations may realize some advantages within the UNDRIP frame, but most likely they will not see full indigenous claims to self-government, territory, and cultural autonomy. The UNDRIP solution and implementation can be only a partial solution at best (p. 11).



The United Nations cannot clearly represent Native Nations if they are not included, recognized, and empowered. This would require a restraint of powers and privileges granted the original member states such as veto power.

### *On Peoples Sovereignty and Self-Determination*

I have chosen to foreground this concept because I believe it provides a point of departure, and a foundation from which we can further analyze Forbes ideas. Forbes (1968a) earliest known usage of the term itself, peoplehood, comes from his analysis of California and Nevada Native Nations. Forbes (1973a) next usage describes the distinctions between “races” and peoples. His discussion of the term *mestizo* and its related formations, that of *metis*, hybrid, half-breed, *coyote*, *ladino*, half-blood, *cholo* and other terms which have sprung from European imperialism upon Turtle Island and its Peoples demonstrate the fictive nature of “races” as anything different, or downcast or in reference to being subjugated by superior peoples. He uses the word Peoples consistently which suggests that he understood this paradigm quite well, as it is also the language of the U.S. Constitution, as in the phrase, “we the people.” It is a general term for any population, which also makes it potential stronger than other human-centric terms, or terms which define humans as a completely separate species or race such Nation which is not normally used for other beings, those labeled as animals, or plants in western scientific terms today (although providing the definition for Nature, as well).

Outside of the English and Indo-European origins of the term, if we look at traditional conceptions of peoplehood from the Americas, we find there are many different ideas that can be associated with it, each valid in their respective frameworks,

languages and relationships. Important for his own conception is the equation of these terms with comparable others, such as nationhood or Nation and American and Sovereignty. The purpose of clarification here is that these terms in and of themselves are not the generative ones derived from traditional conceptions but rather, these are merely, the closest relatives shared by colonizing groups. In line with this kind of analysis, one needs to merely look at the numerous conceptions found among peoples of California such as the Payomkawichum (Luiseno) who maintain throughout their stories and worldview the other beings which they live amongst, who Europeans call animals and plants, are People too, akin to themselves (Hyde & Elliot 1988, p. 261). In Kanien'kéha and Onöndowa'ga:', the terms *Onkwehonwe* and *Ögwé'ö:weh* denote “real earth or original people”, and are used only for Indian people, yet all life is deemed intelligent and imbued with an equal spirit-power or *orenda*. In this way, kinship and family are derivatives of the original kinship structure of their world, one in which, specific creatures have helped them become Payomkawichum or Kanien'kéha, with one reason being, that they are considered much older and wiser. Thus, Peoplehood in traditional terms is not limited to humans, or we at least admit for every People, a different conception and possibly many varying conceptions. Indigenous conceptions of Peoplehood, of “we the people” would never have been limited to white's, to men, to even the five-fingered or *Onkwehonwe*, and would never have excluded dark-skinned or light-skinned peoples as separate or distinct other than white human, and in fact, would never have separated other creatures or beings into lesser-thans, deprived of their rights to life, liberty, property or the pursuit of happiness. In Eurocentric frameworks non-humans

cannot have “sovereignty” and “rights”, “tribes of Indians” have “limited sovereignty” and the U.S. and recognized “states” have unlimited sovereignty (Holm 2005, p. 198).

The result of recasting traditional conceptions of Peoplehood is that there is a grave admission here, that the Constitution of the U.S. or “CanAmerica” (Canada-America) as Lee Maracle (1996) calls two bedmates, clearly reflects a specific peoples view of others without even saying it, one that deprives and has deprived most creatures of the world of Nationhood and Peoplehood. Thus, the law of the state says “we the people” but doesn’t mean all peoples because white males are the imagined “people”, or were by its founders, the ones with the original defined status and privileges, which omitted queens, Native Nations and other Peoples-creatures. The problem with “we the people” -hood is that difference is not recognized as a prerequisite for Nationhood because this would undermine the project of the U.S. While the U.S. claims to be a Nation, it is not, because a Nation is a People. The U.S. is a State, or rather a confederation of states, all ratified by white men who devised constitutions and agreements together. These states were originally chartered corporations commissioned by the United Kingdom, *Imperio Español*, the *Empire Français* and others. The original empires gained their status primarily through claims to a divine right of kingship or godhead and were monarchies first and foremost, investing in what Morgan (1989) calls “the old fiction, the divine right of kings”, now a new “state” of relations established by their creator via their representative on earth (p. 15). Sovereignty only makes sense in this original and continuous tradition, whose meaning has always been defined in relation to the above organizations of power, powers which maintained themselves by violence, terror and theft. Sovereignty, from Old French *soverain*, and Vulgar Latin *superanus*,

meaning “overlord, principal, superior, master, ruler” has as its prime root *super* “over, above, higher” with an attached noun stem *anus* that makes it an adjective, as in *Romanus, Christianus, Montanus, Paganus* all terms to denote people of a place, a religion, etc.. Sovereignty is a term now monopolized by the “State” which assumes an imperial functionary, always protecting its right to rule as it transformed from kingship, to empire and statehood.

Forbes (1970b) assumes that the “state” and “sovereignty” are actually synonymous, providing this comparative definition which shows their relationship to each other:

It is ironic that while some sectors of mankind feel competent to undertake the task of discovering new worlds, other groups of human beings must continue to grapple with one of man's oldest and most difficult problems, that of defining the concept of the “state” (sovereign governmental unit) so as to insure the well-being and self-realization of the “nation” (ethnic group or nationality) to which they belong (p. 670).

The Nation or the People, the population or populace, the ethnic and the folk group, the race, these are at least terms which specify a group of beings who stick together through time and in places. The sovereign on the other hand is not a traditional term of familiarity to treaty-making Indians except in the specific personas as the Great Father, a person they may someday meet, unlike the sovereigns of Europe who had never stepped foot in America (Prucha 1984). It definitely is not a term applied American Indian Nations or tribes. Article II of many treaties provides this basic understanding as first presented in a Treaty with the Wyandot in 1785, “The said Indian nations do acknowledge themselves

and all their tribes to be under the protection of the United States and of no other sovereign whatsoever” (Koppler 1904, p. 7). A Treaty with the Creek Nation in 1790 provides a few other stipulations such as this Article II:

The undersigned Kings, Chiefs and Warriors, for themselves and all parts of the Creek Nation within the limits of the United States, do acknowledge themselves, and the said parts of the Creek nation, to be under the protection of the United States of America, and of no other sovereign whosoever; and they also stipulate that the said Creek Nation will not hold any treaty with an individual State, or with individuals of any State (Koppler 1904, p. 25).

The U.S. has imbued itself with a state sovereignty that although a super-state providing protecting and taking care of its local nations, offers them the flowery of “kingships”, Forbes “cacique”-ship, in order to entice the signers into actually believing them. The letter of the law is quite clear on this arbitrary assumption of power and inequality. The doctrine of discovery which claims the basic will of empire, the act of discovery and claiming itself was enough to curtail the sovereignty of those whose lands its claimed. The doctrine could be repealed but another reason will be used as justification, such as the actual invasion and war upon Native Nations, which shows both the nature of the state to be built on those terroristic attributes but also the view that Native Nations are “reduced” to less than through violence. When the word sovereign is not used in the variously placed treaty articles, it is replaced with other terms such as “nation” and “power”, or all three as in the Treaty with the Pawnee Republic in 1818 (Koppler 1904, p. 74, 112, 138, 158). After 1824, the term “sovereign” is not even used in any treaty to define the U.S., as it is imagined internally that they are a new American Empire whose

sovereignty is unrivalled, and unquestioned in their role as protectors and caretakers. All of the 18 unratified treaties of California made between 1851-1852 open with an akin declaration of “sole and absolute sovereign” status of the U.S. While acknowledging Native Nations as accessible by treaty, these are not the only agreements made or the only ones in effect, they are simply the only ones recognized by the self-proclaimed “absolute sovereign”, the United Empire of Colonial-States. Native Nations have long established agreements, compacts, treaties, and socio-legal relationships prior to and throughout the imperial age in America (Fadden 1972; Simpson 2008).

The development of sovereignty from an imperial view makes sense when paired with racial sovereignty or superiority, and patriarchy. The U.S. established a special kind of empire, one not rooted on the divine right of kings (patriarchy) but on the divine right of whiteness (still patriarchal). White male supremacy is the new “state sovereignty”. As a unified vampiric group it wields political power principally in control of the territories of Indian Nations, and while private servitude of African and American persons was the early and forging rule, it was jettisoned for a greater goal: the preservation of the union of colonial states, the empire. Using Forbesian analysis we can dissect the nature of Empire using Peoplehood-Nationhood as our framework for analyzing how empires, states and nation-states of the European tradition has captured the world's 5,000 Nations and more than 7,000 languages (not including dialects) into a total of 195 recognized states. All of these “states” have standing armies, constitutions, and have passed through the fires of empire in their development. What are they, if not the People themselves? How do they survive? And, what do they mean for the purpose of education in our communities is the purpose of the next chapter.

## Ch. 6: (anti)Colonialism, (anti)Imperialism and Indigenous Resistance

*Imperialism* refers to the broad process whereby a people or a state apparatus (a government) seeks to impose its will upon others. *Colonialism* usually refers to the technique whereby imperialism is imposed. Colonialism and imperialism usually are thought of as something that takes place as a part of foreign affairs, overseas, or with aliens. That is ordinarily true but we have to keep in mind that in many ways there is a significant and close relationship between the exploitation of classes within a society and the exploitation of people that live outside a society. That is, it is very rare for a society that does not have internal exploitation along class lines to become an imperialistic society. Most societies that go out to exploit other people are already exploiting their own people before they start. There is a close relationship to exploitation within a society and exploitation outside. I don't think colonialism can be sharply or completely separated from exploitation of peasants, exploitation of workers, exploitation of women and children and so on and so forth within a stratified society (that is, within a society that has class lines. Almost all empires have been those kinds of societies). (pps. 29-30, from Forbes (1974b)).

“I have come to the conclusion that *imperialism and exploitation are forms of cannibalism and, in fact, are precisely those forms of cannibalism which are most diabolical or evil*” (Forbes 2008a, p. 24, emphasis original).

## *Introduction*

Forbes (1963) early complained in with regards to the study of American history, that White “historians discriminate against the native American” primarily because their myopic view is enveloped in a “conqueror-consciousness” and a “racial consciousness” rooted in a Euro-Asian imperial traditions (p. 349). Put simply, you cannot understand Anowarakowa or America without centralizing the real and only Americans for 99% of its living history and memory, and to not do so is a purposeful attempt to leave the imperial view as central rather than marginal (Forbes 1974a; Forbes 1974b). To view America from a particular imperial lens (Spanish, English, French, Dutch, Protestant, Catholic, etc.), offers a wholly incomplete view. The origin story of the U.S. is at odds with the story of America says Forbes. The ethnocentric views developed such as being an East Coast (English) origin, or Southern (Spanish) skew, a Bering Strait “hunch”, or now in schools we find the inclusive view of “multicultural America” that ends at the U.S. current borders and attempts to include current “ethnics” and “oppressed” (Sleeter 2018). A recent online version of an article by educator Christine Sleeter (2018) on “Immigration and White People’s History” was given the classic, smug “naturalization” response by a sole commenter who reveals utilizes a white imperial “rationalization” (Jones 1909):

My ancestors, colonials all, did not come here legally. They were components of a military conquest of other people’s lands. The natives fought back, we won. End of story. That is what human beings have been doing to one another all over this planet since at least the early neolithic. That is what we are supposed to do. The people migrating here today are supposed to be doing that, and we are supposed



to be resisting them. The very existence of distinct ethnic groups is absolute proof of that process. We should be proud of our own and wish to see it be demographically dominate [sic] into the future. It is the oldest, most time tested, universally accepted form of human behavior in all of history. We are not supposed to feel guilty or bad about it in any way at all. We are supposed to be proud of it. And should be. I am. There was absolutely nothing wrong with Europeans taking lands away from other people who in most cases had taken that same land away from some earlier group. I do not feel even the slightest emotional angst of any kind over the issue and neither should anyone else. Stop letting yourself be emotionally black-mailed over this kind of nonsense (see link to Sleeter 2018).

This is what the white male imperialist rationale promotes towards discussion of current imperial conditions, as if the “universally accepted form of human behavior”, consisting of invasion, exploitation, torture, terrorism and genocide of “non-combatants”, of families, was uniform in its appearance amongst queens-women, among other Peoples in the Americas and elsewhere. Or, is it as Forbes alludes to, a pathology of particular groups of people in successive generations? Calls for extermination of Indians are found in U.S., Mexican and Canadian newspapers well into the 20th century, and have been replaced by new calls to exterminate other kinds of peoples and forms of life (Bakersfield Californian 1929; Huron Daily Times 1909; Oakland Tribune 1926; ). George Bush Jr.’s call to “eliminate the terrorist parasites” rings similar to prior media surrounding the “merciless Indian savages” of Bacon’s Rebellion and the Declaration of Independence

(Bush 2002). Is there a deeper connection? Do we have the language to describe this kind of behavior?

### *Imperialism and Colonialism 101*

Forbes (1978a) contests that there a number of key areas from which imperialism takes root and causes havoc on a person and on a people. He provides a few instances where he speaks about imperialism specifically, what it is, who spreads it and how, and what its infection looks like when applied to Native Nations. First, there is the mind-heart-spirit, symbolized as thought. Close to this is a person or people's identity, their sense of relationships and nationality. Next is their way of talking and sharing information most notably via language. This in turn complicates a person's understanding of the present and the past, or history. Ceremonial and governing traditions, clanship-kinship relations with other peoples and life are replaced, complicated, distorted, destroyed, misshapen, co-opted, or eliminated. How one relates to specific places, to the land in general, to the agreements and original instructions are challenged and manipulated. Imperialism is spread by individuals and by groups, by words and actions, by the sword and cross, by paper and pen. Imperialism literally cuts across all lines of distinction and locations. Core to an imperial ideology and person, at the foundation of an empire way of life, is the conception of the superior being or state. This sense of superiority results in a rash of replete actions upon others such as terrorism and murder, servitude and abuse, control and captivity, theft and deceit, etc..., simply because they can get away with it, now they don't feel wrong about their actions. They feel righteous, they

feel justified, they feel even more powerful, and in turn, unstoppable. Forbes says this is the long-term result of male, Christian, and militant societies.

Forbes (1967a) pointed out early in his scholarly and educational career that the United States, is a consolidation of politically powerful groups not a nation, or a single people:

The United States is a state (a sovereign political unit), but it is not yet a nation (a single nationality or ethnic unit). It has always been a multi-ethnic state dominated by one group, the English-speaking “white” majority. The United States is also composed of many different religious groups, socioeconomic classes and subdivisions (p. 51).

And further, I argue that the U.S. is an empire because of its attempts to develop an “empire of liberty,” and essentially attempts to falsely “liberate” other Nations territories because of self-righteousness and a profound conception of supremacy or superiority. Forbes notes some historical examples that demonstrate how the U.S. came to embody and be embolden by a smug sense of superiority, by an arrogance that is almost unrivaled today:

The United States has, almost from the very beginning of its existence, possessed a messianic fixation with its own superiority and destiny. For example, an editorial of 1845 asserted that “we the American people, are the most independent, intelligent, moral and happy people on the face of the earth.” (ibid, p. 41).

Key to understanding our situation today, Forbes had long examined the present political situation throughout his lifetime and gives us barometers to identify our current situation with:

The Radical Right's success in the United States in great measure rests upon a widespread feeling that America's destiny has been thwarted (in this case, by Communists). Many Anglo-Americans, nourished by the mythology of superiority, cannot comprehend foreign policy failures nor can they understand the coolness or hostility of other peoples towards the United States (ibid, p. 43).

Sound familiar? Ring a bell? During the invasion of Iraq in 2003, Forbes responded amidst many public pronouncements that the U.S. was an empire abusing its power and utilizing Iraq as an exploitable colony, rich with fossil fuels. He framed his understanding of the "new U.S. empire" to be rooted in an ancient imperial process whereby "many historic empires have not always used "direct rule" as their operational mode. The Romans, for example, allowed Herod to serve as King of Palestine and the British allowed Egypt to exist as a monarchy under British "protection." The British also had many "native states" in India and elsewhere, under British control, but not ruled directly". Further he explains the local origins of the "US Empire commenced in the 1780s when Washington attempted to assert control over several American nations including the Creek-Muscogee Confederacy, the United Ohio Nations, and the Cherokee Nation." The Creek for example he writes were turned "from an independent sovereignty into a US protectorate and semi-colony" not unlike other native "American republics" who "were gradually brought under US domination or "indirect rule" as the US sought to exclude French, Spanish, and British traders, sought to promote dependence upon US traders and

trading houses, sought to obtain domination over weak chiefs (by means of alcohol, bribes, and/or intimidation), and placed US citizens within the tribes as farmer-instructors, missionaries, and agents.” Key to imperialism was to use either direct or indirect rule according to the situation. He writes, “thus we may fear that Iraq, with its oil reserves, will also become a US colony, eventually run by a clique of wealthy Iraqis placed in power by the Bush administration and “protected” by US military bases “in-country” or close by. There are many kinds of empires. The US has often found it to be cheaper to dominate a country through indirect rule, rather than to shoulder the costs of direct rule.” Troops remained in Iraq until 2011, then were re-engaged in 2014 and as of July 2018, there were at least 5,000 U.S. troops still in Iraq. President Trump issued a travel ban on Iraqi citizens in 2018, while U.S. citizens can travel to Iraq.

Key to imperialism today, and rooted in the previous chapter’s discussion, the specific superiority complex we are dealing with is “white supremacy” or “white power” which has long been complimented by “male supremacy” and “manpower”. Further, we can identify that before this, the imperialist man, the supreme being, identified himself as greater than other forms of life, and proceeded to capture, abuse and terrorize other creatures, their homelands and waters. Forbes notes that while “white supremacy” or light-skinned persons were basically superior, if this distinction wasn’t enough to solve the matter, a range of “cultural superiority” emblems were identified which leads us back to the specific peoples who came to identify as “white”, the Anglo-Saxon (Forbes 1978a, p. 43). Reginald Horseman (1981) says this identification as a master race who was already imbued with culturally superior qualities was manifest principally through a neo-scientific paradigm: racism, or the belief of separate, superior and inferior species of

people (p. 4). The origins of the superior and inferior complex that helped develop imperial nations was principally based upon cultural signals and characteristics which is where the terms *savage* (Latin *salvaticus* “forest people”) and *barbarian* (Greek *barbaros* which was used to describe the Amazighs whose language was unintelligible and therefore, inferior) come from and are still in use today. They are now used to describe any person or people that does not fit into the imperial vision of the universe, anyone who goes against the grain, or among our current children’s generation, it is being used to describe something “awesome” or “cool” as in “that’s savage” which is trying to reference the stereotype of “uncivilized, uncontrolled, wild or lawless” performance. Other labels Forbes shows are dangerous to a healthy identity, such as Civilization, is because they are really cultural constructs of the lawful citizen, the average imperial subject who follows the rules set forth within the empire yet condones egregious acts of violence, terrorism, genocide and ecocide on their own and other peoples and places.

Empire is a way of life itself, an ideology, a religion, a story of itself, and rulership by and for a few people, such as a royal family or propertied voting group, and as every group it names itself, as Whites. Politically, they are represented to the world and its subjects as the United States of America, but as discussed with regards to the politics of recognition and representation and the sense of “natural sovereignty” being an “internal conviction” of a group, whites began their imperial project of naming and claiming themselves at the local level first, in homes and in farmed fields, churches and on horseback as superior beings, pursuing their only god’s divine providence as white people, an imperial spawn. Lipset’s (1963) study of the “new nation” concluded that it was formulated not in a day or night but over time and “it was from this crucible of

confusion and conflict that values and goals became defined, issues carved out, positions taken, in short an identity established. For countries, like people, are not handed identities at birth, but acquire them through the arduous process of “growing up,” a process which is a notoriously painful affair” (p. 1). Painful indeed was American and African servitude, for without them, whites would have not become so color conscious and so color-blind so as to admit that one’s values and religion allow genocide and terror but call it civilization and patriotism (Dunbar-Ortiz 2014; Reséndez 2016; Takaki 1984; Zinn 2005). Now that whites have allowed others to participate in their political system, they have only one escape route left: to maintain power in every other realm while eroding the power of the legal system to affect dramatic unwanted changes to actual relations and access to resources. The system was built to acquire resources originally, “life, liberty and property” in its original declaration which also cited, like Bacon’s Rebellion, that it was necessary to fight the “merciless Indian Savages whose known rule of warfare, is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions” with a stable war-making institution (Atwood 2010; Dunbar-Ortiz 2014; Weigley 1973). Indeed, the empire has remained hidden since it first expressed itself as a new Rome, an “empire of liberty” so much that in 1914, Lindsay Garrison, the current Secretary of War, he advised that “the word “colony” must not be used to express the relationship which exists between our Government and its dependent peoples,” meaning in particular “overseas” territories but which had been the unofficial policy at an earlier date in its oppression of Native Nations (p.60). This relationship might tie the United Colonies of 1776 to the new United Empire (UE), one closely allied with the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, France, Germany,

Israel and generally, the European Union (EU) which are the white dominant states of the world and considered empires by all up until recently.

Forbes et al (1972) offers his own example of how imperialism and white power have approached the Indian in his introductory treatise titled “Why D-QU”, saying succinctly that white people, corporations and states are still inculcated in an imperial nexus of theft and murder which continues to privilege whites as the arbiters, owners and the most powerful group in the U.S., if not globe:

A society that does not give intrinsic value to human beings, a society that approves of genocide, cannot prevent the rise of violence within the society. A society that conquers Indians and Chicanos, and which seeks to justify such aggression intellectually and morally, has no ethical or psychological defense against violence and “crime”. If it is “okay” for whites to steal Indian land and keep the stolen property (as is true today), without returning any of it, then it is “okay” for any man to steal from another. “Power” becomes the only arbiter of morality. If it is “okay” to kill Indians (and if the “movies” justify it every day) then it is “okay” for any man to kill another. “Power” alone determines whether a killing is “legal” or “illegal” (p. 4-5).

Imperialist rule provides the superiority-militaristic framework, while colonialism is a method of settlement-replacement who depend upon religious and cultural education and catechesis at in and beyond stolen territories to continue the original mission. This is but one strand in the greater nexus and matrix of power he is getting at. Scott DeMuth (2012) argues that “colonization is always war”, but I feel more precisely, “imperialism is always war” while colonization can be done by plants as much as people just as



education can be done by anyone (p. 59). There is a struggle, a negotiation, even competition, but this does not preclude continuous warfare as the universal rule of life. This is an old internal European debate, one derived from the onset of an imperial infection which has reduced the question of violence and terrorism to two opposing arguments raised during their “renaissance” by Hobbes and Rousseau, from which Cunliffe (2006) summarizes this way: “for Hobbes, man has the natural capacity for violence but is constrained by social convention [or covenants] and strong leadership; for Rousseau, man is by nature non-violent but is led to violence by unnatural social constraints” (p. 64). Howard Zinn quotes a Washington Post editorial during the Spanish-U.S. war in 1898 which summarizes the consistent hunger for war as the basis of empire-building this way:

A new consciousness seems to have come upon us—the consciousness of strength—and with it a new appetite, the yearning to show our strength. . . . Ambition, interest, land hunger, pride, the mere joy of fighting, whatever it may be, we are animated by a new sensation. We are face to face with a strange destiny. The taste of Empire is in the mouth of the people even as the taste of blood in the jungle (as quoted in Zinn 2015, p. 299).

Traditional stories speak of the range of actions available at any given time by people includes the response of revenge, of blood for blood and eye for an eye as one possibility amongst others given the agreements and values of the people, but nowhere have I heard of a single story which glorifies the outright killing of whole peoples, places, and traditions. The prospect of battling people-eaters (cannibals) or becoming one is real, but nowhere is it expressed so openly that people-eaters deserve death as a matter of

course. Onöndowa'ga:' and Kanien'kehá:ka stories surely are riddled with tales of murderous and deceitful persons but nowhere are the Neutrals or Anishinaabe, or any people or any creature regarded as worthy of extermination. As captives, once unequal power relations are established over a group, the next step is to establish them within the group, through a long-term strategy of internal colonization which is really the same warlike process magnified. It takes practice to perfect the art of war, internally and externally. White, European, and Christian histories as presented to students in the classroom depict quite the opposite. How does a once resistant person or people become susceptible to imperial and colonial designs? How does this become an internalized reality? This chapter seeks to explicate how Forbes understood the “colonial problem” and the “imperial imperative” which despite public U.S. and European efforts at decolonization since the early 1800's and especially since the United Nations formation which put decolonization on the political menu, the “global American empire” as Williams (2016) has called it, has grown in power and stature. As living members of the oldest resistance to the empire, it is vital that we continue this struggle from within its bowels, our only homeland.

### *Internal-imperialism and colonialism*

Chávez (2011) explains that internal colonialism theory “seeks to explain the subordinate status of a racial or ethnic group in its own homeland within the boundaries of a larger state dominated by a different people” (p. 786). Internal forms of imperialism and colonialism are as vast as the empires and subject people's matrices can be conceived as they entail totalities rather than segmented entities. It is brought about by first securing

the boundaries of resistance and nationalism, such as within a bounded space, such as a reservation, or within the reach of a police or military state (Adams 1995; Forbes 1978a; Thomas 1969). Throughout the period of large-scale resistance which preceded this state of envelopment, native leadership and individuals are constantly infiltrated, manipulated, bought off and used in order to advance the imperial acquisition of land and power (González Casanova 1963; González Casanova 1965; González Casanova 1978). This process is supremely intensified once free peoples are subject every day to the state's laws and the repercussions of resistance through terror and violence. Forbes (1978a) says the imperial state will

try to bring about a situation where the conquered people control themselves. This is the key to destroying the native mind and the native society. What happens, of course, is that the caciques, or the native leadership, have to be bribed and sucked away from their people and integrated where possible into the colonial structure so that native leadership - instead of serving the Native people - becomes part of the colonial administration (p. 104).

While there is some leeway in terms of the power of the native leadership such as in tribal councils, this is heavily monitored by external groups especially the U.S. government because resource extraction is an ongoing process, and it will not cease until the people give in. For example, most treaties stipulate that an agent is appointed as overseer of the reservation community and is the go-between for the federal government. So while tribal councils have been modified in many ways since their original creations beginning in the 1920's (band councils in Canada) as with Navajo Nation's formation of a Business and later, a Tribal Council, a majority still do the work of controlling the

population by creating their own police and adopting imperial laws and practices such as single-sex or monogamous marriage, allowing or not allowing alcohol while prohibiting other federally sanctioned “drugs”, allowing mining, timber, water, and other resource extraction companies to operate or opening their own destructive operations, enforcing mandatory state and federal public schooling attendance laws whether it’s on or off the reservation, the allowing of external churches and religious groups to proselytize, etc.. Internal colonialism consists most visually when peoples adopt the external measures of control and transformation, terrorism and “law” and take these over themselves, giving them new names and life. It is difficult to discern internal imperialism from total social transformation or becoming a new people because imperialism is in and of itself a kind of freak experiment which destroys life in order to empower its own. Every human society or people will have ongoing resistance or seemingly obstinate traditionalists in their midst because of this fact.

Forbes (1978a) says resistance to the whim and will of empire is performed by destroying all aspects of indigenous independence such that,

the Native religion, the Native institutions - such as men’s societies, religious fraternities - all of these kinds of things have to be destroyed because they are all potential centers for rebellion and resistance. *And every potential center of resistance ultimately has to be shattered* (p. 104, emphasis original).

Everyone should keep in mind that religious freedom is a U.S. constitutional right that was never extended to Native Nations despite being considered “domestic dependent nations” since the 1830’s and after 1924, full-fledged U.S. citizens regardless of their birth origin or status (Talbot 2006; Tinker ). It was not until the passage of the American

Indian Religious Freedom Act in 1978 that any kind of legal protection was afforded to Native Nationals, and even then, if there was a conflict with imperial laws and those laws adopted by sensitive tribal councils, such as in the case of peyote use and the Native American Church, members were still prosecuted for many years not counting the lack of protected status for the plant-medicine. Thus resistance is quelled to the greatest possible extent internally while resource extraction is pursued. The end goal is to include the creation of a usable native labor pool or proletariat which predominantly participates in all of the imperial endeavors, now, voluntarily. Forbes (1991) calls this entire process “envelopment” as opposed to development. He says this is the most important process that attacks Native people directly and “this proletarianization is the process of creating a cheap wage or no wage workforce, either urban or rural . . . [and will reap] all the cheap labor that is not only demanded by colonial systems but makes the colonial system comfortable for those that rule it”, and this process of displacement and forcing “Native people off the land so that the conqueror can get the land and then so that there will be a landless mass” will, like the first kinds of servitude in the United Colonies, simply consume the lives of those who work for it. The ruling caste will not perform the work such as found at the Kayenta mine, as found at every rich white person’s home doing all the cleaning and landscaping, or working in the agricultural fields, on their former lands of those recently displaced (p. 104). In those communities that do not have a land base to access for food, ceremony, or to be active caretakers, there are few opportunities to work on behalf of your people, maintain your language, ceremonies or traditions, and participate in nation rebuilding. Relocation efforts of the 1940’s, 50’s and 60’s successfully moved many peoples who had never left their reservation-based

communities or homelands into urban industrial cities where they were trained for these specific positions, further exacerbating the problem as more people live off their homelands than ever before. Without a land base, as Deloria, Thomas and Forbes have suggested, a people cannot survive long as a unified people because they cannot continue to develop freely and in unison, but are constantly subject to the whim of outsiders, their laws, institutions and ideas. Black scholars readily took to the “internal colonial” and “internal imperial” paradigms such as Du Bois and the Black Panther Party’s leadership. Blauner (1969) saw that landlessness was at the root of Black ghettoization and the creation of an internal colony subject to the whims of imperial markets and machinations. Clark’s (1965) analysis was that “the dark ghettos are social, political, educational, and—above all—economic colonies” (p. 11). Almaguer (1971) notes for Chicanos the “caste-racial” nature of the internal-colonial relations and conditions explains how

control of the colonias and the barrios still comes from the outside. The Chicano largely remains unable to determine how things will be done in his own community. All the major institutions that directly affect the lives of the Chicano population remain in the hands of the colonizer (p. 18).

Without being able to perpetuate their own Nationality and destiny, people are subject to the white imperial forces of racialization and castization, of envelopment rather than internal development, whereby they are unable to enter U.S. society as equals with whites, and instead are forced to adopt an inferior place in an exploitive society. Forbes describes this process clearly (1979b) when he explains that

these are all systems to take Native nationalities and destroy them and replace them with systems of ranking where everyone is graded on the degree which they

have white blood or the degree to which they imitate European culture. So, if you are lighter you are closer to the top although there are exceptions as when you're darker, but imitate closely the culture of the ruling group. And, of course, in all of the Empires, they always provide a way for the most aggressive people from the lower ranks to push their way toward the top although never reaching the top (p. 105).

The election of president Barack Obama is an interesting test case for the U.S. for as Bell (2009) prophesized upon his election, "if he fails, those of us who look like him better prepare for a return to the past", our current present (p. 5). All in all, Obama did not drastically alter or challenge the most basic foundations of the U.S. empire: he went to war on multiple occasions, he continued to support corporate resource extraction on Native lands, he even went so far as to bail out corporations when they failed to survive on their own, and so on and so forth. Racism is on the rise. Worldwide land, water & air pollution and desecration are only advancing at alarming rates and are predominantly caused by so-called First World states like the U.S., China, Soviet Union, the European Union, and India, who together own half the world's lands and a majority of the people. Native Nations have been unable to uphold any of their treaty rights or negotiate new ones after 1871 and the few court cases identified as victories such as those representing fishing rights also give 50% of those rights to the state and to non-Indians even if there are only two fish in the waters. Indigenous languages and traditions are losing their homes within community speakers while non-Native persons are acquiring them as well as their lands and resources. Imperialism is an ongoing shape-shifting process (Alfred 2014; Alfred & Corntassel 2005). Rome rose and fell but regrew out of Constantinople,

and then rebounded in the Ottoman, Spanish, Portuguese, British, French, Italian, Dutch, U.S., Canada and other empires.

The knowledge base of imperialism and colonialism, religion and identity is rooted in what Forbes (1979b) calls “European Science”, which since the 1700’s invented “whites” and “blacks”, invented “germs” and “microorganisms” (tiny life), invented all kinds of weapons of mass destruction, invented a new empire, invented new stories and myths such as the Bering Strait hunch, invented “capitalism” and “industrialization”, invented new religions such as “Scientology” and “Mormonism”, reinvented “Christian civilization” and then “Western civilization” and then “white civilization” and so on. Imperial science now forms the foundation of all knowledge production in the realm of education, from pre-k to Ph.D. Forbes (1979b) argues that this is the ultimate test of the will to empire because it is the most structured and widespread industry in the U.S. and world (also Forbes 1979e). The ability to transform people into “willing workers”, into “educators” of imperialism, into “scientists” of exploitation, into the new missionaries of Christianity, imperialism and capitalism is a profound move and stage. Perhaps it is the end stage. Forbes (1979b) points out that imperial and European ways of educating people are unique because education is an essential tool of the imperial caste system:

. . . education is a tool for upward mobility and for the acquisition of wealth. That is why most students go to college in the United States and in Mexico: because they live in a socially stratified society where it is not perceived as being good to be down at the bottom. College provides an opportunity to get certain kind[s] of tools that will allow you to make more money. Now that is not the only reason, of course, why individuals are in higher education but that, I think, is the over-riding



perspective. But I think from the traditional perspective of education in the Americas, *the most important question in education is how one lives in this life in an ethical sense, in a spiritual sense.* In fact, all other questions of education are insignificant in relation to what the ancient Mexican people call “acquiring a face” (p. 107, emphasis original).

Within an imperial setting, education cannot be Nationalistic unless it seriously distinguishes itself, and severs many of its relationships from the centers of power, influence and control. This is part of the greatest issue with transformative education models is that if they do not question the imperial nexus and in turn, unplug themselves from the matrix such as through federal funding and teaching core imperial science and social subjects unchanged or unchallenged. Ethical values, spiritual development, the acquiring of a righteous or resistance identity or character, the development of an allegiance to your Nation or territory, the sole focus upon your National language is not wholly supported. The few opportunities that do exist will be described in the final chapter so as to continue this discussion upon what a decolonizing philosophy of education in practice looks like from those who are making headway down this long road of struggle. First, we must deal with the monsters in the room, our own minds. Internalized imperialism and colonialism are also not simply a set of material conditions and relationships far beyond our grasp. It also refers to the ways we both have become our own kind of imperialists, how we rationalize our conditions, how we have adopted imperial institutions, and how we ourselves adopt an empire state of mind.

### *Mental Decolonization and Anti-Imperial Thought*

The first and most important element of a decolonization or deimperialization according to Forbes is, as a living, breathing, thinking being, we need to take control of our bodies and actions. This is manifest for Forbes like so many acts of creation, it begins with thought. Forbes (1998) performed a radio interview alongside Jan Carew on the topic of Africa and Decolonization and he had this to say about the struggle we are up against in terms of mental decolonization:

So one of my objectives is to help people to liberate themselves, to open things up. And to do that it's quite clear that you have to kind of start being skeptical about what has been given to us. And to me this is an extremely exciting task of discovery then, of trying to set aside the dominant paradigms and see what the historical evidence really will give you if you just let it flow out onto the table in front of you. In other words instead of trying to organize it ahead of time, you let the evidence you know flow out and organize itself and you look at the picture and see what it's all about ("Decolonization, Africans and Native Americans by Jack Forbes, 05/28/94 KPFA" in D-046, B. 191).

As a historian, he understood that the practice of deductive logic, which reduces thought to a linear, downhill or uphill process of progression/regression was limited. He also understood that after a certain point in a person's life, a person has developed or accepted a paradigm, a cage or sphere of thought, worldview, cosmology, ontology, allegiance, a language and system of reasoning or logic from which all other ideas are tested against. Viola Cordova's concept of "windows" or "frames" is a people's worldview, cosmology and ontology (see also Wilson 2006). The boarding school progenitors clearly understood

this which is why they insisted that Native children should be taken from their families as early as possible, before they had developed their view as one of the people, replete with all of the paradigmatic beliefs, language, practices, laws, and thought that a paradigm nurtures (DeJong 1993; Hoxie 2001). Every creature develops a concept of itself and then becomes what it should be based on this understanding. We see this very clearly in how people train their dogs to eat dog food out of a bowl rather than hunt for their food. A dog, if left with other dogs will adopt and learn how to be a different kind of being, one which is adept at a certain kind of living and thinking produced within a dog group-culture much unlike how people often teach their dogs to think and act. And on another extreme, we teach dogs to kill people, to hunt down brown bodies, to sniff out cocaine and marijuana, to heed the voice of one master, or to submit to random strangers touching them, etc. These are all teachings from a particular view of the world which is reproduced in another being. This is learned behavior. It can also be unlearned. Yet, unlearning is not quite the right concept because you don't undo anything. You move on, you heal, you change, you fix or repair it, but do you forget? We never forget. Abused dogs, like abused people are traumatized and it is very hard to heal the wounds, to get rid of the fear and anxiety, to dispel the terror which still in all reality may exist the next moment and is beyond your control.

Forbes (1979b) says "in order to proceed with mental and spiritual liberation, we must first identify some of the key areas in which colonialism has distorted our thinking," we need to take stock of these problems, to identify exactly the sides, the gaps, the anchors and roots, the cloudy and foggy aspects of our thinking and behavior (p. 102). One of these core ideas is related to identifying the "boundaries" of our thinking, and the

bounds and bonds of imperial-colonialism. The concept of “critique” is important here. It does not mean to simply be judgmental or negative, these are reactionary perspectives to the art of critical thinking. Various languages maintain its original conception such as current day Gaeilge (Irish) *criathar* “sieve, riddle, sift”, also *critic*, Modern Irish *críoch* “limit, boundary”, Middle Irish *crich* “border”, Deutsche *critick*, Latin *criticus*, Greek *kritikos* “able to make judgements”, from *kreinin* “to separate, to decide” or applied in Greek as *kritike tekhnē* “the critical art”. Further, there is also the concept or use of “clear thinking”. John Mohawk (2010) describes clear thinking as rooted in a number of ways of thinking about the world from an Onöndowa'ga: / Seneca and Rotinonshonni perspective as related in the creation story, the Great Law, the Words before all else, and other core “texts” or “original instructions”. At the root of clear thinking is a humble respect for all life. Next is a humble intelligence which respects that the world is sacred and mysterious, that it's complex and deep, that it's alive and intelligent, and powerful. He says of the great mystery, “we should never be so arrogant to think that we can understand even a little bit of it” (p. 51). He says further that imperial science or “secular” thought must be united once again with spiritual thinking, because it has gone beyond its own limits, and thinks it can understand everything in the universe based upon scientific investigation and analysis, the assumption of principles, and the exclusion of counter-evidence and ideas. How do we bridge the divide? Mohawk explains “on the one hand there are dreams and visions, and on the other hand there's a responsibility to maintain a clear version of reality, and those two streams of thoughts and reaction have to live cooperatively together” (pps. 51-52). Mohawk, who was always a critical thinker questioned one of the elders who held fast to the “Old Ways” of the people while

attending a conference they were at together, asking about “how things were done” or how the Old Ways are practiced today. The unnamed elder reminded him,

it is hard to follow the right way. It is the hardest thing in the world to do, because you must push away from your mind even bad thoughts about people. There aren't many people who are willing to even try to follow the Way of Life of the Indian people. But our way of life is clear enough. It's clear (p. 36).

Elsewhere, Mohawk cites one of the most profound perspectives of Rotinonshonni clear thinking, which is embodied in the “ga no ya”, also called the “ganony:ok” or in Kanien'keha the *ohenten karihwatehkwen*, “the words before all else” which is recited at the beginning and end of every important meeting. Here is the enjoinder of the “spiritual mind” with the “rational mind”. Every source of life is named, offered descriptive and connective value through relation-binding and humble gratitude giving in order to discuss what's truly important in the lives of people. Everything of value in the world is boiled down to an essential list of core sources which perpetuate all life inclusive of the sun, moon, stars, plants, herbs, creatures, winds, sacred beings and relationships, “the whole thing. Everybody in the world ought to be able to agree that we depend on those things. Those things are actually essential to us, and that's the rational mind with a poetic way of expressing the rational mind” (p. 52). This is the pronouncement of a holistic view of the universe, whereby we purposely express our indebtedness and reverence, for “we have not separated ourselves from them. They are others and we are part of the others” (ibid). This is an embodiment of Cajete's “theology of nature”. Forbes (1979e) argues that at some point in the imperial mind these “essentials” became divorced, separated, secularized, distant and objectified to the point where consumption

and exploitation becomes a given, or thoughtless. He says in a vein similar to Mohawk, “there can be no conflict between “religion” and “science”” (p. 133). Further he says “Native Science” as a living practice, as the embodiment of clear and critical thinking “must be part of the larger science of Living” (p. 134). He calls this “way of life”, “the *Science of Appropriate Behavior* or the Science of Good Living or the Science of the Good Road” because it is not about simply thinking, it’s about living (p. 135, emphasis original). Thus, Native American Studies, Tribal Colleges and Universities were forged in his mind out of perpetuating this core element of traditional “clear thinking” where students are focused on a total way of life rather than singular or conglomerated facts, technical expertise, and wage-earning without socio-intellectual development. Attention to the world is an attention to our minds, and attention to our minds leads us toward dreaming together, not apart.

Forbes (1998a) relates that the “development of Native American Studies as a full discipline demands not only that we ignore the spatial boundaries set by European colonialism. We also must set aside many aspects of intellectual colonization” such that we cannot accept the bounds and claims of European self-proclaimed sovereigns who after usurping their own territories, spirituality, etc., had come to America to do the same (p. 17). Boundaries are rooted not just in our thoughts and minds but in the land, in space, and in place. On the one hand, we are finding the boundaries of our thinking, which are enmeshed into the boundaries of political and religious institutions, territorial boundaries, walls, and frontiers. For example, Forbes (1979b) says with regards to territorial boundaries, or separateness that,

European imperialism would like us to believe that the boundary lines drawn on the map by Anglo-Saxons, white Canadians, Spaniards, Portuguese and so on, are sacred and eternal unless, of course, they are changed by the imperialist in one of their many wars. But we must bear in mind that all of the existing boundary lines in America are arbitrary and are the result of chance fortunes of war and so on (p. 102).

Forbes (1979b) says, “the De-Colonized America mind then, it seems to me, will take a fresh look at this land and not be bound by the lines set by previous aggression” (p. 102). Part of this is because we come to accept the boundaries imposed upon us as the boundaries of our “real world”, imaginary or not, which are rigidly mapped to produce permanence. Racism, classism, and sexism are all products of the mind rather than actual deficits each people or person has. The decolonized mind can see the world from frame of its own language, community, and experiences eyes rather than an imposed order, the “Great Lie” as Trudell (2008) calls it.

Once these boundaries are reduced to nothing more than renaming, as “claims” and thievery, Forbes (1979b) says we can see that this is “one America and not two” which in his eyes “*has a common history because it has a common Native race*” (p. 102, emphasis original). What this means is that we must realize that “it is one struggle, against one common enemy, which is not just the United States but is, in fact, elitist European industrialized imperialism” (ibid). His use of the term “Native race” is only used to imply that these are the real Americans, who have never called Europe or the U.S. their home, they are in their one and only ancient homeland and have developed various versions of a “way of life” in connection with each other and separate from Europe. Thus,

when Forbes (1998a) began to devise Native American Studies and D-QU he “realized that the borders of the United States could never serve as intellectual borders for our new field of study” because they simply reinforced an imperialist vision and claim upon our lands and ideas, our “Native Science” or spirituality (p. 16). Finally, Forbes says, “intellectual self-determination allows us, I would think, to reclaim and/or examine all of our indigenous heritage, including that part that does not fit in so well with the standard stereotypes held by white society, and now by most of us as well” (p. 21). This includes anti-black racism, patriarchy, homophobia and Christian hegemonic ideas about the superior human. Race is one of those basic conceptions developed out of the science-spirituality or “way of life” of imperialism that was used to divide peoples into arbitrary categories for a purpose: denigration, dehumanization, and subordination. Now let's look at the materialization of mental imperialism via the stories of democracy and liberty which are taught egregiously at school.

### *The Fiction of Democracy and the Empire of Liberty*

One of the key issues in dealing with an empire and constant imperialism is that it's not simply a matter of military occupation or physical coercion or forced removal. Once a people has come under the influence of violent outsiders who are willing to sacrifice their own people in order to destroy the morale and virility of another group of people, the stages that follow occupation and invasion involve a concerted penetration and attack upon local institutions, values, and forms of knowledge. I began this section with quotations presented in order to demonstrate that the colonial and imperial versions of history, of the rise of the U.S. as an imperial power in terms of militaristic and social



influences (perhaps “knowledge”) is due completely to the core facets of its foundations: African and Indian servitude, labor, knowledge, lands and influences are equal to, if not more important, than anything brought over from Europa when we consider the “positive” influences or wholly, and the hearty origins of the U.S.. Replacement is a key, and core concept we must grapple with, and it is much more valuable than assimilation, which means to make similar. We are taught consistently that the U.S. is a syncretic or synthetic mix of cultural elements and ideas, in following with the powerful “melting pot” and “we are all immigrants” myths which as Forbes (1966), has pointed out, has “not produced a new alloy”, meaning, a new people, but instead only a new empire (p. 7). All while Indigenous (and African and Asian knowledge) knowledge has been stolen for the benefit of corporations like Monsanto-Bayer, white farmers, colonial scientists, and imperial governments. “There is no question but what the “rip off” of Native knowledge constitutes a “steal” as significant as the theft of the continent itself. Not that Native People haven’t been willing to share knowledge for the good of humankind, but the sharing must go in both directions for it to be fair, it seems to me” says Forbes (pps. 2-3, Forbes 1994f). Native Nations are supposed to give up *their* natural resources because somebody else wants them all the time, which is really just a developed system of prostitution and predation led by white militant pimps and predators.

First, I would like to unpack a few of the most common terms used to describe culture change and knowledge exchange which have been propounded historically and recently including: Assimilation, Acculturation, Deculturalization and Replacement. Each has their own unique history so I will not delve too deeply into all of them but I would like to highlight the uniqueness of each of them and the ways in which they have been

used as weapons for and against Native and other Peoples, especially in relation to mental imperialism. Assimilation has been used to describe a one-way process whereby one group is pressured to become like, or similar to another group, if not, the same. In the U.S., this has had grave consequences in the realm of education and schooling because as pointed out earlier, there has never been a singular white culture, or a singular Black culture, or singular Indian culture or Asian culture, group, body of stories, beliefs, values, practices, etc. Thus, for peoples to be forcefully integrated or segregated based on perceived “racial” characteristics is a false struggle because it is based on the farcical notion that white’s or the ruling class or group are somehow homogenous and there is a complete end goal or cultural standard that is actually achievable. The problem with assimilationist ideologies is that they are only functional in a relatively homogenous group whereby the teachers, parents, leaders etc. are chosen based upon their exemplary or model behavior of those predefined traits. Richard H. Pratt who was the founder of Carlisle Indian Industrial School in 1879 received only a few years of elementary level education, and otherwise served as an apprentice for a short while as a tin-maker before becoming a militarist turned educator or “civilizer” (Reyhner & Eder 2017, p. 183). He was hardly exemplary, except that he was a militant white man, as someone devoted fully to the perpetuation of the U.S. and its progressive goals of exploitation, no matter what kind of poor example it was to other nations. As the inventor of the “outing system” whereby Indian students would serve and live in white households, farms and factories, he presumed that these whites were examples for these students without any justification other than their success in an imperial system of exploitation as whites. Luther Standing

Bear (1933), who claimed to be the first student to enter Carlisle's gates learned quickly what assimilation meant for whites:

So we went to school to copy, to imitate; not to exchange languages and ideas, and not to develop the best of traits that had come out of uncountable experiences of hundreds and thousands of years of living upon this continent. So, while the white people had much to teach us, we had much to teach them, and what a school could have been established upon that idea! (p. 237).

Forbes (1979) argued that science cannot be separated from anything else, same with religion. They are what we actually think and do, nothing more or less, no matter the name or game. Science is possessed by all peoples at all times, what Cajete and Hill call "ethno-science". Religious and scientific imperialisms serve the same functions. Yet there is something unique about what imperialists call "science". Dr. Ellis Powell (1920) gave a speech on "Scientific Imperialism" at the Empire Club of Canada (Toronto, CA) in order to declare the ushering of a new era, that of the Scientific man. He began by clarifying that, "imperialism in the old sense is dead, and of course that is true. Of an Imperialism in the sense of arbitrary and capricious domination over the bodies and souls of men, we know nothing in these days". He then goes on to argue that Scientific Imperialism has replaced the militarist approach to overcoming resistant peoples and now has moved on to the rest of the world. He says he has travelled to all parts of America and has seen that all imperial peoples are engaged in "the yoking of all the developed and undeveloped forces of nature to the triumphant chariot wheels of man". Further, the purpose of this "yoking" is supposedly a good one, a lofty dream which will bear fruit. He says, once "all those mighty forces under contribution, the more free will he be to

devote himself to his own spiritual, moral, social, and intellectual concerns, in freedom from daily anxieties for the provision of his daily bread.” Forbes says of science that “it does not, I might add, refer to a collection of technical facts or even theories. Above all it does not refer to collections of inventions, machines, and instruments. Science is a technique of the mind” and further, it is an “intellectual-mental process, a method, an approach, a way of looking at the world” (pps. 131-132). This “way of looking at the world” is bound to our “way of living in the world”. The “Scientific Man” like the “Christian Man” is defined by his actions, in this case, the yoking of peoples, lands and nature to those who can fit in the driver's seat of empire.

For Forbes, Native Nations, runaway servants of empire, Chicanos, and all people have a unique opportunity: to throw off the yoke of empire. But he says we must overcome a lengthy process of spiritual-mental imperialism which has deranged our thought and dreams of who we can imagine ourselves being, who are ancestors had once envisioned, and our children will revisit. Speaking of his vision, which came out of his own decolonial endeavors as a youth, he says:

Now one of the parts of our dream, of my dream, which is not popular with all Indian people in this country is to attempt to say: All of these people of Indian race, of Indian ancestry, no matter what they have become mixed with, no matter what kind of historical process they've gone through, all of them have the right to reclaim their destiny as native people, and we have to make an effort to counter the effects of four or five hundred years of brainwashing (“Testimony” KCP MSS 566 BC, B. 2, F. 16, p. 12).

Brainwashing, is figurative and metaphorical for the work, time, structures, and approaches which goes into transforming clear thinking, critical thinking, liberated minds into the programmed characters Forbes and Trudell warn of. Freire calls this method to teaching in education the banking method whereby students as receptacles are deposited information, however harmful to the recipient and their relations. Jesse Rainwater, a Forbesian like character from his only novel, *Red Blood* (1997d) finds his own voice, dream and critique while an art student in Mexico in the 1960's:

Looking out over the skyline of Tacubaya, towards the rising sun, Jesse told himself, "I see now that education is warfare. What the blancos call education is ideological aggression. It isn't just racist, or bad, or lousy, or misguided. It is conscious unadulterated cultural and class warfare" (p. 185).

W.E.B. Du Bois (2007) once spoke to a Parisian crowd at the World Congress of the Partisans of Peace conference in 1949 where he declared unabashedly that the U.S. was indeed an empire:

Leading this new colonial imperialism comes my own native land built by my father's toil and blood, the United States. The United States is a great nation; rich by grace of God and prosperous by the hard work of its humblest citizens ... Drunk with power we are leading the world to hell in a new colonialism with the same old human slavery which once ruined us; and to a third World War which will ruin the world (p. 7).

Elsewhere, he plainly calls it the "United States Empire" (p. 123). This next section will draw from Forbes lifelong study of these colonial relations, which he summarized as a total state of (1995b) neocolonialism, because in his view,

“Imperialism and colonialism

it is seen

are not over in a day;

one night of revelry

does not bring freedom.

a change of flag

changes colors only -

not the system” (p. 24).

Given this line of thought, Forbes would agree that the new “American Empire” as imagined by the founding fathers such as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams and others, was a change of verbiage, of coinage, rather than an actual break with European tyrannical traditions. Forbes (1967h) was convinced we lived in a neocolonialist paradox for although the rights of citizenship are given a “colonialist mentality” persists such that “neo-colonialism is not destroyed by the *mere forms* of independence or self-government” (p. 175). Ha-dya-no-doh (Swift Runner), also known as Maris Bryant Pierce (1839), an Onöndowa’ga:’ leader and graduate from Dartmouth college in 1840 once spoke about how he could never be a free person while in the shadow and presence of the United States Empire. Speaking at the Buffalo Baptist Church on August 28, 1838, while attempting to fight the theft of the Buffalo Creek Reservation outside of Buffalo, NY he declared to the mostly white crowd:

I deny that we could possess *such a territory* this side of [the] shores of the Pacific, with *safety, free of molestation* and in *perpetuity*. “Westward the Star of Empire takes it way,” and whenever that empire is held by the white man, nothing

is safe or unmolested or enduring against his avidity for gain (p. 15, emphasis original).

It was clear from Indigenous intellectuals, scholars and leaders such as Ha-dya-no-doh that the U.S. was the new Roman empire, the new British empire incarnate in the new people, the “white man”. Pierce was an interpreter and advocate for Indian schools, and had his home stolen by the Ogden Land Company with government support, a fate that my family also shared in, from which four treaties were made to “legally” take the land, the first of which was illegal as it was made with a non-federal representative. “Westward the Star of Empire” is taken from Bishop George Berkeley’s (1752) *On the prospect of planting arts and learning in America*, which was subsequently utilized by John Quincy Adams Plymouth speech in 1802 and had commemorated the landing of the Pilgrims, but was made recently famous closer to Pierce’s day in George Bancroft’s (1834) *History of the United States, from the discovery of the American continent* (see Peyer 2007, n. 10, p. 96 for more elaboration). The empire is a traveling menace, unperturbed by Native Nations, by mountains and rivers, buffalo and grizzly bears in its quest for control, exploitation and the consumption of all life. It has been known to be as such from its first birthday and beyond as it nears its 250th.

The United Colonies, as they were called in the original Articles of Confederation of the United Colonies of New England (1643), and in the declaration of independence (1776) became something else, the United States of America, by the time of the new Articles of Confederation (1776 and 1781) with a jolt of a feathered pen and some decisive moves to distinguish themselves as something different, as “States” which would be recognized by the newly formed European “States” grown out of their imperial

ministries. Transformation from the old to new, from one frock for another, was an old game. As is known from the earliest colonial archives, observers and commentators, the real Americans were all those called Indians by Columbus, and America was the whole American island, and is the term all peoples and nation-states of the whole island uses for itself (Forbes 1976c; Forbes 2000b). As previously discussed “semantic warfare” was utilized in order to reimagine the empire and also to reimagine the imperialists, who differentiated themselves as the “real Americans”, which Forbes (1976c) notes was a way to enact a “transformation of themselves into the “native” population, and the actual natives into the existential status of foreigners or non-persons” (p. 37). The U.S. sought purposely to control and expand its empire and influence from “sea to shining sea” in 1776 not in 1823 or 1835 or 1912. This change is to coincide with recognizing “we the people”, who in the mid-1600’s with the onset of red-black slavery became, the white people, a new polity and political alliance. It is unclear exactly when and where it took a cohesive shape and form, but many predict that Indigenous theft of land and liberty, both Native American and Native African were key in this development (Allen 1994; Horseman 1981; Forbes 1964b). For the creation of a color (observation-visual) schema or hierarchy is paramount and relies upon both a superiority complex *and* dehumanizing sub-peoplehood framework to reinforce degraded “others”, a kind of racial othering and racial selfing (Mills 1997; Allen 2002).

Thus, Ira Berlin (1998) calls attention to the way whites are complicit in imperialism as a caste-class based system of exploitation (p. 5). When slavery and involuntary servitude (unless a crime can be charged upon them) is abolished in 1865 with the 13th amendment, the complicitous behavior of whites continues because



servitude in total was not abolished which is the real foundation of imperial society: coerced or forced labor. On this, Berlin says:

The stench from slavery's moral rot cannot mask the design of American captivity: the extraction of labor that allowed a small group of men to dominate all. In short, if slavery made *race*, its larger purpose was to make *class*, and the fact that the two were made simultaneously by the same process has mystified both (p. 5).

Forbes (1990a) argues however that "class" is really "caste" because the small group will always remain small and this unchanging fact is the constant factor in the empire way of life ( see also Forbes 1993). This is mental or cognitive imperialism because we are constantly fed a bill of lies, what Trudell calls the Great Lie, which can equate one thing with another without any real change of the foundation or the rooted realities of the empire. When slavery/involuntary servitude was abolished in 1865, did this require any actions to dismantle a servitude-based system from the top down and all around or did it pick at some parts within the machinery? Du Bois (1935) declared for example that post-Civil War reconstruction efforts failed primarily because they were rebuilding a house built on Berlin's "moral rot", which included American dispossession and exploitation. He says, "out of the exploitation of the dark proletariat comes the Surplus Value filched from human beasts.... The emancipation of man is the emancipation of labor and the emancipation of labor is the freeing of that basic majority of workers who are yellow, brown and black" (pp. 15-16). But is it just labor? Du Bois says what was not dismantled was the "color caste", and so while Black men and women were free to move off of plantations, they could not leave their caste no matter where they went (p. 30). The

unCivil War was for Du Bois, the development of white imperialists forward march towards “new dreams of power and visions of empire” (p. 5).

The fact that slaves joined the northern armies to fight the secessionists and were recruited after 1863, does little to demonstrate how the U.S. would not allow itself to be changed in the aftermath as whites did not fight and die for Blacks, or Native Nations to be liberated from a system of servitude but rather for them to be free from the responsibility of servitude as private citizens. Prisons and the courts can legalize servitude, this was already tested before 1865 such as through the Indian Act of California (1850) which although slavery is outlawed in the state, Indians can be pressed into labor by white vigilantes, by white judges, and by a white system of terror. We find for example that child labor becomes more pronounced than ever before after the civil war. Native youth are employed as “students” in boarding schools who must work half the day in order to receive an education starting in 1879. Further, simply because “wages” or “contracts” are implemented, a system of exploitation via sharecropping and the devaluation of labor occurs simultaneously once a large pool of “free” labor becomes available in the north and south. Lastly, after 1848, the western valve had been opened and whites without slaves are pouring into Native homelands with a clean conscience, for they are not slaveowners, they are not the enemy. This continues to be a mental fiction we are confronted with today.

The U.S. was not a democracy in 1786, nor in 1886. This was not republican (representative) government. This was a new unbridled imperial confederation of renegade colonies turned states (neo-corporations owned by white male citizens who

wrote the “charters”). Forbes (1979b) argued that, at the very least, a democratic society, one governed directly by the people must contain at least these eight parameters

- (1) a people who wish to govern themselves
- (2) a people who have not been psychologically “broken” by centuries of tyranny
- (3) a people who are able to govern themselves without oligarchical interference
- (4) a people who respect the right of individuals and who tolerate non-conformity
- (5) a people who are either geographically isolated from threatening neighbors or who are able to defend themselves without creating a military elite
- (6) a people who possess no territorial ambitions
- (7) a people who are not so individually selfish as to attempt to exploit each other, and
- (8) a people who are not so numerous and spread out as to seriously impede communication and participation (p. 11).

Given this criterion, the U.S. has failed at nearly all of these areas, but most importantly, it continued in classic imperial fashion to make war upon every kind of life within its grasp, life without “rights” to life.

The first consideration for example might have been lauded over in pretty language in the constitution and by its founders, but it held captive Native American and African peoples, notwithstanding the oppression of queens, the persecution of non-Christians, and publicly anti-homophobic qualities. Second, it is clear that the U.S. was formed by a group of people who possessed a slave mentality, that is, they insisted upon the breaking down of the minds and power of their own people, let alone those they held captive or fought against. Imagining the daily repudiation of queens in any white

household during the revolutionary era outside of a privileged and outspoken few is troublesome. Third, the consistent relationships that the U.S. developed with overseas empires such as the English, French, Spanish, and others as well as the development of a two-party system essentially has quelled the possibility for equal participation, minority dissension and consensus, especially after the rise of the white corporate industrial state. Fourth, the U.S. has oft-cited itself as the bastion of political liberty and free speech, but this has always come at a high price including jail, exile, and death for those who are on the other end of the law and its brute squads. The development of the FBI as an internal investigative unit upon even working-class citizens demonstrates clearly the extent to which a state built on fear has progressed. Fifth, the U.S. has been at war constantly since its inception, and with standing armies, state guards, local police enforcers, thousands of militia groups and a global military presence cannot ever be a democracy based on consensus but instead, is based on long-term coercion and the threat or conditions of violence and terror. Sixth and related to five, is that the U.S. continues to move in on other people's lands and might establish itself as a global territorial empire given its past trajectory of acquiring lands by force, rising from thirteen seaboard colonies to fifty plus many other island nations and territories such as Guam, Samoa, Micronesia, Puerto Rico and more. Further, you do not need to own land in order to exploit it. You do not need to physically control a government in order to influence its leaders. Seventh, we see this point clearly demarcated by the individual nature of U.S. values and ideals manifest in nearly every sphere of life as the U.S. prides itself on "rugged individualism", a value manifest in private property, the support of individuals to form corporations, and the destruction of surviving communities of color. Lastly, the U.S. is spread across a vast

territorial swath from northwest Alaska to western Hawaii to the islands previously mentioned and up to Maine. It's a ridiculous area for people to attempt to be on the same page or agree about any one subject without serious dissension and without a majority constantly overruling differentiated masses.

As Taylor (2001) points out with relation to Reconstruction of the U.S. and the development of Black Codes, a set of laws that only applied to former black slaves beginning in 1877 and the election of Hayes:

The aims of the Black codes were fairly straightforward. If Blacks would not willingly work on plantations, planters would force them to. Above all, Black codes were meant to control the movement of newly freed slaves and forcibly coerce them into plantation labor. Every Southern state came up with its own statutes aimed at controlling Black labor. In Georgia, it was illegal for Black freedmen to “stroll or wander in idleness.” In Alabama, the former “master” had first rights in compulsory apprenticeship of Black children—without parental consent. There were laws against fishing and hunting aimed at depriving freedmen of independence and autonomy. Where the law would not work, violence, murder, and terrorism replaced it (p. 17).

There already were Red Codes, now Black Codes, and with the exclusion acts in the late 1800's Yellow Codes for Asian peoples. The constitution is the White Code, or Racial Contract among Whites. Du Bois (1935) says instead of an Empire of Liberty, an “Empire of Industry” was forged, now that whites were free from Reconstruction with the election of Hayes in 1877-8 at the cusp of massive industrialization (p. 596).

One cannot be democratic and an empire at the same time and as such, groups like the many “captive nations” of the U.S., aka, Native Nations, as well as other groups like the Ryukyuan’s of Okinawa, the Boricuanans of Puerto Rico, Guamanians and other locales are in what Forbes has called a state of “semi-colonialism”, that is, they are still policed by foreign others (Forbes 1979b, p. 21). This is supported most recently in the 1886 decision of *United States v. Kagama* (118 U.S. 375, 6 S.Ct. 1109, 1112, 30 L.Ed. 228) a case that ruled on the Major Crimes Act. The court renewed the status of “domestic dependent nations” and the 1871 Appropriations Act rider which ended treaty-making of any formerly recognized “independent nation, tribe, or power” in a fresh language, declaring:

They [Indians] were, and always have been, regarded as having a semi-independent position when they preserved their tribal relations; not as states, not as nations, not as possessed of the full attributes of sovereignty, but as a separate people, with the power of regulating their internal and social relations, and thus far not brought under the laws of the Union or of the state within whose limits they resided.

The degraded status precedence has not been drastically augmented since the Marshall trilogy of decisions which made bridled Indians to the empire as dependents, wards and pupils. So despite Deloria’s (1969) early hope that a federal legal solution is the most obvious difference and answer for Native Nations, it has only been changed slightly since 1830 who have been entrenched in a protectorate, dependent, guardianship status legally. W.E.B. Du Bois also utilized this concept of “semicolonialism” when speaking about Blacks in the U.S. who he says control no institutions of their own and are under near

constant police invasion and pressure to conform or suffer the consequences. This he also extended to the various peoples of China and the Soviet Union in later years (1985, p. 229). Du Bois' (1985) definition is important because he used it while speaking broadly and in a historical sense. He said:

a colony, strictly speaking, is a country which belongs to another country, forms a part of the mother country's industrial organization, and exercises such powers of government, and such civic and cultural freedom, as the dominant country allows. But beyond this narrower definition, there are manifestly groups of people, countries and nations, which while not colonies in the strict sense of the word, yet so approach the colonial status as to merit the designation semicolonial (p. 229).

The word forming element *semi-*, meaning "half", is often used as an inexact phrase, such as in semi-arid or semi-naked, meaning more closely, "partly". It is in this sense that Forbes and Du Bois share in their analysis of colonialism in the 20th century. The end phrase of "as the dominant country allows" is the key to understanding the relationship, as one being at the mercy of the other's quest for control and subjugation which is normally held in check through violent repression, draconian laws, intimidation and coercion. And while the U.S. espouses one thing, it quickly does the opposite in times of desperation. At the core of cognitive imperialism and mental colonization is the planting of the idea that the U.S. is a democracy rather than an empire.

Contemporary historian of the U.S. David Reynolds (2009), has suggested that imperialism and the creation of an empire was a foundational root and despite attempts to claim itself as a bastion of anti-imperialism, it was from the outset, no better a model. I quote in full:

. . . in reality, America was already an empire. The thirteen colonies that broke with Britain in 1776 extended only a few hundred miles inland. Within thirty years, however, the United States stretched far beyond the Mississippi, across half this vast continent. Thirty years later, by the mid-nineteenth century, it ran from the Atlantic three thousand miles to the Pacific. For many Americans in the nineteenth century and since, this process was axiomatic— an expression of “Manifest Destiny”—yet, from a historical perspective, it is of dramatic significance. Transposed onto the map of Europe, the continental United States would take us from the Urals to the Pyrenees, which is the domain of half a dozen separate nation-states— countries, moreover, that spent much of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries fighting ruinous wars against each other. The fact that the most fertile and mineral-rich swathe of North America was under the control of one government was a development of world-historical importance.

Parts of the American continent were bought— the Louisiana Purchase, for instance— but ultimately this country the size of a continent was made by war. War against the European empires— France, Spain, and Britain— which had previously controlled or claimed much of the continent. War against neighboring independent states— particularly Mexico, from which Texas and California were wrested by force. War against the Native Americans, the original inhabitants, who were steadily driven west, corralled on reservations, and even reduced to bit parts in Hollywood movies. And, most devastatingly, war against fellow Americans in the South who, on the model of, wanted to break away from the Union and form their own Confederate States of America.



This was truly imperialism, used as a neutral, historical term (p. xiii).

Thus, to hold onto any illusions that the U.S. has been anything other than a self-declared empire, is to ignore the most obvious of signs.

For example, the fledgling empire developed a now classic monetary insignia that includes the Latin phrase (harkening to their appreciation of the Roman empire) *novus ordo seclorum* or “new order of the ages”, which was part of the original design created in 1782. Further, while many claim that *e pluribus unum* or “out of many [states], one [nation]” is symbolic of the struggle to break away from the British empire, it is perhaps more appropriate to read this instead as “out of many [colonies], one [empire]”. An “empire of liberty” comprised of hundreds of “captive nations”, states, territories, and a global military presence. Current with today’s public discourse, many people of color are resisting to stand or honor the U.S. flag especially during the singing of the national anthem. The first verse of the anthem, the “Star-Spangled Banner”, was written by Francis Scott Key during the Battle of Baltimore in what is known locally as the War of 1812 in which the capitol in Washington was burned. The final stanza of the lyrics written by Key clearly indicates the imperial tradition. Forbes would see the lines as clearly “Machiavellian”, whose known rule of the “ends justify the means” was aptly promoted:

Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just,

And this be our motto: ‘In God is our trust.’

And the star-spangled banner in triumph shall wave

O’er the land of the free and the home of the brave (retrieved from the Wayback Archive).

Conquest meant much more than fight back, it meant the promotion of an unrivalled American Empire, not simply a confederation of colonies cum states.

*The Doctrine of Discovery and Imperial Sovereignities*

European imperialists derive their rights to rule locally and imperialize others based upon feudal notions of sovereignty, or the right of monarchs, primarily through male kingship to usurp the rights and lands of others. They empowered and overwrote male owned corporations, literally, bodies of men in order to achieve their ends. The practice of land theft, the right to colonize and Christianize other lands and peoples, and other destructive actions was built upon over thousands of years of practice in AfroEurAsia, predominantly by men. Robert A. Williams Jr.'s (1990) seminal work on the development of colonial legal discourse concluded that "a will to empire proceeds most effectively under a rule of law" which was written by white men in the prime (p. 325). On Turtle Island, "the rule begins with the Doctrine of Discovery and its discourse on conquest" which not only denies Indigenous discovery as equal to imperial or Christian discovery but also hampers the debate with a principle of superiority as the basic crux for all subsequent arguments, what Williams calls the "perfect instrument of empire" (ibid).

Forbes (1968a) in following the thought of Robert "Bob" K. Thomas, suggested that most, if not all reservations were "miniature colonies", in the sense of "resource colonies" and exploitable communities (p. 11). The first case of the Marshall trilogy, the case of *Johnson v. McIntosh* (1823), Justice Marshall made clear the role of the "doctrine of discovery" and the assumed superiority of European imperialists as Christians and

invaders that elevated their rights of property above original Nations. The case was brought forth as private landowners sought to confirm their purchases in the state of Georgia (who claimed land from the coast far inland and beyond their control) yet the court ruled that only the federal government has the power to purchase Native lands, going back to the commerce clause of the constitution. Chief Justice John Marshall gave his opinion in the court and discusses the matter at length, saying clearly, “this principle was that discovery gave title to the government by whose subjects or by whose authority it was made against all other European governments, which title might be consummated by possession.” Further, he offers that Native title to their own land was successfully diminished through mere discovery. I quote:

They [Native Nations] were admitted to be the rightful occupants of the soil, with a legal as well as just claim to retain possession of it, and to use it according to their own discretion; but their rights to complete sovereignty as independent nations were necessarily diminished, and their power to dispose of the soil at their own will to whomsoever they pleased was denied by the original fundamental principle that discovery gave exclusive title to those who made it. (Retrieved from, <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/21/543/>).

The legal quagmire begins with the right of possession through discovery as it is argued further in the court’s opinion that this was how Spain, England, Portugal and France all made their own just claims. Each of these subsequent “discoveries” necessarily and automatically diminished the rights of Native Nations to their own homelands no matter how intermixed with whites, how Christian, or how right they are in their cause. Williams (1990) asserts that this battle was one that the revolutionary-era colonies had

fought for against the British who had made the original claims from which the United Colonies hoped to make their own in light of the passage of the Royal Proclamation of 1763 which prevented individuals and states/colonies from moving into Indian Country. Interestingly, this right could not be found when Native Nations' members went to Europe as Christians in the 20th century, and claimed possession by right of discovery, even to such places as Chernobyl which did not have any inhabitants. A number of staged attempts by Rotinoshonni and others to challenge this have proven unsuccessful to sway any courts opinions because the precedence has been built upon over time and rests upon that single argument of "complete sovereignty" or "imperial sovereignty" for original imperialists. This was a purposeful relationship, one established clearly in the "domestic dependent nations" degradation created in the case of the *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* (1831), the second of the infamous Marshall Trilogy of cases which although Native Nations original equal status was acknowledged, the process of imperialism and the status of the U.S. as a superpower had diminished and usurped their status. I quote the argument in full by the presiding judge John Marshall, who made his claim based on the follow presumption of power:

The Indians are acknowledged to have an unquestionable, and heretofore an unquestioned, right to the lands they occupy until that right shall be extinguished by a voluntary cession to our Government. It may well be doubted whether those tribes which reside within the acknowledged boundaries of the United States can, with strict accuracy, be denominated foreign nations. They may more correctly, perhaps, be denominated domestic dependent nations. They occupy a territory to which we assert a title independent of their will, which must take effect in point of

possession when their right of possession ceases; meanwhile, they are in a state of pupillage. Their relations to the United States resemble that of a ward to his guardian. They look to our Government for protection, rely upon its kindness and its power, appeal to it for relief to their wants, and address the President as their Great Father (Retrieved from: <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/30/1/>.)

Thus Native Nations are recognized merely as first occupants, whose title to the lands was usurped through the doctrine of discovery whereby “possession” was assumed at first through “will”, the will to empire, and then by theft, “point of possession”. This included even communities such as those in California who the U.S. did not even know existed, and as such, when California became a state in 1850, the U.S. treated the Native Nations there as if their usurpation had taken place over a couple of hundred years of dispossession and fighting them rather than a few minutes at a table at the capitals of Sacramento and Washington. The United Nations similarly has never allowed a solid challenge of the doctrine of discovery, despite evidence that perhaps Native American sailors may have landed in Europe before 1492 (Forbes 2007; Weaver 2014). At the United Nations, the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues made a clear declaration on May 8, 2012 that this core illegality must be uprooted in order for Indigenous justice to take place (<https://www.un.org/press/en/2012/hr5088.doc.htm>). The author believes this will not be recognized until the United Nations allows Native Nations to join as equal members and while they are represented in council by States who consider them “wards in a state of pupillage” and “domestic dependent nations” with a diminished claim to “complete sovereignty” and independence.

This section seeks to argue not that Native Nationalities have been legitimately degraded, but rather to establish that the imperial relationship is an illegitimate relationship. It is argued by some that Native Nations have given their “signatures of assent” as Lyons (2017) has framed the protectorate status of treaty-making and the trust relationship which evolved from these legal marks. I will forever argue that no government can give another person their freedom, their vocal cords, their feet, their ability to congregate, to make love or war, to be a people, to live on their respective lands. These are inviolable freedoms given to all creatures, all of creation. However, these are not respected by U.S. colonial law. The constitution in fact does not recognize other forms of life outside of the absolute rights of white men to be the owners and makers of the world. The only mention of Native Nations is in sec. 2 which allows direct taxes to be made upon “Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons” and in Sec. 8 which allows congress to “to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes”. Further, the Queens (women) are completely excluded from the entire constitution as well as succeeding amendments (article xix refers only the rights of voting in terms of “sex”, which now is something one can go to a doctor to “change” or “remove”) as well as those enslaved including Africans, children, those imprisoned, those unrecognized, and the rest of creation are left out of the clauses, on purpose. Anything that is a non-white male property owner is essentially barred from full participation, essentially, a perfect oligarchy. Subsequent cases have frequently depended upon the Marshall trilogy of cases including *Beecher v. Wetherby* (1877) and *Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock* (1903) which draw clear legal precedence from the Marshall cases as well as other cases.

*The Empire Strikes Back at D-Q University*

When D-QU was founded in 1970, Forbes (1972) proclaimed that they were overcoming hundreds of years of colonialism by doing a few things: reclaiming Native territory, providing an Indigenous education to Indigenous community, creating a refuge for traditional peoples, uniting formerly divided peoples such as Chicanos and Indians, and developing an intelligentsia or trained leadership that was being prepared for the task of nation-rebuilding. The school was dreamed of as a Ph.D. granting institution so as to accredit its own community members as the leaders of its struggles. Yet, by 1981, the University was forced to drop its Chicano board of trustees members, cut back on all of its grand plans at being a University granting Ph.D.'s and training leaders, and was brought up on charges by the FBI and other constituencies for financial mismanagement and not fulfilling the stipulations of their quit claim deed. The following is a short list of D-QU's unique struggle with the imperialistic federal government during its first 15 years:

**1970** D-Q U incorporated as a nonprofit institution. The former Army Communications Base near Davis is declared surplus property by GSA. Sen. George Murphy, running for reelection announces that UC Davis will be awarded the land even though the application is still open and UCD's application is incomplete. D-Q U files suit to enjoin the government from deeding the surplus property to UCD (for primate research and rice farming). UCD withdraws application.

**1971** Title to 643 acres near Davis is officially deeded to D-Q U. News articles in *Santa Ana Register* and *Lake Berryessa News* report revolutionary literature, training with firearms, and sending of radio signals to Peking at D-QU.

**1972** D-Q U Land Blessing and Dedication. D-Q U Council of Elders formed.

**1977** FBI begins two-year criminal Investigation of D-Q U (with no indictments) based on allegations of fraud by college officials. About fifty students are questioned. Western Assn. of Schools and Colleges officially awards D-QU full accreditation status. FBI keeps tabs on Sun Dance at D-Q U and refers to it as a “fanatical rite.”

**1978** FBI calls D-Q U “a major target case.”

**1979** Government “freezes” 1978-79 D-Q U federal student financial aid monies. The freeze continues with 1979-80 funds. U.S. Attorney declines to prosecute D-Q U, stating “there are no bases for criminal prosecution.” FBI investigation ostensibly ends after almost two years.

**1981** A top Ed. Dept. official memo ridicules D-Q U Sun Dance as “savagery.” U.S. Dept. of Ed. and Office of Inspector General initiate “sham” audit of D-Q U which requires 228 staff days to complete (Fleur Ng’Weno 1989, p. 51; see also Lutz 1980; Forbes 1985; Berger 1994).

In an effort to finally resolve some of these issues, D-QU attempted to have a bill passed, H.R. 3144, that would finally give them regular financial support and securing their status as a public institution rather than being constantly demonized as a terrorist training camp and a renegade haven which provided sanctuary for leaders such as Dennis



Banks who had come to California in 1975 in part to escape extradition to South Dakota on charges stemming from his involvement with Wounded Knee II and what was called the “Custer Courthouse Riot” (Oppelt 1990; Banks 1996). Forbes explains his relationship and concerns over D-QU in a letter to congressman Vic Fazio dated March 22, 1979, saying:

As you may know, I was one of the original architects of DQU and one of the principal developers of the philosophy for the university. I have not been active there for several years but I am very much aware of what DQU’s current problems are.

You should understand that DQU’s mission has always been to serve Native American people. The board was originally setup to include people of Indian heritage from the U.S. and Canada (the so-called Indian half) and Mexico (the so-called Chicano half). Both halves of the board were of Native race, in short. Unfortunately, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the agencies it influences always has opposed the concept of pan-Native unity. The BIA sought to continually discredit DQU as a “Chicano” school and BIA-influenced Indians often succeed in blocking USOE Title III funds by using that false rhetoric. On the other hand, many Chicano agencies perceived DQU as an “Indian” school and thus did not give it a high priority (D-046, B. 9, F. “1979: From”).

In 1981, Vic Fazio, became a sponsor of the bill H.R. 3144 to fund D-QU and who gave this testimony which summarizes their struggles and why it was necessary to resolve their status as a public educational institution:

In California we have, as you know, more Indians than we do in other States and yet a very, very small percent of them are tribally based. So we are trying to deal with the problem of providing some relevant, significant education for people who are broadly in the class of “urban Indians,” people who are no longer necessarily identifying with a particular region of the country or tribe, but who still wish to hold high their Native American heritage and make that part of their education. D-QU when it was founded 10 years ago was faced with probably far more impediments to success than the founders themselves even realized. The institution really was created out of a concept that grew out of a consciousness within the Native American community that was probably really coming of age in the late 1960’s and early 1970’s. The property that they occupied in Davis, Calif., was really not at the time suitable for the kind of educational program they wanted to offer. There were many, many physical problems—dilapidated buildings, telephone poles, etc.—because a communications center had been there. The land was not useable for agriculture. The buildings were not necessarily suitable for habitation. But through sheer effort, most of those problems have been taken care of to a degree, but there were many, many problems with the Federal surplus property law and relationships that did not necessarily succeed between the people in the bureaucracy —the General Services Administration, the Department of Education and its predecessors—who did not understand necessarily what the effort on the campus was all about and vice versa. I think we have come a long way to breaking down some of those barriers. I am very pleased with the highly favorable reviews that the BIA has been able to

provide under the Tribally Controlled Community Colleges Act. The Western Association of Schools and Colleges' review has indicated that D-QU is doing well and that its accreditation problems have been resolved I believe for the foreseeable future. I am really saying I think to the committee—and I am anticipating perhaps some of the testimony to follow —that we need to take a positive look to the future of D-Q. We need to keep in mind that this is an institution that has had problems, but that it is also one that understands its recent history, has learned from it, is ready to move on to make some real progress in meeting the demand for the services it wishes to provide and the need for educational programs that it hopes to offer (U.S. 1984, pp. 13-14).

Steve Baldy, who was the current President of D-Q University also gave testimony about the situation there and in which he described how “federal agencies, a few of them, have not taken the position of wanting to work with us. We have had to force the issue to make them work with us from the very beginning” which goes back to the very beginning of D-QU’s story, as the university began through a multi-pronged effort involving years of preparation, community and organizational support from the CIEA and other groups, litigation for the site from California Indian Legal Services, occupation by students, community and other supporters, and prolonged negotiations (p. 26; Lutz 1980; Forbes et al 1972). Forbes (1985) describes elsewhere that D-QU had been literally black-balled of any federal funding outside of a few sources and as such was being sanctioned for gaining the site and for being a sore in the mouth of the monstrous empire. For example, D-QU was barred from making any revenue from the site, something totally unheard of at institutions of higher education who charge for all kinds of services, and depend upon

making revenue to support their university. Another slate against the original vision was when D-QU got “caught” farming the university, which is in prime farmland and they always had the intentions of farming as stipulated in all of their original proposals, yet somehow, this source of economic vitality and social viability was negated by the powers that be. Baldy describes the situation this way:

In 1978, GSA stated to the institution, they made a visit with one person and discovered from their point of view that we were farming the property to produce revenue to support the school. The office claimed that that was the first time that they were knowledgeable that we were doing that. However, we had been farming since 1974-75, 1976, 1977, and part of 1978. Realistically, it would be hard for someone to claim that they were unaware that we were farming (p. 28).

One person told them they could farm under certain conditions, then a change of personnel in the federal agencies told them to stop or have the lights turned off. This is an imperial-colonial relationship. This is a relationship that is dictated not upon equality, justice, democratic processes of consensus and fair play, or any sense of freedom. This is what happens, as Forbes (1981) testified at the American Indian International Tribunal, held at D-Q University the same year as the hearings presented above, that when they are forced to deal with the intricate nexus of a colonial and imperial relationship that comes down on what it identifies as resistance to their system of exploitation and control. Forbes (1981) speech summarized his feeling of this relationship, experience and the major purpose of D-QU:

Well, what happens then when Indian people try to establish their own universities, their own colleges, or other kinds of institutions? In a colonial

situation, when an institution surfaces, when it becomes visible, then it becomes a prime target. It's like a tall tree that attracts the lightning because it then is something that the colonial system can grab hold of and can strike against, and D-QU has been that kind of institution from the very beginning. Now, why? What is a university all about? Well, most of you know it has to do with education, and so on. But from my point of view one of the key things about the kind of education that we are trying to bring about is to develop what I call warrior scholars and to develop people who are going to use the knowledge that is gained in the defense and in the interests of Indian communities and of all people for that matter. Now that kind of institution, however, is a de-colonializing institution. It is a direct threat to the colonial system, and the oppressors know that because historically whenever a people have risen after a long period of oppression one of the main agencies has been the development of universities under their control (p. 3, KCP MSS 556BC, B. 13, F. "American Indian International Tribunal DQU").

As Baldy (1981) related at the hearings, of which the bill did not pass in the Senate, was that in 1979, their federal funds were fully frozen which effectively stanching their energy and movement as 99% of the students were attending based upon their continued flow of federal financial aid (see also Oppelt 1990). Further, he describes that "we were investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. We were being investigated by the Office of Inspector General, San Francisco. We were being investigated by the Attorney General's Office" (p. 29). They found nothing to warrant a conviction. These agencies had to publicly declare this, but this did not stop the damage that was already done. D-QU is one of the few institutions of higher education to have an FBI file, to have its

leaders investigated, to have multiple lawsuits brought against it aimed at bringing the school down.

The other key to this story is the racist underpinnings here, as D-QU was up against a white power structure of exploitation, control, manipulation and terrorism. While Native Nations such as the Rotinoshonni took at first clear stances against the United Colonies, they became divided and the Oneidas and Tuscarora's fought against their own compatriots as the rest of the confederacy was in alliance with the British, who they had treated with for over a hundred years. In the end, general George Washington or "Town Destroyer" as Rotinoshonni called him (1779) decided that in order to win the war, he would take the approach of total destruction, a practice that became ingrained in what Patrick Wolfe (2006) has called, "the logic of elimination". Washington's letters to the newly commandeered general Sullivan makes clear his approach, where submission-destruction meant victory:

The Expedition you are appointed to command is to be directed against the hostile tribes of the Six Nations of Indians, with their associates and adherents. The immediate objects are the total destruction and devastation of their settlements, and the capture of as many prisoners of every age and sex as possible. It will be essential to ruin their crops now in the ground and prevent their planting more. I would recommend, that some post in the center of the Indian Country, should be occupied with all expedition, with a sufficient quantity of provisions whence parties should be detached to lay waste all the settlements around, with instructions to do it in the most effectual manner, that the country may not be merely overrun, but destroyed.

But you will not by any means listen to any overture of peace before the total ruinment of their settlements is effected. Our future security will be in their inability to injure us and in the terror with which the severity of the chastisement they receive will inspire them (Letter from George Washington to John Sullivan, May 31, 1779).

Terrorism is the name of the game. Terrorism enabled the founding of the United Colonies, now called states. But who are the terrorists? What kind of people are they? They claimed to be “white people”, Christians, and also freedom-lovers. The Treaty of Fort Stanwix (1784) was the end result of this experience of terrorism for the Six Nations in our homelands and has been argued, like so many, if not all treaties, that it was made without legal authority of the confederacy, where the council at Buffalo Creek refused to ratify it, but it was signed by a few people anyways and was considered legitimate in the eyes of the Great White Father (Hauptman 1999). Even white authors recognize that “it could hardly be called a treaty” due to the basis of negotiations and lack of legality (lacking consensus of the grand council) (Smith 1884, p. 56). A war of elimination rooted in terror, was conducted at D-QU, although this war was performed in the media, in financial “freezes”, in FBI investigations and infiltrations, in feigning support, in renegeing legislation, in numerous court battles that cost millions of dollars, and in sapping the movement’s energy every step of the way. Derrick Bell (1980) calls this colonial dilemma of unequal relations the “interest-convergence” principle, whereby the interests of the empire and the political power group of unified “whites” must always be considered and met, even if they are unequal and downright disastrous for the other parties involved. Derrick Bell’s example was that desegregation policies were only

carried out if white, state and federal interests were preserved, and which carries the banner of inequality. It was definitely not in the interests of the empire to let D-QU be, to let the tall tree stand, for one day, someday soon, it was going to bear and drop new seeds, and grow a forest around it. Instead, we find that it did that, but the forest is scattered, clear-cut and logged, its tree-people have been burned out in the struggle of survival, and there the tree stands today, alive but mangled, burdened, nearly broken.

Forbes (1966a) says over time, White's:

gradually evolved a policy of completely suppressing native culture by force. This "cultural imperialism" knew virtually no limits - it reached into the structure of the family, religion, socio-political organization, modes of dress and ornamentation, and language. Through a process of conscious "brain-washing," the young especially, were to be completely deprived of all that was Indian. In addition, they were taught to despise their parents as "depraved savages." Everything con-[sic] conceivable, short of complete extermination, was done to destroy the native community and its heritage (p. 8).

This statement echoes the pronouncement of Stanley Hall (1903), the inventor of the term, "adolescence", who said that "the world goes to school. This has become the method of colonization and completes the work of conquest by armies", which was clearly manifest with Indian boarding schools, racist public-school curriculum and segregation (p. 494). In historicizing the situation, Forbes suggests that the reform era of the 1930's, coinciding with the reign of John Collier was a minute organizational blip, not a major change in policy. Colliers work sought to complete the recommendations of the Meriam Report of 1928 (Committee of 100, of which a few Indian members such as



Henry Roe Cloud were invited to contribute) which criticized the Bureau of Indian Administration, and in particular Indian boarding school conditions, finances and policies. According to Forbes analysis, “Collier’s men simply tried to reform from above. Perhaps even they distrusted the Indians and desired, in their own way, to play God” (Forbes 1966a, p. 8). Further, through the 1950’s he argues “one thing has remained the same: “the Anglo-American “imperialists” are unwilling to give Indians control over Indian affairs. They are unwilling to allow natives to choose their own destiny” (ibid). Thus, by the 1980’s, the U.S. general policy towards D-QU was that it was not either an Indian or Chicano college, but rather a terrorist training camp and it served only to interrupt ongoing imperialism as it regularly called upon Native community to converge, discuss and act upon their real conditions. The empire struck back, and while D-QU survived the 1980’s and 1990’s, it was clear that by 2005, it could no longer sustain itself in such a hostile environment and without the original outpouring of support which it had in 1970.

Key to choosing your own destiny, is the ability to speak your own language without repercussions, that is, to speak your truth and tell your stories. As King (2009) relates, “the truth about stories is that’s all we are” (p. 2). What does the story of D-QU reveal about U.S. imperialism? And greater still, what can we still say with regards to the language of imperialism which remains a central aspect of any people and their lived history, one which constantly reflects an imperial present-presence? One way to analyze imperialism’s depths is through its abuse of language.

*Mother Tongues and the Language of Imperialism*

Those who have never tasted the blessings of life might not embrace them when they do. Just as many who have never been able to move about without persecution or pain, whether it's from guns pointed at them, or from their bodies suffering some malady, they may never be happy with their life, with their freedom. This is not their fault. This is the fault of some evil doing. I have never known a free creature to willingly submit to castration, to willingly submit to rape, to willingly submit to captivity, to backbreaking labor, or to the loss or ridicule of its mother tongue. There is always something that *causes* the force or represents a kind of coercion, manipulation or confusion if not outright threats, abuse or terror. This is most clear amongst our flying relatives, our walking and running relatives, our crawling, hopping and slithering relatives, our swimming and finned relatives. More clearly is the persecution of Indian, African and non-white "others" mother tongues, who in Forbes mind are like William Apess and Felix Cohen a "looking glass" or "miner's canary", whose treatment at the hands of empire signify the intentions, outcomes and relationship they have with white imperialists. Free peoples (everything is people) cherish one thing above all others, their freedom, and with that, their blessings. We can learn from this, but only if we are able to experience it firsthand. It's hard to cherish what we don't know we should. The problem we have today is the deprivation of experience, of the full range of life's blessings, to use Bob Thomas' phrase (Holm 2005). Without these experiences, we accept our victimization as normal, and freedom as abnormal. The reservation can be a haven or a prison, a site of empowerment or depression, a thriving community or an internal colony (Thomas 1975). People's language often signify the key way they differentiate

themselves (Champagne), making them “culturally distinct” (Deloria), and is a prime target, like D-QU was for maintaining and developing tradition-bearing or mature forms of peoplehood, “original instructions”, stories, relationships, ceremony, law and governance and other tap-roots of peoplehood.

Forbes (1984a) penned a short story called “South of Hope”, which describes through the voice of an Indian survivor named Emory, who is hiding from the police and terror squads in an Orwellian inspired *1984* U.S. situation. Emory speaks with other survivors from his bunker saying that “Orwell was just like an Indian, a real prophet. “1984” was a vision, not just a book” (p. 39) The slogans from George Orwell’s (1949) *1984* remind us of this polarized realism in slogans such as “War is peace. Freedom is slavery. Ignorance is strength.” We find words like these have turned our world around, our truths turned inside out and on their head through language. Orwell’s and Forbes’ words describe a struggle where we doubt our world, ourselves, and other forms of life. Elsewhere, Orwell (1946) reminds us in his *Politics and the English Language* that “if thought corrupts language, language can also corrupt thought” and further, “a bad usage can spread by tradition and imitation, even among people who should and do know better” (p. 253). An example from the plot of his infamous *1984* is demonstrative of this paradox. The case of the protagonist Winston who masters the art of Doublespeak and thinking he has outwitted the Thought Police and Big Brother comes to realize they have created “the enemies” and “the resistance”. Winston concludes, “what is needed is a piece of pure fantasy”, in other words, a lie which bears the guise of truth (p. 59). This is what is believable nowadays. Total fictions. Such as White people, who are not really all white, not “white as snow” as we are to believe of Snow White, or “lovely white” within

the mind of Benjamin Rush (Takaki 1979, p. 35). It is a group of aligned persons naming themselves “whites” for a powerful purpose. They seek to reap the blessings of another’s freedom. In order to do this, they in turn invented enemies and non-whites, such as Negroes and merciless Indian savages, cannibals and extreme parasitic terrorists. They invented enemies as the Romans had earlier invented the extreme *civitas*, *salvaticus* and *rusticus* as did the Greeks “barbarians”, which were all adopted and adapted by later imperialists including the U.S. Other inventions are that of the Indians, the Red People, so-called Redskins, and Yellow People, so-called Asians. Africans for example are merely Indians from Africa, and upon their inter-mixing with American Indians in Forbes mind become a whole people, Red-Black People or what others have labeled Black Indians (Forbes 1988; Forbes 1993). The term “hispanic” for example is derived from a particular people, *hispanos*, yet was adopted by the U.S. in order to create a pathway to whiteness for imperial citizens with documented European ancestors and other light-skinned persons (Forbes 1992a). These are fictions that are readily identified today as real, as real as the sun and the moon. In imperial science today which draws heavily from earlier ideas, we find “animate” and “inanimate” or “physical” and “mental” as the new dichotomies and structure of thought and reality. These are pure fantasies made real, not unlike the devil, satan and similar characters who were formerly a plethora of “spirits”, good and bad, later reforged into the purely evil ones.

Orwell (1946) also reminds us that there is hope, even for English speakers. He says, “to think clearly is the necessary first step towards political regeneration” (p. 128). This concept of clear thinking is echoed by John Mohawk (2010) and Forbes (1967, p 53). To work through our imperialized language and thoughts is to become conscious of

who we really are and what we have become as well as becoming empowered subjects rather than new objects to be enumerated in the census. James Sákéj Youngblood Henderson and Marie Battiste (2000) argue that many of us suffer from a kind of “cognitive imperialism”, essentially, thought control or what so many call “brainwashing”, literally an activity of cleansing oneself of non-imported ideas while wholly becoming the imported ideas. They argue that the “implicit sovereigns in modern thought are the interests that lead humans to choose a language. The people who have the power to decide what a thing will be called have the power to decide reality” (p. 74). “Implicit sovereigns” are internally planted or grown through rigorous influences, mediums (and media), tools and techniques (Battiste 2013b). Blaeser (2012) says of Native languages, orality and literatures:

Ultimately, we have survived as Native peoples partly because our literary traditions are embedded with our nationhood. Our spirituality, our healing rites, our community structures, our relationships to place and subsistence economies—all these elements are woven into the tribal stories, songs, and dances. Yet, as the Native oral performances began to be transcribed, translated, annotated, interpreted, and abridged, they underwent a colonization. The colonization of orature and literature is as real as the colonization of land, the evidence as concrete and as readily traced as the shrinking land holdings of Indian people across the centuries (p. 213).

But was this a straight across process that imperialist scientists, historians, anthropologists, linguists and others perform without equally being affected by the language, content and people they speak about or work with? Is translation always an

imperial-colonial process or is white, scientific and Christian imperialism a lens, a window that can be played with, as a toy-tool just as much as language? How important is language to repossessing the world-view, values, and mobility to create and inhabit the blessings of creation, freedom and community?

Forbes readily took up this task throughout his life by both mastering Englantino (as he called his dialect of English, different than Webster's American English or the Queen's English), and Mexicano (Mexican Spanish) as well as learning as much as he could of his other mother tongues, including Lenape, but also Dutch and others he encountered along the way such as Nahuatl. Forbes understood the power of language. As Winona LaDuke (2005) has so elegantly framed it, "there is power in naming, [and] in renaming. That power is widely abused in the United States. Many communities struggle with the names given to them by others, and the deconstructing of the categories and borders placed on identity" (p. 51). Forbes (1996b) himself devised many alternative names, spellings and ways of describing Native Nationals and Nations and shortly after he became an emeriti at UC Davis in 1995, he complained:

isn't it time to throw off the names of colonialism and to insist that indigenous peoples be treated as human beings worthy of respect? Perhaps we need to rename our reservations, our towns, our tribes (as the Ho-Chunk Nation) and then rename the languages, archaeological sites, and mountains and rivers. Maybe that will help to give Native People a sense once again of being in control of one's own destiny (p. 2).

Yet, is language in-born, is it deeper than something we learn or unlearn because it is not something we do alone, being a product of community? Lastly, is language that

powerful? Does Forbes and others intimate a position that presupposes people to be bound by imperial languages so as to delimit any real creative thought or actions beyond its limited purviews and conceptual frameworks?

Tom Porter and Kay Olan, two of the leading members of the revitalized Kanien'kehá:ka village of *Kanatsiohareke* "place of the clean pot" of upstate New York have both reiterated for example that with the loss of their language, also goes a genuine recounting of their creation story. Creation stories provide the essential founding of a people in relation to their place in the universe, their core characteristics, their "original instructions" which amount to traditions and a way of life and relating to others. Counting from one to ten on their fingers in the language reminds them every time of their creation story (Porter 2008, p. 81-82). Olan remarks poignantly that "if we lose our language we lose that" (Olan and Matthews 2003). The subtle meaning behind language is what binds words to history, to essential understandings, relationships, important ideas, and ways of living in the world. Forbes (1995b) relates that "imperialism and colonialism have often attempted to interfere with the autonomy of weaker political units, sometimes by wholesale substitution of names" (p. 33). Forbes argues that the term America may even be a traditional name for Anowarakowa or the Great Turtle (island). Among the Miskito people of Nicaragua, their central mountain range still bears the name *Amerrisque* and has been suggested by numerous scholars to have at least originated, informed or reinforced the name "America" (Forbes 1976c; Forbes 1994g; Forbes 2006; Forbes 2008b). John Cabot's map of the known world in 1497 included the name *merrique* and Waldseemuller's 1507 map had the name *America* which was included in Vespucci's Latin text of his travels *Cosmographiae Introductio* published that same year.

“Amerigho Vespucci” was the baptismal name of the person known today as Amerigo Vespucci and there is no way to discern if the numerous similar Indigenous names are the original derivative. It is common for example even for Empires, for colonial states to adopt Indigenous topology and autonyms. Twenty seven of the fifty U.S. states are derived at least in part from Native words as are nineteen of the thirty-one names of the states of Mexico (the original name of the capital of the Triple Alliance was Mexico-Tenochtitlan), and at least seven of the provinces of Canada are derived from Native languages. Canada is from an Iroquoian language word for village, still found in Kanien’keha *kanata*. Europa is named after the Greek goddess of the land as is Asia, while Africa has obscure roots widely debated, perhaps of indigenous African origin.

These are *not* the original names for the land or people’s but rather imperialized (anglicized, frenchified, etc.) forms as in Oklahoma (with a twang or drawl). The problem goes back to the power of language. This is especially prescient when the language that is used and forced upon all others comes through colonial schooling and religious efforts. These efforts are not benign, neutral, positive, beneficial, education. As Forbes (1995b) vehemently points out with the relationship between race and a language of power:

the appropriation of America constitutes a key element in the form of white supremacy that emerges in the area of the United States, even as the later appropriation of “Canada” by Anglo-Canadians has become a key aspect of white supremacy there, and as the appropriation of “Mexico,” “Peru,” “Chile,” etc., by white or light-skinned elites has formed essential parts of white supremacy in Latin America. Stealing the name of a land, as noted, is certainly a vital part of



conquest and the development of a strategy of domination and predation toward the native inhabitants (p. 45).

Are we doomed by this power, are we damned or cursed eternally by this repeated refrain?

Cutchá Risling-Baldy (2013) has quipped about the whole of a global imperial totalitarianism in the context of a post-apocalyptic *Walking Dead* scenario, asking hopefully “can we come back from this?” Or to follow the thought of Audre Lorde (1984), can we use the master’s tools to dismantle the master’s house, that is, without changing how we use them or without uprooting foundation or tap-root, language? As has been pointed out in the previous chapter, to be an American is to be the possessor of the land. It was clear that presidents Polk and Madison who enforced “manifest destiny” attempted what previous Pope’s and empires had done earlier: they claimed the whole of the American island as their possession, their exploitive territory, their personal symbol of identity and power, their realm of influence. “The struggle over the name America really has to do with possession, with who has the right to possess and to dominate the land and who has the right to possess and to dominate the story of the land, its history, its character, and its future,” concludes Forbes (1995b) (p. 45). The purpose of such efforts as Native American Studies at UC Davis (and elsewhere) along with the experiment of D-Q University exemplify Forbes’ felt need to break away from these colonial myths in such a way as to severely destabilize their common usage among all peoples.

“The white man does not understand the Indian for the reason that he does not understand America. He is too far removed from its formative process. . . . The man from Europe is still a foreigner and an alien,” harkens Luther Standing Bear (1933, p. 248).

Standing Bear understood the predicament and power of language so much that he argued that colonizers arrogance and ignorance were debased because “he brought the Word [of the Christian God]! There ensued a blind worship of written history, of books, of the written word, that has denuded the spoken word of its power and sacredness. The written word became established as a criterion of the superior man--a symbol of emotional fineness” (p. 249). He makes clear that Forbes is also referring to the written naming of the land, to the mark of the colonizer and ongoing imperialism for this is what they teach in the prime at schools today. The U.S. kind of imperialism is led forth with the “American tongue” of Daniel Webster. Is the forced learning of the written word of the colonizer, of the empire, akin to worshipping a superior God that demands repentance for fear of retribution? It’s not simply proper pronunciation, it’s a recitation of the stain of colonialism upon the universe and the relinquishment of it to the empire, which is ruled now not by the Christians but by western scientists (so they believe), the new kings of re-naming. Armed with the Roman and Greek language, students today are thrust into a world constantly being questioned and reordered, renamed and reclaimed so much that all the ancient tongues of the world are becoming embittered and distrusted while whitened English as an imperial language is constantly promoted. The processes involved have changed, such that first perhaps Christian missionaries made the initial inroads into transforming a language, and now colonizing knowledges empowered by a belief of “human supremacy” are being extolled (Jensen 2016). We know from the last 400-600 hundred years of European and Christian discourses; this is specifically developed within the context of a White Male supremacist view. The development of western science as a new monolithic religion and story of the world (replete with a new version of genesis, aka

the “big bang”) has come to further empower these original patriarchal and racist world views. This equates to a war against the world in which the supremacists believe humans (if not whites, if not men, if not their religion, etc.) “are superior to all others, and that this superiority entitles us to exploit them” (ibid, p. 322). These kinds of justifications for exploitation intone that “difference leads to hierarchy. Men over women. Whites over non-whites. Civilized over indigenous. Humans over non-humans. Animals over plants. Plants over rocks. Mind over matter. Those higher on the Great Chain of Being over those lower” or in the case above, English over Lakota, or Tolowa or any other language (ibid). A western scientist might argue for a language of science, or the language of quantification, that is, a mathematical language to be superior, and hence, so are the people with the greatest knowledge of this language. Mathematics or enumeration is not a neutral language any more than English or Han Chinese. In any case, the supremacist view is rooted in the imperial exploitation of the world, the act. It’s not simply a belief, or a positive expression of love. It’s a way of war upon life, equating to death if you happen to resist, or rebel, or thwart the “will to empire” (Waziyatawin & Taylor 2005; Blackhawk 2006). Lyons (2000) notes that “the erosion of Indian national sovereignty can be credited in part to a rhetorically imperialist use of writing by white powers” with special references to treaties, laws and written imperial “agreements” (p. 253). Another clear example would be the implementation of the language rod or stick which is found in many imperial, missionizing, proselytizing, and schooling efforts. Gaelge was beaten out of little children a world away from Cham’teela for the same purposes: to change their way, their future by brutalizing their tongues and bodies. Trauma is reborn in the body, and conformity is sustained through fear of re-traumatization. You only have to beat a

dog once is the rule I've heard. It used to be the same for children in European Middle Age education, Roman and Greek forms (Parsons 2015, p. 3). The "tally stick" among Irish speakers is also found in Indian boarding schools who were equally whipped the number of times it was recorded they were caught speaking their language at the end of a given day (Coleman 2007, p. 98).

The imperial project in the U.S. was led at first by the sword and the cross, empowered by colonial charters (the first corporations), and historical "successes" of previous colonization efforts and empire-building. Language as the symbolic carrier of a people's values, traditions, and ideas were utilized and attacked, for Columbus' first voyage revealed his understanding that the Arawak needed to be made to talk, that is, speak an imperial language . Only during the first meetings and early relationships developed between imperial-colonial efforts were Indigenous languages allowed to be substituted, especially in the case of religious texts such as the bible, for colonial languages. We can find numerous examples of Indigenous languages being used to communicate the various Christian sects messaging through rigorously translated biblical texts, songs, and stories and early immigrants' willingness to learn the languages of the lands-peoples they were living on. Supposing a religion was a total way of life and that translation had already occurred in the past, Christians, especially Catholic Jesuits, Franciscans, and Dominicans were able to learn and use Indigenous languages as catechistic tools of conquest. Some early mission schools and praying towns only used Indigenous languages as the medium of communicating Christian messages, this however, was a short-lived reality as the colonial groups gained major footholds, especially after the Yankees broke away from the empire and started their own. None of

the Native Nations were offered the total protection that many Treaties suggested would be respected, and thus, they were not allowed to retain their autonomy, especially linguistically as every language community had English or Spanish forcibly thrust upon them. This is a key feature of empires. For example, the Soviet Union under Lenin allowed for a multiplicity of languages, however, this was based on their desire to become part of the Union rather than a sympathetic view of their just nationalism which Lenin thought would keep them separate as he believed in assimilation. By the 1936 Constitution (Chapter X, Article 121) under Stalin, it was declared that “Citizens of the U.S.S.R. have the right to education. This right is ensured by universal, compulsory elementary education; by education, including higher education, being free of charge; by the system of state stipends for the overwhelming majority of students in the universities and colleges; by instruction in schools being conducted in the native language”. Yet, not long after these “sacred words” were written in a Constitution, full-scale Russification took place. In the U.S. language is not mentioned in any part of the constitution or amendments and still does not recognize each and every local group of people to exercise their right to speak their own language and to learn in their own language. Language itself as a tool-technology of people, can become a weapon. It can eat away at the dignity of a people, degrade and dismiss them, ignore or silence them. It has the ability to harm or heal, to cure or curse, to destroy or empower.

By the time of the passage of the Civilization Fund Act of 1819, missionary and Christian groups (primarily Protestant) were offered annually 10,000 dollars to introduce education including “reading, writing and arithmetic”, all via imperial White English. The U.S.’s war on America and native Americans, was previously a war for extinction,

yet through the mist of language, the act proclaimed the opposite, which is that it was created “for the purpose of guarding against the further decline and final extinction of the Indian tribes, adjoining the frontier settlements of the United States, [who] are for introducing among them the habits and arts of civilization”. Education was conceived as the only protection, however, not against imperialism, but savagery. Civilization is a catch all term for “white civilization”, “Christian civilization”, “western civilization” and imperialism (Forbes 2000). In the efforts that followed, the English language predominated while Latin was taught in relation to the Biblical texts and precepts utilized. Previously tried mission schools were not federally funded and this act created a whole new regime of imperial-colonial schooling. These early mission schools helped pave the way for the boarding school era which began officially in 1879 led by Richard Henry Pratt, a lieutenant in the army who had at first experimented on Fort Marion prisoners the kind of inter-tribal congregated (segregated) schooling found at his flagship school, Carlisle Indian Industrial School which enrolled at first more than a hundred ex-prisoners (Reyhner & Eder 2017). At Carlisle and elsewhere, Native languages were forbidden and any student caught speaking in a non-English tongue were severely chastised, if not beaten, jailed, or possibly, killed. It is unknown how many children died at the boarding schools for any number of reasons outside of the conditions of congregation which themselves promoted tuberculosis and other illnesses. For example, Rule 41 of the published Rules for Indian Schools of 1890, clearly spelled out the intent of the schools’ efforts:

All instruction must be in the English language. Pupils must be compelled to converse with each other in English, and should be properly rebuked or punished

for persistent violation of this rule. Every effort should be made to encourage them to abandon their tribal language. To facilitate this work it is essential that all school employees be able to speak English fluently, and that they speak English exclusively to the pupils, and also to each other in the presence of pupils (p. CLI).

Tom Porter (2008) explains that in the 1940's when he attended St. Regis Mohawk School in Hogansburg, NY, that although he was raised solely speaking his language by his grandmother, he notes how he had been forced to endure an extremely violent and hostile environment beyond home at school. He said, "I remember they used to hit us. In fact my generation was the last of the Mohawks of Akwesasne to be physically punished for speaking our language" (pps. 28-29). Yet, the relegation of the language to being second class did not end there, and was not actively promoted in any way until well into the 1970's. Even today, the language is taught as an ancillary one to English, where only three language teachers do the work of creating speakers out of more than 500 students, of whom more than 60% come from the reservation community in the reformed boarding school now a public school of St. Regis. Porter notes that his grandfather and great-grandfather attended Carlisle, a school whose purpose was "meant to deprogram all the Indians from their language, deprogram them from their spiritual orientation, deprogram them from their values or moral standards," essentially, "make them into Yankee-Doodle-went-to-town kind of people" (p. 386). His grandfather came back to the reservation as an adult who didn't speak the language any more, and according to Porter, other serious problems existed as at the school where "he had no mother. He had no father" and he did not experience the loving relationships of kin and clan that aided greatly in creating a dysfunctional reservation community (p. 387). We learn our

languages, as in the aphorism “mother tongue”, from our families. Without their traditions of talk, we become a different kind of people.

The Carlisle plan was extended throughout the U.S. so that there were more than 150 boarding and mission schools by the 1970’s, not counting the hundreds of day and reservation-based schools as well as the white-oriented public schools which became the predominant places Native children received an education beginning in the 1920’s and especially after the passage of Johnson O’Malley Act (1934) which funded public schools per Indian student attendance via individual states. Joseph Suina (1988), a Cochiti born survivor of Albuquerque Indian School complained that “school was a painful experience during those early years. The English language and the new set of values caused me much anxiety and embarrassment” (p. 297). Further, he notes specifically about language that the rules for this school was anti-Indian,

“Leave your Indian at home!” was like a school trademark. Speaking it accidentally or otherwise was punishable by a dirty look or a whack with a ruler. This reprimand was for speaking the language of my people which meant so much to me. It was the language of my grandmother, and I spoke it well. With it, I sang beautiful songs and prayed from my heart. At that young and tender age, it was most difficult for me to comprehend why I had to part with my language (p. 298).

This was not only the case for Native Nation’s language speakers as Spanish speakers, outside of the first few years of statehood in California, Texas and Arizona territories, were also not allowed to speak freely at public schools. Gloria Anzaldua (1987) explains that as a child in south Texas in the 1950’s:



I remember being caught speaking Spanish at recess - that was good for three licks on the knuckles with a sharp ruler. I remember being sent to the corner of the classroom for “talking back” to the Anglo teacher when all I was trying to do was tell her how to pronounce my name. “If you want to be American, speak ‘American.’ If you don’t like it, go back to Mexico where you belong” (p. 34).

In the case of *Meyer v. Nebraska* (1923), the court ruled that “due process” was being violated where a teacher was reprimanded for teaching a student to read in German, tying in the 1st and 14th amendments to clearly state that it was in the teachers and students (and parents) rights to raise a child to speak another language (freedom of speech), and that this was a basic constitutional right. This was in response to a recent (1919) passage of a statute called “An act relating to the teaching of foreign languages in the state of Nebraska” whose core text read, “No person, individually or as a teacher, shall, in any private, denominational, parochial or public school, teach any subject to any person in any language other than the English language.” Justice McReynolds who presided over the verdict included in his opinion that “the individual has certain fundamental rights which must be respected. The protection of the Constitution extends to all, to those who speak other languages as well as to those born with English on the tongue.” Arguments for the plaintiff included the task of Americanization who advised the court to maintain the act because “the purpose of the statute is to insure that the English language shall be the mother tongue and the language of the heart of the children reared in this country who will eventually become the citizens of this country.” So freedom of speech can be reneged if it goes against the *intentions* or the *will* of empire, or with regards to non-whites? The U.S. passed the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 whose federally funded

statutes would give students equal opportunities in learning the same curriculum despite language differences by offering special language-based teaching measures and programs. In the case of *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) Chinese speaking students won a case which reinforced the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that included passages to protect people from undue harm given their limited English proficiency through providing adequate supplemental teaching measures. The Native American Language Act of 1990 and 1992 provided for the first time in legislative history specific commitments to support Native language instruction (backed in the 1992, 1994 and 1996 legislative pieces with funding measures) as well as rescind previous efforts and mandates that might target Native languages for extinction or bar their use.

Only a few communities have been able to truly benefit from this legislation as it provides only short-term funding which allows perhaps some pilot programs to begin but not maintain their efforts. Groups will have to find alternative funding for the various backlog of preparatory and complementary efforts required to be successful, such as parent classes, localized textbooks, language nest or pre-school programs, highly qualified teacher training and community teacher training programs to name but a few. The Esther Martinez Native American Languages Preservation Act of 2006 hoped to remedy this issue by providing funding for the above efforts however these are all limited, short-term funding measures which deter communities from investing in more than one school as well as not addressing key issues such as transportation, creating tribal school districts out of public ones, creating international universities on multi-national reservations, community language revitalization outside of school, and other big issues. A new form of the bill has passed the Senate since November of 2017 but it has failed to

move into the House for deliberation, and would include longer terms for the grants as well as reauthorization until 2023. The problem with these bills is that they are all short-term efforts, without any long-term commitment to Native communities where the languages come from, and further, they do not provide funding for urban schools where multiple languages may need to be taught, nor does it provide for homeschool efforts in reservation communities where parent organizations do not exist to siphon funding and administer them.

In California, English only legislation passed in 1986 making it the official language of the state (not that this has any bearing on the 14th amendment clauses), and in 1998 Proposition 227 was passed which rolled back many statutes of the state bilingual education act with the declaration that “all children in California public schools shall be taught English by being taught in English.” This act did not entirely ban foreign language instruction, yet it made it very difficult as districts and schools had to prove there was a “special need” or an exceptional excuse to speak your mother tongue which had many students switching teachers to learn in another language in order to get around the clause of “shall be taught in English” as well as causing many schools and districts to disband their programs. The No Child Left Behind act of 2002 seriously strained the Bilingual Education Act, changing its title to the English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act, thereby focusing upon the assimilative goal of English speakers rather than bilingualism. This act was heavily resisted because of its emphasis upon high-stakes testing, which did not prove helpful for non-English speaking populations, programs or communities whose efforts to speak a language other

than English were to be altered so as to maintain a national standard of knowledge (Forbes 1998).

By 2015, a successive law, the Every Student Succeeds Act was passed which removed a number of key provisions and which moved the standards held in the high-stakes testing down to the state level rather than a national standard (Alaska, Hawaii, California, New Mexico, Iowa and New York for example had the same tested knowledge base yet have extremely different populations, histories and languages). In California in 2016 the voters unanimously passed the Multilingual Education Act (Prop 58) which was opposed by the Republican Party and demonstrates the state-led requirements of education as emphasized in ESSA. While Native Nations have attained some support from the federal government, almost no support has come from their respective states, nor is there any support even on the federal level for terminated tribes, urban native communities, non-recognized or state-recognized Nations or non “U.S. Indians”. Further, the largest number of Indigenous language speakers today in the U.S. are from non-U.S. Native community members either in Africa, Asia or in southern America, especially Mexico. Thus, language is not simply a Native National struggle, however, it is an extremely pertinent one as Native U.S. speakers are overwhelmed in terms of population and territory or more specifically, property ownership, especially in California, from foreign Native members and communities. The U.S. as an imperialist nation seeks primarily in its actions to incorporate Native Nations and nationals into the corporate body politic, especially via the English language. The English language has been consistently aligned via political alliances and Anglo Europeanization to the United Kingdom and British English who the U.S. keeps as their ally and friend in empire.

Speaking, storying, joking and making plans intercept the linguicidal approaches of colonial attacks. We get caught up in the meanings and definitions of words when we allow the colonizer to own the plane of our existence, and especially, our language fields. There is no monolithic English but rather an Imperial English, which is an extension of the Anglo English imported from England with minor additions allowed from settler-colonial whites. Noah Webster perceived the differences yet maintained the connection to Britain in his *American Dictionary of the English Language* (1828) which remarks that “although the body of the language is the same as in England, and it is desirable to perpetuate that sameness” he admits, “some differences must exist” and was the base reason for a dictionary which would be better “suited to the people of the United States” yet he remarks never that there are hundreds of languages spoken in the U.S.. The language he speaks of is an imperial language of conquest and dispossession, and his standardization project of the English language served a higher purpose: to be “a more useful instrument for the propagation of science, arts, civilization and Christianity”, that is, he hoped the U.S. would develop into a new empire rather than a conglomerate of colonies turned states where a single language empowered the white populace to exert their influence as one. This is a basic lie that global imperialism as an ideology desires for itself and was manifest as a prerogative with the British Empire’s initial efforts in the early 1600’s. Within the heart of the empire there were multiple languages spoken such as Scots, Cymraeg (Welsh), Gaeilge (Irish), Gaidhlig (Scottish Gaelic) all of which had various dialects, also Breton (Brythonic), Cornish (Cornwall), Gitano languages (Gypsies) and Traveller-Itinerant languages, as well as numerous English dialects that were extremely diverse and distinct. Contemporary independence movements from all of

these peoples have been expressed which have marked their language as one of the distinguishing features. The same can be said for *Castellano*. At the time of the invasion of Anowarakowa by Columbus the dialect of Castile was only spoken by a narrow population, as not even Columbus or many other invaders such as Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo were first language speakers in that specific tongue. The Kingdom of Castile had only spread its particular dialects (which were different even among Ferdinand, the bureaucracy and propertied classes) so far, as there existed Aragonese, Galician, Catalan, Asturian, Occitan, Andalusian, as well as the languages spoken by Basque (Euskara), Gitanos (Gypsies), Sephardic Jews, and Muslims who were still very much a formidable part of the population even after the reconquista. Today, these distinct dialects have further distinguished themselves so much that Euskara and Catalan have expressed contemporary desires for independence from their states. They are in Forbes critical mind, “captive nations” who speak captive languages.

Language is a key tool of distinction as well as the means to express experience, history, and other aspects of peoplehood. James Baldwin (1979) once remarked that Black English, Ebonics, the Black vernacular, etc., as a language “comes into existence by means of brutal necessity, and the rules of the language are dictated by what the language must convey”, in this case, white imperialism must be survived by something other than what Whites speak. Yet Whites have adopted a great deal from the black vernacular, from black music such as jazz, the blues, hip-hop, country, also cultural ethos formed in the Beat generation, and a whole host of other characteristics, culture and phenomenon. Baldwin suggests that Blacks should be credited with “having created a language that permits the nation its only glimpse of reality, a language without which the

nation would be even more whipped than it is” (p. 3). The truth revealed in this fact is that Whites still need Black people, like they need Indians, for some sense of “the real”, as Huhndorf (2001), Philip Deloria (1998) and Berkhofer (1979) have made plainly clear in their studies of Whites “playing Indian”. Zora Neale Hurston (1891-1960), who studied with Franz Boas, decidedly returned to her communities in the south to collect traditional thought, stories and language, where she also wrote a great deal of literature in a Black vernacular and was a most celebrated author. Yet, she was unable to get her text *Barracoon: The Last Black Cargo* (2018) published by a colonial white press while she was alive due to racism and a disrespect for her people’s language, stories and critical insight. The fight over teaching through the Black vernacular in Oakland, California was fought and won and then defeated within two year’s time as white schools, board members and parents fought against the wave of resurgent Black families and community’s daily language inclusiveness as recent as 1996-1997. Yet, if we follow Baldwin’s line of thinking, don’t Whites need Black people, if not to speak, or create new cultural forms, but to also maintain a unique supremacist sense of peoplehood? Aren’t blacks the underemployed or underpaid class that whites have always relied upon, whether they were in or out of prison as these penal institutions are constituted in large mass by incarcerated, working blacks? With over 37 million people totaling 12% of the population in the U.S., Blacks far outnumber others in percentage represented in prisons with over 2.3 million people or 34% of all persons incarcerated as of 2014 (NAACP 2015). Angela Davis (2003) has poignantly noted that Africans transported from their homelands to the slave-based colonies in Turtle Island went from liberated persons in 1865 and the passage of the 13th and 14th amendments to being the principle people

incarcerated in the world's most massive prison system, who uncoincidentally, are forced to labor for bread, water, and a few commodities or commissary items.

At the crux of Forbes early work was an honest promotion of pluralism, multilingualism and the transformation of educational sites into truly inclusive places of learning. Forbes understood that the roots of Black Power, Brown Power or Chicano Power, and Indian Power or Red Power stemmed from the lack of community control of public institutions, let alone the creation of new institutions founded and developed by the communities they represented. These institutions would look drastically different than past or current examples and in the vein of Luther Standing Bear who suggested that what is needed is an "Indian school of thought", Forbes began to advocate for a drastically different kind of school setting. These new schools would not teach tokenized forms of knowledge merely for the sake of inclusion or to fulfill a compromise with white power, but rather to drastically alter the nature of schooling in the southwest and beyond. Forbes initial contributions in the field of education was as a substitute high school teacher, who then began teaching community or junior college until he landed a full-time tenure track position. He served as a board of trustees member for the Ventura County College District from 1961-1963 and was much distrusted despite his positive returns, where he helped purchase land to open a new community college, Moorpark College, which did not start classes until 1967, years after he had already left San Fernando Valley State University for the Far West Educational Research Laboratory in Reno, NV in 1964 after teaching for three years there. One of the issues he constantly dealt with was the power of language and its influence on a people's perception, self-esteem, cultural reinforcement and feelings of belonging. For example, he suggested



numerous names for Moorpark College drawn from Indigenous names of the valley where it is located which were met with repugnant opinions from the White press (see “Trustee Kept Goals in Sight”, March 27, 1964, *Ventura County Star Free Press*, Sec. B12, Vol. 89, No. 121). During the 1960’s, Forbes was of the few non-Black outspoken critics against one-sided integration measures which were being promoted after ineffectual efforts stemming from the *Brown v. Topeka Kansas Board of Education* ruling more than ten years prior (Forbes 1969c). Forbes (1966b) argued that “most whites have no desire to be integrated” and further suggested 12 years after the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision that,

Perhaps the Negro would be better off with his own schools, his own movie studios, his own TV stations, and his own institutions in general. Integration with Anglos is a one-sided surrender on the part of Negroes and a condescending act of chauvinism on the part of whites unless it is accompanied by genuine multi-cultural and multi-racial revolutions in education and society. Should one say, “I want you to be just like me” or “Let’s learn from each other” (p. 7)?

Almost seventy-five years after the decision, a few token pieces of literature, a few snippets focusing on “heroic” and peaceful figures such as Martin Luther King Jr. and Rosa Parks are all that can be founded in today’s curriculum. Forbes words still ring true, “whites have no desire to be integrated”, especially, linguistically. Worst, is that the pressures to conform to ever more stunting forms of education are required as the technocratic sphere of influence has certainly pervaded all forms of schooling which are requiring less in the realm of culture, history and the arts and more of imperial science and mathematics, imagined today as STEM, for they represent objective measures of

“learning” and appropriate socialization today within the Industrial Empire. Yet, what is at the “heart” of the white problem, the colonial problem, the imperial matrix and the destructive behaviors which are now practiced in every living community? Do we have the words to describe it or is the plague too nebulous? The authoring of Forbes most searing political and polemical critique, *Columbus and Other Cannibals* (2008a) was subject to a critical review upon its revision provided by Luna-Firebaugh (2010), who explains that Forbes critique of imperialism simply comes from “a different era and a different time” (the 1960’s and 1970’s), suggesting his views are rather irrelevant (p. 122). Is imperialism the real enemy or is it something else? Is Forbes irrelevant today?

#### *Forbes and the Development of Wetikoism and Machiavellianism*

Important to understand the mind and philosophy of Forbes, and in relation to education, is that Forbes thought in order to truly provide a culturally relevant and holistic kind of learning-becoming experience, one must also deal with both mis-education and distortion of healthy and traditional peoplehood, was that we must deal with the imperial problem educationally, as the most important social problem. Forbes might say, this is what we're up against, so let's face the monster head on by naming it, by describing it, by talking and teaching about it. Here are his conclusions about what lies at the root of imperialism, what he deems to be the vilest, avarice and destructive way of life the world has ever known. Forbes early equated imperialism with what he called, *Machiavellianism*, and is derived from Niccolo Machiavelli, author of *De Principatibus / Il Principe* or *The Prince* (1532). Forbes search for historical and cultural archetypes of Columbus and others sickness and psychosis was part and parcel of his “radical” thought,

or root work as a historian. Looking back towards recorded historical orations as well as to contemporary names and concepts which describe the U.S. and white's psychosis, we find there is much to say beyond Forbes own paradigm. Tecumseh (1811) related in a speech he gave to the Osage in his quest for anti-imperial unity, "the white people are like poisonous serpents" and cannot be trusted (as quoted in Brock 1845, p. 308).

Exonyms, or names for other's are often telling of a group's perception of those beyond their own societies. For example, the U.S. uses exonyms almost exclusively to describe Native Nations, preferring often names derived from enemy nations such as Mohawk "flesh-eaters" which comes from the Wyandot derision. The term Indian for example, from Latin *india*, originally Sanskrit *Sindhu*, is found infamously in reference to the *Indus* river, but also is the generic Sanskrit word for "river", and is not at all what the people called themselves or their land. It could be reclaimed by American Indians to mean "river people" but this is not what is happening, as it is used to reinforce the Nation-to-Nation relationship developed with the Dutch, British, Spanish, French and U.S. empires. However, it may have actually been only a Nation-to-State relationship, or Tribal-to-State relationship where Native Nations were rarely seen as equal parties. The name of the game: power, is the important denominator. We see this pattern and the power derived from naming used against one group while empowering another.

Forbes, who was a student of imperialism all of his life (1934-2011) beginning with the rise of neo-fascist states in Italy and Deutschland, he continuously adapted and drew from historical examples and critiques. Tracing Forbes use of Machiavelli as an archetypal "cannibal" is difficult. Hobson (1902), who wrote prior to neo-imperialist

Germany, Italy, France and other's states from Europe also placed the U.S. within this realm based on this simple definition:

The scramble for Africa and Asia has virtually recast the policy of all European nations . . . has driven every continental nation to consume an ever-growing share of its material and human resources upon military and naval equipment, has drawn the great new power of the United States from its isolation into the full tide of competition . . . . The new policy has exercised the most notable and formidable influence upon the conscious statecraft of the nations which indulge in it. While producing for popular consumption doctrines of national destiny and imperial missions of civilisation, contradictory in their true import, but subsidiary to one another as supports of popular Imperialism, it has evolved a calculating, greedy type of Machiavellianism, entitled "real-politik" in Germany, where it was made. . . . Earth hunger and the scramble for markets are responsible for the openly avowed repudiation of treaty obligations [with other nations]. . . . (p. 11).

It is unclear from Forbes notes whether he was influenced by the work of Hobson (1902) before the first 1976 draft of *A World Ruled by Cannibals*, while he does reference him later on (see Forbes 2000b). Had Forbes read T.D. Adorno's *Authoritarian Personality* (1950), or Leo Strauss's (1958) *Thoughts on Machiavelli* or other scholars such as the now widely cited psychology study of Christie and Gies (1970), *Studies in Machiavellianism*? For example, Strauss argued that "even if we were forced to grant that Machiavelli was essentially a patriot or a scientist, we would not be forced to deny that he was a teacher of evil" (p. 11). This is precisely Forbes angle, but Strauss is uncited. From at least 1971, Forbes clearly articulated the base arguments from which his future

works on the subject were at least rooted. In a speech on the Deed Day, April 1st, 1971 of D-Q University he spoke to a crowd of Chicano, Indian and other public supporters, where he summarized the issues at heart and the main reasons for the founding of D-QU, saying:

It is obvious that the value system of many white Americans, emphasizing aggressive, selfish manipulation and the exploitation of living creatures and Mother Earth, is leading this country to doom. But by turning to the Native American ideals of real democracy, the achievement of beauty and harmony, absolute respect for the rights of others and profound love for the entire web of life, white people will be able to save themselves (JDF D-046, B. 252, F.

Correspondence - Jack Forbes, p. 3; see also a published version in

“Deganawidah—Quetzalcoatl University Receive Army Land in Davis, Calif.” *Navajo Times*, June 16, 1971, p. 14).

Forbes (1975) began to pen his own study of the psychotic imperialist as a sickness or disease by first narrowing down his model character, that of Niccolo Machiavelli. This article was at first a speech he delivered during what was hailed as the “First D-QU Statewide Symposium” with the running theme of the *Philosophy of the Third World* which took place on the D-QU campus December 3-5th of 1973 (JDF B. 252, F.

Correspondence - Jack Forbes). The informational flyer for the event has the original title of the speech as “What does “Self-Determination” mean? Captive Nations and Colonialist States”. This speech was later transcribed and titled as, “Self-Determination and Captive Nations” and was subsequently reproduced and distributed via *Akwesasne Notes* catalog as simply *Captive Nations*, in audio-cassette (magnetic tape) format. As a

text it was first transcribed and published in *Philosophy of the Third World* (1974) by D-QU Press and then later by *Akwesasne Notes* as ““Machiavellianism” The Most Contagious Disease Known To Man” in the Autumn (Sept. 30th) issue (Vol. 7, no. 4) of 1975. Much of Forbes pronouncements were developed for the eyes, ears and hearts of live community audiences, only later becoming published texts. Academia was not his major performance base, as he relied upon community feedback and input throughout the process from which to develop his ideas. In 1975, Forbes began to teach Native American Religion & Philosophy at UCD alongside Sarah Hutchison and the artist George Longfish who was hired the year before, and it is clear he was considering all sources of knowledge, experience, languages and ideas in the formulation of his ideas as he travelled across the U.S. speaking, to Europe, and beyond. He was highly influenced and influential by the 1960’s such that is difficult to discern the various waters in the sponge.

Forbes (1967) first use of the term “Machiavellianism” in a public text focuses on the tremendous destruction brought to Anowarakowa by European invaders who carried the tenets of Machiavelli far and wide, and is found in a speech he gave on *Far West Indian-White Relations* at Stanislaus State College for a Conference on the Training of Teachers of California Indian Pupils in March of 1967. He suggests clearly that his use of Machiavellianism is an original conception:

Tribal-supra/tribal relations involve a number of characteristics which I think are of some interest. First, I have a concept which I have developed on my own, more or less using my own term to try to get across some of the feel of one of the important elements I think involved in Indian-White relations. This is what I call the contact between sophisticated and unsophisticated cultures, although I don’t

like those words. I might call them Machiavellian and non-Machiavellian. In other words by sophisticated I mean the kind of sophistication that includes the knowledge of evil (p. 5, JDF D-046, B. 43, F. “Conference on Education of Teachers of California Indians”).

The next time it is found he uses this term is in his treatise on *Why DQU?* (1972), which was disseminated widely as a mimeograph and then later published in his collection *Aztecas del Norte: the Chicanos of Aztlan* (1973), where he says:

The crisis in white society which today threatens the continued existence of the United States (and of the world) is not the result of an accident. It is instead the inevitable result of “machiavellian” attitudes towards Mother Earth and towards living creatures, including humans. *No society based upon an exploitative, aggressive, greed-oriented set of values can possibly survive for any great length of time. Such a society inevitably brings about its own destruction.*

How is this true? It is true because a people who do not recognize the intrinsic rights of other living creatures will destroy them at will (provided that greed, based upon a desire for wealth-derived social status, is socially approved). This was what the white man did to the bison in a few short years. This is what the white man did to the forests and grasslands of North America (pps. 234-235, emphasis original).

This truth is expounded upon later (1974) in his *Americanization of Education in the United States* when he argues:

If we were able to open our eyes to the truth, we would see a land with fantastic original beauty, now partially ruined. We would see a native legacy of

tremendous power and value. We would see millions of Blacks, Browns, and poor whites struggling heroically to survive and develop through centuries of slavery and exploitation. We would see, in short, not only many peoples and many colors, but we would also come to understand how greed, materialism, Machiavellianism, and violence have caused this land to become at one and the same time one of the most beautiful and most ugly places on the earth (p. 16).

Here, we see that Machiavelli is used as a symbol of the extreme tyrant, who exercises unrestrained power in order to achieve whatever ends it desires. The “techniques” of empire that Machiavelli advocates have become the common lifeblood of European and white invaders. The original use of the term in connection with the founding of D-QU is important as he describes what Native Nations offer the world at large, and could develop with a university of their own. Forbes et al (1972) sets up a dichotomy which dramatizes the imperial condition of California, U.S. and world he finds himself subsumed within:

A “machiavellian” mass society valuing wealth-acquisition and typified by exploitative relations must, inevitably, be a violent society, using force to protect the “haves” and the “hope to haves” from the “have-nots” and outsiders. *Such a society will destroy itself because its greed will cause it to consume its own resources and even its own people.* No self-restraints can effectively be imposed because the society’s very nature, its internal dynamic, is to consume. *Its voracious appetite will cause it to literally eat itself.* When sufficiently weakened, other similar social monsters will finish it off-if anything remains.

Non-machiavellian people, such as most Indians and Chicanos and a certain number from other groups, exist within the territory of this self-destructing



society. If they are to survive this crisis, they must see to it that their own people are given the opportunity to be saved, along with those non-natives who possess the personal values necessary for “salvation” (pps. 235-236, emphasis original).

Imperialism is an extreme form of consumption. Here we see the core of his argument meted out, that it is a kind of spiritual, territorial, cultural, mental sickness which envisages all life as consumable by people and their empires of exploitation.

Next, I will describe the thrust of his arguments as they developed in this and related texts describing in detail the study of the maniacal killer or wanton consumer of life, the cannibal or wétiko, whether they are poor or rich, sane or insane, good or evil which he believes is at the heart of the issues regarding the longevity and transference of the psychosis or disease. Dutch, English, French, Christians, Europeans turned Whites were the original carriers. The wétiko psychosis, or rapacious consumption of another's life or spirit, he says:

[Wetikoism] is the greatest epidemic sickness known to man. The rape of a woman, the rape of the land, and the rape of a people, they are all the same. And they are the same as the rape of the earth, the rape of the rivers, the rape of the forest, the rape of the air, the rape of the animals. Brutality knows no boundaries. Greed knows no limits. Perversion knows no borders. Arrogance knows no frontiers. Deceit knows no edges. These characteristics all tend to push towards an extreme, always moving forward once the initial infection sets in (Forbes 1992a, p. 12).

Ohiyesa (1921), better known as Charles A. Eastman recalled a speech from Sitting Bull he paraphrased to his best ability as remembered by multiple observers of it. I quote him in full:

Yet hear me, friends! we have now to deal with another people, small and feeble when our forefathers first met with them, but now great and overbearing.

Strangely enough, they have a mind to till the soil, and the love of possessions is a disease in them. These people have made many rules that the rich may break, but the poor may not! They have a religion in which the poor worship, but the rich will not! They even take tithes of the poor and weak to support the rich and those who rule. They claim this mother of ours, the Earth, for their own use, and fence their neighbors away from her, and deface her with their buildings and their refuse. They compel her to produce out of season, and when sterile she is made to take medicine in order to produce again. All this is sacrilege (pps. 119-120).

Forbes was a student of the great Native leaders of the past including Ohiyesa, and frequently invoked their diverse words and wisdom in order to demonstrate the continuity behind their interactions with those who have “a disease in them”. Murderous behavior is easily justified if one is in a constant state of “war”. The root word of war is originally from Proto-Indo European *-wers*, or contemporary German *verwirran*, Old Anglo Saxon and Old High German *werran*, which all mean “to confuse, mix up”, and are related to the word *worse*, as in the opposite of better, and the phrase “to make matters worse”. Essentially, an all-out war creates mass conflict, confusion and disrupts any balance or order in life. Those who say there are rules to war are themselves confused, for there is a great difference in traditional conceptions of engaged battling and fighting. To fight

because of another's lack of respect for laws is not war, for as the Mohawk rule is, you have three warnings or opportunities to make things right. A war-like state lives off of this hysteria, and feeds like vultures upon its many battlefields filled of carrion. In this way, imperialism thrives on order as much as disorder, the living or dead. As was pointed out previously, war can become the engine or the spirit of the law, as in the words of the Spanish empires "requerimiento" which argued a Christians right "to make just war" on non-Christians, or the Declaration of Independence's rationale which blamed the "merciless Indian savages" as one of the paramount reasons for their "rebellion", the latter word is from the Latin word for war, *bellum*, as in the "antebellum" period, or before the revolutionary war. A spirit, a heart, a mind at war with the world and within itself are split, they are unable to find peace and beauty in themselves or amongst creation and its infinite creatures. Although Forbes (2008a) began with Machiavellian thought, he concluded that "it does not adequately describe the nature of what we are dealing with" and chose instead to focus upon the "*wétiko* concept" (p. 24; Forbes 1979a, p. 13). Machiavellianism is the rationalization rather than the sickness itself, and perhaps, it was an already studied phenomenon by European scholars. Forbes turned to a traditional Lenape, Creek, Anishinaabe and Pan-Algonkian concept in order to strategically place himself with an indigenous framework of analysis, that of the *wétiko*, *windigoo*, *wintuc*, or the cannibal.

### *Imperialism, Colonialism, Cannibalism and The Wétiko Disease*

Forbes struggled to find a local description of how a "people" could do so much damage and destruction. He turned to the traditional worldviews, stories and

understandings of Anishinaabe and other peoples (related linguistically to his Powhatan-Renape and Lenape ancestors). It is unclear if he had “named” the malady earlier than 1976 when the first published edition of *The Wétiko Psychosis: The Disease of Cannibalism Among Human Beings*, later entitled *A World Ruled by Cannibals: The Wétiko Disease of Aggression, Violence and Imperialism* (1979a) was voiced, mimeographed and distributed. This treatise is known to most scholars today bearing the title *Columbus and Other Cannibals: The Wétiko Disease of Exploitation, Imperialism and Terrorism* (1992 and revised in 2008) which shows his reflections over time as well as the reception it has received from others. In 1997, Forbes gave a speech at his old stomping grounds, the Southwest Museum of the American Indian in Los Angeles’s Mt. Washington which he used to visit as a young adult and do research in as a college student. In this speech he reflected upon his first sharing of this idea to public audiences. Originally, he presented this framework of imperialism as a disease to a conference of the Southwestern Anthropological Association in March of 1979 in Santa Barbara, calling his talk simply, *The Wétiko Psychosis*. His reflection in 1997 received a bewildered laugh from himself, as he recalled that the audience of anthropologists present that day were completely unreceptive, and this was one of the last times Forbes ever attended an anthropology conference in the U.S. due to their complete lack of enthusiasm or openness to his core ideas and thoughts. The public familiarity, let alone the scholarly or religious awareness of Indigenous-derived sickness or psychosis constructs such as becoming a windigo was not unknown. Forbes use of the Cree term *wétiko*, seems to point towards the least publicized of the terms which I believe he used for this purpose in order to dramatize his newly applied idea, which was not a “new” one at all.

There is a great dearth of testimony from Indigenous and Christian informants prior to the 20th century dealing with the character of the *wétiko*, as well as the conception of a “wétiko psychosis” that far precedes Forbes rendition and reinterpretation. For example, Saindon (1933) first described a “windigo sickness” among the James Bay Cree which launched a massive outpouring of psychological, ethnographic and anthropological studies on the subject. Saindon suggested this was what many have come to name “culture-bound syndromes” that only affected the peoples who believed in the stories of windigo’s. The Anishinaabe George Nelson complained that white people were lucky that they did not suffer such an affliction, and as such Forbes departs greatly from these original conceptions and analysis and comes to regard global imperialism as a kind of neo-consumption that targets not only people, but all life and lands, knowledge and ideas (Brown & Brightman 1988; Waldram 2004, p. 196-197). But the question remains, is people-eating “culture-bound” or are cultures more fluid and interconnected than is suggested from these studies and by diagnosticians? For example although one might not believe in windigo’s, this won’t prevent them from being eaten by one! Anishinaabe elder and author Basil Johnston (1995) for example contends that the core affliction of the windigo is its selfishness, a universally known condition that can infect any person or being (pps. 222-224). The next section will examine the prior literature with regards to three core areas which will shed light on the windigo’s origins and offer some insight as to why Forbes perceived the possibility that the windigo theory of health and psychosis might be extended beyond simply people-eating. The section includes material from: (1) Indigenous storying and testimony, (2) Religious and civil information, and (3) Anthropological and cultural studies.

The framing of White Peoples and the U.S. core values and foundations to be a psychotic episode was not even a new idea, as many Native diplomats had expressed similar ideas throughout the history of the U.S. Forbes surely had glossed the original speeches of Powhatan, Tecumseh, Pontiac, Red Jacket, Sitting Bull, and others whose words were luckily recalled and later transcribed. Many translations and interpretations abound so I have carefully chosen those which have been given rigorous study and are deemed to be authentic and closest to the original verbiage used at the time they were uttered. At the core of the construction is that a *wétiko* is a people-eater, the most debased form of a fully grown human. Forbes use of this idea stems from the belief found among his Lenape ancestors as well as being a psychological analysis of the average person to who have slid from normal behavior and into the realm of a pathological killer. Even today, the “cannibal” seems to be the most feared and pathetic of people, one who eats his own. This consumptive quality is not unlimited, for as I will demonstrate, those who have such cravings, desires and ambitions will do nearly anything to achieve their ends. A common and akin mythic figure today stemming from European lore is the case of the vampire, for they *only* feed on people, and were originally normal, yet this is without a psychological analytic, as they are turned into vampires by another vampire’s feeding frenzy rather than their own faults. In this case, one can explain their origins as various, while their actions are congruous to peoples everywhere.

According to DeSanti (2015), Anishinaabe constructions of the windigo were framed within an integrated ontology where “notions of personhood, the soul, and the community also interact in ways that ideally encourage a person to live a life in accordance with the concept of *mino-bimaddiziwin*”, essentially, the way of the good life

(p. 187). Further he explains that this conception of personhood is rooted in a “tripartite self” which navigates the world by honoring “benevolent relations with human beings, spiritual powers, and other-than-human persons” who “in many ways depend on how well an Ojibwe individual maintains equilibrium among their tripartite self—consisting of two souls and a physical body”, which are what he calls the intellectual-rational “ego soul” that lives in the heart and the “dream soul” which is a person’s access to the spiritual realms and rooted in the head (p. 196). Often for example, the windigo is considered to be off-balance because it has developed a heart of ice, impervious to rational-intellectual thought, that is, they are led everywhere in search of people by their “heads”. Another affliction is that a person is possessed by a spirit and thus its dream soul is sick or manipulated, or as many stories imply, a person may dream of becoming a windigo, again an affliction of the dream soul (p. 197). This is far different than the contemporary Christian conceptions of the person born into original sin, and tainted through the fall from grace heralded by Eve’s basic evilness in her bout with the serpent in the garden of Eden. Traditional Anishinaabe stories are not simply telling’s of a fearful beast but are complete moral and learning teachings, where in most cases, the windigo is cured or their prey finds a solution to the issue (Friedland 2016). Yet, within windigo lore, they are not always a person, and sometimes are other-than-human figures, spiritual mutants, or under possession of a windigo. Even further away from a people-centered conception is that windigo are representations of the cold, frost, wind and desperate winter conditions, and even Winter or Cold embodied. Rotinonshonni, Cree and Anishinaabe lore contains all three kinds of figures as well as contemporary examples which demonstrate that this is not simply an ancient story being recast onto today’s

peoples and problems, it is also current thought. While many regard the Windigo to have gone or never existed, Forbes and Johnston among many others see its persistence.

*On Cannibalism and Settler-Colonialism: Misnomers?*

Australian scholar Patrick Wolfe (1996) maintained that settler-colonialism was a structure not a (singular) event, and in this way, we must view imperialized persons as architects who enact the “logic of elimination” through construction as much as destruction. Fanon (1969) argued that “the setting up of the colonial system does not of itself bring about the death of the native culture. Historic observation reveals, on the contrary, that the aim sought is rather a continued agony than a total disappearance of the pre-existing culture” (p. 34). Forbes (1998) suggests that this agony is exploited through a process of “envelopment”, “castization” and/or “proletarianization”, three process which steal American Nations life and territory as they are brought into the imperial economy. The agony is prolonged through the envelopment via empire-building, for Native Nations serve a purpose as the original knowledge keepers of the land and this knowledge must be exploited as much as bodies abused, enslaved, or yoked to the empire’s desires to be manifest. “Protectionism”, the concept which binds the trust relationship, government-to-government relationships as reorganized (1934) domestic dependent nations of quasi U.S. citizens (1924), also implies a consummation process. For example, slavery notwithstanding, the rise of bio colonialism of pharmaceutical and agricultural corporations who rely upon Indigenous knowledge of traditional plants for foods, fibers and medicines began in 1492 and has never ceased, only intensified, both as more people become brought into work and be used for their knowledge and skills and as



more land is brought under imperial control and accessed, tested and researched, altered and manipulated genetically or otherwise (Crosby 1997). Elimination as a goal must be identified in the specific cases where it existed, which is the specific places where it was demanded that removal of Native peoples served the best interests of imperial whites at that time and place. In other instances, it was easier to proselytize than murder, and elsewhere, it was to greater effect to incite internal and external violence than be at the front of them. Unique to Forbes view is that elimination means “a loss”, and although killing provides removal, eating victims is a greater source of nutrition that once lost, must be replaced, and therefore was not always the prerogative of empire.

Forbes use of the term cannibalism is hypnotic and is noted to enhance “difference” between mature (good) people and evil people, people like Christopher Columbus. Forbes was unfortunately seduced by the power of the image, of the word, cannibal. Despite his amazing research capabilities and his uprooting of myths, stereotypes and meanings behind the words we use, he failed to discern, possibly on purpose, the original meaning of the “cannibal” to be synonymous with Indians. Greek lore contains many ancient references to *anthropophagia* or “human eating”, as do other peoples from AfroEurAsia such as the Romans who document many such peoples they encounter as well as their own ritualistic sacrifices, and their wars upon others. Key to our understanding is that cannibalism is not an ideology or way of life on its own, it is part of a complex practice. This is not to say that eating people is always a singular, random act, Forbes suggests quite the contrary. The word “cannibal” is an invented term of none other than Columbus, who in his inability to demystify the new places he visited, mistook the name *Carib* (an Arawak people), and proceeded to relate the term directly to

his perceived landing in India, hence the misnomers, *las indies* and *los indios*. Led on by his false assumption, *Caniba* is the term Columbus came away with, and is a reference to what he supposed was a people who were under the rule of the Great Khan in India, and which summarily became *cannibal* in Spanish, also *caribal* (Morison 1955, p. 55).

Kenneth Lincoln (1987) calls this shaky start the result of “tin ears and inventive tongues” (p. 92). Peter Hulme (1986) remarks that even Columbus’ journal and the letters he wrote to Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain were lost in the 16th century, meaning, that all translations we have today are derived solely from the hand of Bartolome de las Casas who transcribed them for his treatise in defense of the Americans. In summary, de las Casas provided “a transcription of an abstract of a copy of a lost original” (p. 17).

Cannibalism was for Hulme, a fastened anchor to Indian, and which was used repeatedly “to make just war”. The power of the word is the most important aspect as it became part of our spoken languages and gained a new definitive power, rooted in a false description of Turtle Islanders, as well as the colonial bloodlust which Columbus (backed by Ferdinand) began. Columbus is the epitome of the original Indian killer. Forbes (2008a) concluded that “Columbus stands as a clear example of an insane person, a killer and a cannibal, a user and abuser of his fellow human beings” (p. 33).

Indian, is another cannibalized term, one made up by Columbus and repeated *ad infinitum* which like *negro*, *nigger* and now, *niggah* (repatriated by Blacks positively, like the word “punk” was by Johnny Rotten) has been adopted by the very people it was used against (see Berkhofer 1978, for a full discussion on the imperial “American Indian”). It’s the only term I ever heard growing up from family or school. My grandpa would say, if someone questioned him about his “Indianness”, “I’d like to see someone try to take it

out of me!” This is not to say that the term Indian or Black can’t *feel* empowering for the persecuted, but the flip side is still present in every interaction, the disempowerment process which forms until/if youth can survive the bullets aimed at Indians and Blacks. While meaning one thing for those who have repatriated the terms, it has a whole other, original meaning for whites and imperialists. As Forbes has argued elsewhere, we also run into the problem of duplication, that is, in the case of Indians, there are more people who identify as “Indians” than “American Indians” in the U.S., that is, people originating in the republic of India, which he simultaneously named. The term India is derived from Sanskrit *sindhu* meaning *the river*, of which the Greeks and Romans established trade with prior to 1 B.C. (Young 2001).

People with the “will to empire”, people who practice forced captivity on their first date, people who practice sociopathic terrorism upon arrival, will pretty much say and do anything to achieve the results of the golden rule, that is, “he who has the gold, makes the rules,” which hints also to one who can break them at will. Shakespeare quickly caught wind of the term cannibal and again, like Columbus, reapplied the term, as found in his work *The Tempest* by naming his central character, Caliban. Matthew Skura (1989) suggests for example, “if Caliban is the center of the play, it is not because of his role in the play’s self-contained structure, and not even because of what he reveals about man’s timeless tendency to demonize “strangers,” but because Europeans were at that time exploiting the real Caliban’s of the world, and *The Tempest* was part of the process” (pps. 44-45). Further, “the various distortions were discursive strategies that served the political purpose of making the New World fit into a schema justifying colonialism” which reveals that the publication and dissemination of *The Tempest* was an

overt “political act” that socialized would-be colonizers into the imperial nexus already underway and from afar, much like Montalvo’s reconquista novels did for Cortes and his ilk (p. 45). This was for Forbes perhaps unknown, but it also detracts from his purpose of calling Columbus, the primeval cannibal. Columbus letter to Ferdinand and Isabella while on his first voyage began with a classic move, as he had flipped the script on the Carib’s who he had at first described in this way, “of anything they have, if you ask them for it, they never say no; rather they invite the person to share it, and show as much love as if they were giving their hearts” (Morison 1955, p. 207). The meeting between two completely different peoples prompts such distinctions and differences as Columbus took careful note, Forbes followed. Columbus chose to become a people-killer, and then to name the people he killed, people-killers. Cannibals were Indians, Indians were Cannibals. Ramos (1994) described the paradigm which Columbus took advantage of in this way:

Cannibalism provided perhaps the most potent weapon for European Control. It had the power to construct with a single stroke two of the handiest images for the colonizing of the New World: white martyrs and Indian heathens. While martyrdom justified the political domination of the ‘cannibals’, paganism justified the right to subject the Indians to Christian indoctrination (pp. 80-81).

These are of course, justifications, a means to an end, and as such, do not need to have any basis in lived morality. The compiled *Leyes del Indias* by 1530 had outlawed slavery in the Americas claimed by the Spanish, excepting those who could be exploited as known heathens and cannibals. White people have similarly created an image of the “other” in “Blacks”, “Redskins”, and the “Indian” which has allowed their own image

creation to go unchecked, and represent, as Columbus does, the living lie. This is because they are like Columbus; the real people-eaters, gold-eaters, or consumers of labor and land. The issue at stake is that the Indian-Caliban (Arawak) became the prototypical cannibal, a stand-in stereotype for every Native National in the whole of Turtle Island.

The crux for Forbes was that he plainly saw that “cannibalism”, although a legitimate issue, was not the greater problem, because Columbus, like Ferdinand, like Machiavelli, like all advocates of terrorism, were infected with a sickness, translated into “gold fever”, into greed, into avarice and evilness as they proceeded at every step to capture, maim, murder, pillage and rape the people’s and lands they desired. Cannibalism was an extreme form of what condition? On the one hand, we have starvation and on the other hand or perhaps on the other foot, we have terrorism, genocide or ethnocide and ecocide. Terrorism and imperial consumption were already a fact at the time of Columbus, an ancient fact, and this was the true sickness Forbes attempted to describe. There are too many instances to cover here as the issue of people-eating has been focused on greatly in the literature as polemic, historical, anthropological, ethnographic and literary works abound. Forbes chose to focus upon the *intentions* and *abuses* of colonizers, drawing our attention away from people-eating which has become rarified, and towards traditional Indigenous conceptions of the sane or healthy person-people and the insane-unhealthy, evil personality-people. Utilizing the traditional Powhatan conception of the *wintiko*, Cree *wétiko*, Anishinaabe *windigo*, Forbes (2008a) says he uses these along with cannibalism instead of Machiavellianism because as mentioned previously, “the term Machiavellian does not adequately describe the nature of what we are dealing with” which in his mind is the epitome of anti-social behavior: people-eating

(p. 24). This is a common taboo the world over that Forbes is depending upon for effect. Forbes' impression is that people-eating is a uniquely self-centered or human phenomenon. Yet, stories abound which either through metaphorical, alliteration or literal telling's, describe people-eating (or the evil intentions therein) to be not entirely people-centric. For example, even amongst the non-woodland Cegiha/Dgegiha (Ponca-Omaha) of Iowa and Nebraska, one can find samples of traditional lore which speak of a People-eating Hill (The Rabbit and the Devouring Hill), and the People-hunting Male Winter (How the Rabbit Killed the (Male) Winter) (Dorsey 1890, pps. 9-12, 32-35). In southern California, many stories exist which describe people-eaters, of spirit form but also amongst Coyote and in other creatures. This is significant, as the propensity to kill people, or to kill one's own kind is not limited to us which has many observations throughout time and at present. "We the people" are not the standard in traditional lore. Diné stories of the fifth world ruled by *yé'iitsoh* or "Monsters/Giants" of various kinds frequently attacked and killed the people, and it was the duty of Monster/Giant Slayer and Born for Water to rid the world of them. One such story collected by Matthews (1897) "The Story Of Tse'tahotsilta'li, He Who-kicks-people-off-cliffs" has the Elder twin asking his grandmother where to find the People Kicker, to which she replies

Now he was a monster in human form who lay in wait near the edge of a cliff and kicked anyone passing by over the cliff to where his children could reach him and eat him, for they were cannibals. This being lived on Wild Horse Mesa now in the Mesa Verde area. The Kicker could be found on a little neck of the mesa above Ute Canyon. The White Bead Woman and First Woman told the Elder Brother that this being was dangerous, that he kicked people off cliffs, but he said: "There

is no place dangerous on earth.” (p. 122; see also O’Brien 1956 for another version).

The use of “cannibals” was extended here by the interpreter and elsewhere to denote other beings that could “eat people” rather than people-eating-people yet we might ask ourselves if there is such a great difference between other forms of life who eat their own kind and those beings who seem to “have it out” for us five-fingered ones. Or, an even greater question may be, do traditional people-eating-people stories identify the specific reasons, conditions, traits or characters who metaphorically and literally consume others, who we could also become? Was Forbes pointing us towards our stories or towards imperial ones?

In Rotinonshonni lore, there are Onöndowa’ga:’ stories of the evil *Ongwe’Ias* “people-eaters”, and Frost Giants, also *Ge:no:sgwa’/ Gë:nö:sgwa’* (“They who eat skins”, also called Stone Coats) and the *Nīa’Gwahē’s/ Nyá’gwaehe:h* or Monster Bears who desire nothing but the death or flesh of people. There is also a most important lesson in our history which demonstrates that the people-eater and killer among/within us is always a looming possibility which is found in the stories and teachings related to the Peacemaker and the establishment of the Great Peace preceding the founding of the Rotinonshonni (Iroquois) confederacy (NAITC 1984; Johansen & Mann 2000, p. 274; Beauchamp 1926). The first epoch deals with Creation and migration, the second with the Great Peace. During this second epoch, war raged amongst the Five Nations of people and many leaders became violent killers who were feared rather than loved. Among them was Aionwatha (Hiawatha) who was a feared people-eater. At the height of his power, he had a vision. In one version, after boiling a pot of human flesh he stared into it and had

seen himself transformed. He then renounced his destructive and people-eating ways, and it was at this moment (in some stories) that the Peacemaker intervened and gave him some deer meat in order to reharmonize him into a normal person and together they sought out the powerful sorcerer Tadodaho (Atotarho), an Onondaga who was feared by all and was a noted people-killer who they targeted because he stood in the way of the Great Peace (confederation) (Gibson et al 1992, pps. 85-90; Parker 1916, pps. 69-70; Wallace 1994). Some versions do not speak of Aionwatha this way or to have met the Peacemaker until after his breakdown by the total death of his family, but in every version, Tadodaho is a tyrant and people-eater that needs to be cured in order to break the fearful and terrorizing hold he has on the people (Parker 1916, p. 17; Johansen & Mann 2000, pps. 276-277; Vecsey 1986; NAITC 1984). In many versions, the Tadodaho (literally, He Has Snakes [in his hair]) is described as “insane”, “mad”, “angry” and according to the version recorded by Hewitt (1892) Aionwatha (He Who Combs), Jigonsaseh (The Mother of Nations, the first Clan Mother) and the Peacemaker needed to “straighten and reconstruct his mind, so that he may again have the mind of a human being” (p. 135; Parker 1916, p. 17; Tehanotorens 2000). They were successful, says one of the world’s oldest living democratic confederacy (geritheocratic of Holm) if we consider Mann and Fields (1997) early date of 1142 A.D. They gave the people-eater, medicine. First, they sang him songs of healing. They “combed his hair out” with loving and promising words of peace. And in his transformation made him the new principal, the faithkeeper of the league, from which they gave the succeeding principal speaker of the confederacy his name, as a reminder of the kind of person they are to be, but also *not* to embody. This is a powerful lesson, reminder and teaching. Why did Forbes, who was



familiar with the story of the Peacemaker, with the confederacy and its Great Laws of Peace (Constitution) which he often recited part of during his many talks and speaking engagements, not locate this highly relevant theme of the people-eater? Or for that matter, why did he omit every and all traditional American example, that is, he did not use *a single traditional story of people-eating* in his entire text of *Columbus and other Cannibals*? Did he feel that imperial knowledge and texts of Native origins were unreliable if touched at all by white interpreters or editors, if not infected themselves with the imperial sickness?

Thus, I will begin with a slight critique of Forbes rendition of the wétiko, to perhaps be a bit of cannibalizing, as he often loses sight of the traditions he borrows from in order to make his case. Forbes uses what he says is a Cree word “wétiko” 204 times without a single example of the Cree oral traditions or the citation of a Cree language source. This was a stratagem, but the author feels, it was not a wise one because the stories explain these basic moral dilemmas that all people share in, as well as identifying possible outcomes, cures and other useful knowledge. It is here that Forbes has his greatest critics. For example, King’s (2000) issue with Forbes is that:

I hear in his account of witiko [sic] psychosis a fundamentalist, conservative program which closes inquiry and stifles creativity. This world out of balance is strangely ordered-neat, tidy, and fully comprehensible. Cannibalism here devours the nuances and contradictions of history, the tensions and turmoil of everyday life. Ingesting these central concerns of anthropology and cultural critique, Forbes substitutes inflexible and rigid categories-sin, sickness, abnormality-which promote condemnation rather than understanding (p. 116).

King summarizes his problem with Forbes and others of his ilk such as Root (1996) saying that they take extreme “positions, they speak as if “the West” were singular, a decontextualized, static other”(p. 12). Forbes unlike Root and others does not simply utilize the trope, “the West” as King claims, as he only uses the term “west” 11 times, and is always used in quotations or is a specific geographic reference such as “west of Iceland” or considered a proper name, like West Indies. For King, Forbes’ fault is that he is forced through his research to “subscribe to a form of Occidentalism” and further, and probably most problematic, is that “these theories of cannibalism ironically incorporate, appropriate, and otherwise cannibalize other ideologies, experiences, and identities. Forbes literally poaches, decontextualizes, and re-inscribes the lives and understandings of diverse indigenous peoples,” as Forbes cites numerous Native individuals to document the opposing “traditional native American” viewpoint (p. 121; see Forbes 2008a, p. 42). One of the issues with King’s analysis is that for him, Forbes is merely citing Indigenous others rather than his own people’s language and thought. However these were languages that Forbes loved, labored over and learned throughout his lifetime, such as Lenape of which he devised a new writing system, and performed studies on mutual intelligibility among akin Wapakanimokok languages, even writing Lenape poetry (Forbes 1976b; Forbes 1996c; Forbes 1996d). Interesting enough is that Forbes chose to use the Cree term rather than any of the Lenape terms such as *wintuc*, or the one he cites *wintiko*, or the character *Mhuwe* which is well-represented in the literature and contemporary Lenape (Speck 1931; Harrington 1921). But why? Is Forbes anthropological (head-hunting) training too embedded that he forgets his foundation? Or is his Indigenous-Indian foundation fictitious or tenuous at best? Or did he want instead to completely reframe

“cannibalism” as imperialism without implicating a particular people’s view? The *wétiko* and *cannibal* are people like Columbus and Hitler, Washington and Eisenhower, this is the image we are presented with, this is evil embodied, these white men working on behalf of empire.

All of this is complicated by the fact that Forbes presents evidence from numerous traditions throughout Indian country which are often decontextualized, yet still within the frame of having notable relationships with imperial forces upon them. For example, decontextualization is greatly proffered by who draws from traditional Mexica-Toltec thought while ignoring the ritual sacrifices they performed (Forbes . Forbes (1995c) does complicate his understanding of this tradition as he argues for example that Bernal Diaz del Castillo’s “true account” was written 50 years after the fact and there are many invented scenes in his text (p. 61). Further, Forbes notes that the act of “sacrifice” or “to make holy” from Latin *sacer* is still a present-day issue, and that his critiques of the Persian Gulf war for instance which he claimed to be a massive “human sacrifice” for empire were not “revisionist” but observational, current, present (p. 62). His basic argument however has always been that “human sacrifice”, for whatever cause or rationale, cannot be divorced from the outcomes. He asks:

Is human sacrifice still with us? Yes, indeed, and it is highly desired by many persons including those who rule states and who know that effective armies must consist in numbers of men and women who will try to kill an unknown “enemy” when ordered to do so and who will die or risk death in so doing. Will we as humans ever change? One thing that might help would be for more scholars to stop dissecting non-white societies and the cultures of the poor and to instead turn

their bright, harsh lights upon the behavior of Europeans and Euro Americans, along with that of ruling classes, the wealthy, and the military castes the world over (p. 62).

During the 1993 invasion of Iraq (which had just occurred, and not the first time) he responded with the equation that in general, imperial war is human sacrifice which leads him to ask:

Are these “sacrifices” to be seen as a part of the concept known as “human sacrifice”? Why have many white North Americans (who probably cringe at the very mention of “bloodthirsty” Aztec “ceremonies”) wholeheartedly supported with their dollars and votes the murder of tens of thousands of Indians and mestizos in Central America since about 1981 for the sake of “anti-communism”? (Forbes 1993b)

Forbes cites for example from many of the post-invasion codices which were produced, coincidentally to Diaz del Castillo’s testimony, years after the actual events or after a lapse of traditional forms of transmission. After the initial production of post-invasion codices by Mexica, Tlaxcalan, Tlatelolcan and others which all were published by the end of the 17th century, as none more were produced in the ancient style or script. These were both part of the same complex and time periods he often cites from and reveal without a doubt, the extent of their tributaries and their massive ritual sacrifices (Forbes 1973c, p. 210; Forbes 1974c, p. 22; Forbes 1979c, p. 7). Forbes also runs into the issue of distrusting or at least not using traditional stories to provide examples, to provide context or to offer value-laden discourse. The only traditional stories samples he ever provides in his 555 or more published works is found in the introductory chapter from his historical

work *Warriors of the Colorado* (1965) where he pieced together the Quechan creation story from pre-published textual sources, the Mbuya creation story (2008a) and small snippets of other stories. Other than this, he offers perhaps a few lines in his poetry which suggest he at least heard or read some stories, but even some of these were from the hoaxed *Walum Olum*, a purported ancient Lenape text of creation and migration (see Forbes 1986; Forbes 2001; Forbes 2002). Forbes historical foci was often complemented by traditional lore but this was slight, and for this author a clear indication that although he trusts Indigenous thought, he rarely, if ever, utilizes the key instrument of story for conveying indigenous world-views, practices, values and ideas. For example, the origin stories of the Mexica depict the founding gods as sacrificing themselves in order to create the universe as we know it, and people likewise required sacrifices from the gods (Coe 1984). The fifth sun was created through a total sacrifice by *Nanahuatzin* “the scabby-sores one”, who leaped into the flailing flames, thus bringing balance to the cosmos and creating a sun which would provide for all life, followed by the intimidated Tezcuicatl, and then finally a mass blood sacrifice from all of the Tezcatlipocas so as to achieve the balanced rising and setting sun we have today (see Sahagun, Anderson & Dibble 1977, Book 7, Part 8, Ch. 2; also the *Codice Borgia* for an image of Nanahuatzin; Portilla 1990, p. 44). The ritual sacrifices performed atop the templo mayor, the pyramid of the sun, were in part, literally required in order to repay the sacrifices made by the teotl’s original life-giving acts. The Codex Borgia, Codex Barbonicus, Codex Magliabechiano, Codice Florentino, Codice Tutela, and many others clearly show numerous sacrifices throughout its images, some of people, of nobility and captives, some of other forms of life, such as birds and deer. The heart for example was considered to be an embodiment of Tonatiuh,

the sun, and to contain part of the original fire (the Sun) from which all life is indebted to. The *yaotl/yollotl* or heart (or spirit, fire) we carry is from this original source, and thus sacrifice was ritualistic, respected, and bound to the original cosmivision of the Mexica (Portilla 1990, p. 44, 216). There is great debate on this subject by many scholars but the evidence is overwhelming that at the center of the Mexica Triple Alliance when Cortes arrived in 1518, he had in fact met the supreme ritual people-eaters. Indeed, each of the Mexica's 18 month-long ritual calendar required sacrificial victims of all ages (Coe 1986).

Does this make them the same kind of people-eaters and does this extend outward into imperialism? Was it merely ritual and ceremony, or does imperialism as an institution and practice of people always require some amount of sacrifice and ritual? Does this constitute a breach in the sacred cosmos and the rule of divine justice and balance? For Forbes and many other indigenous scholars, the Mexica had too succumbed to the same kind of sickness, yet he says almost nothing on the subject in his tome on cannibalism (p. 124, is the only reference; Forbes 1995c for another view). So in this case, I question, did the cannibal psychosis arrive with the invaders from Spain, England, France, of Dutch, Portuguese and other nations or was it already present in less pronounced (or perhaps comparable in the case of the Mexica) and genocidal performances in the Americas? The conception of a *wétiko/windigo/wintiko* is clearly original to the Americas, where both sacrifice and people-eating was known and was clearly feared as a real possibility and is a continued traditional story element and character which haunts the living and their warm hearts into the present and shares no

biblical equal. Also, there are many (at least 50 or more) examples from throughout the Americas, enough to rival AfroEurAsia, especially, so-called modern examples.

The list of people-eaters since the 17th century of non-Native origin is also profound. Yet, within in the context of relationality and based upon a preemptive sacrificial and empowered cosmos, there are limits in most all these cases to not only the act of people-eating such that they are not trying to spread their sacrificial religion to other peoples unlike the many sects of Christianity, Islam and others. Primarily there are two cases today: starvation people-eating and serial people-eaters. The same can be said for Rotinonshonni (Iroquois) people-eating in the past or the *windigoo* common among Anishinaabe, Potawatomi, Ottawa, Tlingit, Kwakiutl, and other north woodland peoples. First, however, I suggest we review traditional stories of people-eating in order to glean the basic struggles and outcomes People have continuously framed their worlds to include, at its extremes, at its worst. For we must seriously grapple with the comparison: is imperialism since 1492 the worst thing to happen to Native Nations? Forbes of course says yes, but what do our stories say?

*Stories of Becoming a People Eater (Wiindigoo)*

The Anishinaabe (Ojibwe) have told and continue to tell many stories about the *windigoo*, who is characterized often as a winter-based people eating monster. As mentioned previously, the term cannibal has no place in any of the lore or literature except as an imperial trope used to dehumanize Indigenous peoples, first abused by Columbus. In traditional stories, the depictions and practice of telling them vary widely, differing in particular places, families and communities quite distinct from each other,

despite sharing in related languages. The Cree of variant bands and locales still speak honestly about their run-ins with the *witikow*, either from experience, from stories or even in what has been referred to in the literature as “windigo dreams”, divined either by a spirit or some other power (Brown and Brightman 1988, p. 90).

Basil Johnston (1995) shares a Nipissing Anishinaabe “Weendigo” story which I have summarized as it’s a contemporary retelling by a native speaker rather than from non-native ethnographic collections of the past. In this story, a man and his family are camped out during a harsh winter, surviving on fruits, barks and snowbirds. They are starving by midwinter. The man decides to seek out a medicine person, a “sorcerer” who gives him a talisman and a recipe for a special drink to allay his hunger. Instead, the opposite effect occurs and he transforms into a weendigo, with an insatiable hunger for the flesh of people. He soon found a village and ate them all without even realizing it. A single hunter was spared as he was away that morning on the hunting trail. Family-less, this man now hunted the Weendigo. He found him in the far north shrunken in size after his trek home and snuck up on him and clubbed him to death, leaving his body in chunks for the ravens to feast on (pps. 225-227). In another story, a man is refused a new wife by her father and creates a frozen effigy of her which through a dark ritual transforms her into a weendigo. As a new weendigo she was initiated by turning on her own family, eating them all, and then the sorcerer-suitor conveniently came to her rescue. She lived with him, among his other wives, and was confused and changed, until she finally came to realize she was a weendigo. At that point, she decided upon suicide rather than hurting anymore people and created a hot fire and committed self-immolation. What remained of her ashes was the icy effigy. (pps. 227-230). In Johnston’s stories, there are multiple



methods and ways of infection and overcoming what Forbes calls *wetikoism*. In a story collected by William Jones (1917), the culture hero Nanabush has a “Windigo” encounter. In this story, Nanabush is called by the Windigo to come to him, which he does. The Windigo tells him he is going to eat him and asks him to make a large fire in order to roast him. First, he sends Nanabush to gather firewood, then to gather a straight sticks for use as a spit to roast Nanabush. Nanabush does so but also purposely falters, picking up a crooked spit from which the Windigo complains of its shape and sends him back out for a straight one. Nanabush then meets Weasel and asks him to help him defeat the Windigo. Instead of delivering the roasting spit to the Windigo, he instructed the Weasel to shove it up the anus of the Windigo, all the way to his heart, which he did, and from whence the Windigo died. Rewarding the weasel, Nanabush painted his body the way it looks in winter, with a white coat on (pps. 197-203).

Kohl (1860) explained in his writings on the Lake Superior Ojibwa in the 1800’s that what he noticed was that Windigo dreams and spirits were real manifestations believed by all he met. He summarizes what he found was a:

universal tradition among the Indians that in the primitive ages there were anthropophagous giants called Windigos. The people’s fancy is so busy with them, as well as with the isolated cases of real cannibalism, that they begin to dream of them, and these dreams, here and there, degenerate to such a point that a man is gained over to the idea that he is fated to be a windigo. Such dreams vary greatly. At times a man will merely dream that he must kill so many persons during his life; another dream adds that he must also devour them; and as these

strange beings believe in their dreams as they do in the stars, they act in accordance with their gloomy suggestions (p. 358).

Other stories such as those collected by Barnouw (1945) have a young boy “get power to fight the *windigo*” while villagers prepare a kettle of boiling tallow. The boy temporarily became a windigo in order to battle and talk to him, which once the windigo is lured close, he pours the tallow down his throat, which cures him completely and he returns to being a regular person (pps. 120-121). Another story about a successful hunter with four wives, locates *windigog* regularly who are jealous of his skill and power. He lures them and then his wives pour hot tallow down their throats in order to cure them (p. 121). In another story, a young girl transforms herself into a windigo in order to kill them. She uses a sumac rod to whack it, two special dogs to pounce it, and then pours hot tallow down its throat to cure it herself. The windigo is chopped up, and it was revealed there was another block of ice inside and inside this was a regular person (pp. 121). In other stories I have heard, it’s the other way around, and inside of the windigo is a literal frozen heart (Brightman 1988).

The Cree, who Forbes suggests is where the term *wétiko* comes from have numerous stories. A firsthand account was given by a man from Lac La Ronge who described the dream lucidly to an ethnologist and trapper, saying:

Those who at any future period are to become cannibals thus dream of them.

After the things usual in all dreams “I was invited by the North [spirit] to partake of a feast of ducks, the most beautiful I had ever seen and well-cooked. The dish was set before me, I set too [sic]. A stranger by me touched me with his elbow and said, ‘Eat not thou of that, look into thy dish.’ Behold that which I had taken

for the wing of a duck was the arm of a child. 'He! what a narrow escape' said I. Then he took me into another room and gave me most excellent meat, the most delicious in appearance I had ever seen. I would not eat-I discovered it was the flesh of Indians thus served up to me. He took me into a third room and gave me Tongues. These I also perceived were the tongues of Indians. 'Why refusest thou what I offer thee? Is it not good?' 'I feel no inclination to eat,' I replied. Then he took me in a fourth room where fine beautiful hearts were served up and I was desired to eat but I perceived it was still the same. I therefore refused. Then said he, 'It is well done, thou hast done well.' Heh! Had I unfortunately eaten of this then had I become a cannibal in addition to all my other misfortunes." Those who eat at these feasts are frequently but not universally told thus: "This is a sign to thee that one day thou shalt become a cannibal and feed on the flesh of thy fellows. When thou shalt see children play with and eat ice (or snow) in thy tent say, 'My time is near' for then thou shalt soon eat Indian (human) flesh. . . . (as quoted in Brown and Brightman 1988, pps. 90-91)

The Cree text transcribed uses the term, *wihtikow*. While the *wihtikow* desire may be induced or propagated by others, such as a person who feeds you the flesh of another person, from a spirit enticement or portent, or out of sheer exhaustion of food sources resulting in hunger that leave only people to eat each other, we find that something occurs in the mentality, the heart, the soul of the one who has been transformed and succumbed. Afterwards, the *wihtikow* does not even desire regular food again.

A Swampy Cree story (1938) collected by Charles Clay is similar to the Nanabush one of Anishinaabe origin and is different in that the culture hero Wesakchuck

takes a large spit that was originally for roasting himself first for the “Wetikoo” but instead is used as an impaling device inserted through the monsters anus after feigning passivity (p. 70). The story series begins with the basic description that the “Wetikoo is a very evil person who is also a cannibal” and that it has “strange powers” such as unfathomable growth, insatiable hunger and ability to eat endlessly, the power to call its victims with the wind, to travel great distances and to disguise itself as regular persons (p. 68). Brightman’s (2007) collection of Rock Cree stories reveals numerous ones which feature Nanabush and Weasel who battle and overcome *wihtikows*. The monster is a spirit being but also a person, and led by *wisahkichahk* the weasel climbs up its into its arse and then has its heart eaten by the razor-sharp teeth of the weasel which is made of rock-hard ice (pps. 33-35). Other Swampy Cree stories collected by C. Douglas Ellis (1995) use the term *wihtikowak* whose translation in English is “windigoes” and also is called an *ochiskaw* or “monster”, who actually were said to live in families, to have husbands and wives. In one story, after a *wihtikowak* “wise one” was called to cure another who was stabbed in the neck, he actually killed him, had a wife *wihtikowak* cook him up and they all ate him, which is said to be the reason why they have all split off into singles or pairs today because they would just eat each other (p. 85). Later in the story, a trick is played on the *wihtikowak* who are hunting a father and his son, and they capture it, dismember it, and burn it to ashes (p. 87). In a Plains Cree (1935) story collected by Bloomsfield it tells clearly how a woman with great power goes with her husband who was hunting and their children and sister but eventually they starve, and she eats all of them except her sister. She then went to the place where her parents were in order to eat them. A man was there that intercepted them and attempted to cure her by boiling bear fat and making her drink

eat, causing her to vomit repeatedly. Yet in this version, it did not work and the woman although apparently was recovered continued to preach that she had the hunger and would soon devour the whole village and begged to be slain instead. Then she was burned up, and the next summer a feast was performed at that very site, from which a bear was spotted fleeing the grounds, and it was said that it was the woman who had changed into a bear (pps. 152-155). In some Cree stories, the person is cured, other times there is no workable cure and they must be killed in order to prevent further death as the monster's hunger grows and grows, and they threaten to consume every person they can get their hands on (Brightman 1988; Friedland 2017).

There are many kinds of people-eaters, all of which are feared either as external creatures, as powerful spirit monsters, as spiritually possessed peoples, and as transformed persons. Some of these transformed people were subject to famine, but not all. In some collected Arapaho stories by Dorsey and Kroeber (1903) the people-eater took many forms such as little people or dwarfs, who the informants explained, after their defeat those who survived “are with the whites now; or rather, their descendants are among them” (p. 124) . The collectors also noted that an informant shared that in the beginning of time “at first there was a nation of white people *fnih'angan*, who were cannibals. [But] Because they ate each other they were destroyed” (p. 16). This could have been something akin to the Frost Giants of Rotinonshonni lore or maybe just a characterization of white people today. An interesting story is told about “Sleepy-Young-Man”, a lazy boy who is told each morning about the cannibals by his father, for if he were to wake early he could do something good for his people by finding them and slaying them. After many times of just laying around in bed despite his parent's best

efforts to get him up, he went to see an old wise grandmother for advice about how to take up this task and journey. He said to her:

. . . recently my father has rebuked me every morning, pulling my blankets off, and telling me to get up. He told me that if I wanted to get to see the cannibals I should have to be an early riser, and furthermore I would never amount to anything if I lay on the bed all the time. This constant remark every morning, set me to thinking, until I made up my mind to look for the creatures. Now, grandmother, since you are an old being, possibly you have heard about the cannibals. I thought that perhaps you could give me some light and advice. Where do these cannibals live? Did you ever hear about them, grandmother? I want very much to look for them, for my father always talks about them and says that a lazy, good-for-nothing young man can never see them (p. 129).

The grandmother then explains what she knows and shows him the direction, towards the sun-rise. He goes that direction and each day meets another people and gets advice about how to find them, until one wise grandmother he talks to tells him he is near, and what he must do:

“ . . .my dear grandson, when you reach that divide, you will see, down in the valley, a big creek with thick timber, the course of the stream being toward the sunrise, and off to the side is a big hill where the wife of these cannibals lives. When you reach the hill, and find the dwelling place, appear as humble as you can. Offer your prayers to her with a sincere desire and with a sense of security. She generally helps her husbands in everything,” said the old woman (p. 131).

The woman has mercy on him given his humble approach, and decides to help him kill her seven husbands who are people-eaters. She gives him her body, and a knife, and tells him to feign as if she/he is going over to sleep with them per their usual time. He acted as if asleep, and cut off the older brother's head who was the only one to stay in the tipi while the other six left to hunt. On his return to the wife, he was caught by geese spies, but was allowed to hide in her iron tipi until the brothers came to the door. They begged to enter but she had devised a trick, so that they could only peek their heads in to see if the boy was there, and in so doing the boy slammed the door on their necks, slicing off their heads. He returned to his home with the cannibal scalp-locks, laid in his old bed and was recognized by his father and village as a new man of courage and power after that journey (p. 131-134).

Other stories were shared about a mysterious people-eating baby they called "Teeth-with-raw-flesh" because it always had this sign after a night of feasting on their leaders and village (p. 137). This baby, they did not or could not kill. In a version of the culture hero Blood-Clot-Boy, he destroys all kinds of bad people including an old blind people eating woman whose tent was lined with the body parts of her victims. He killed her by burning her face with a piece of broiled fat he grabbed from the walls of the tipi. He then proceeds to transform into various animals in an attempt to kill her accomplices, finally turning into a cottontail rabbit and running across a frozen pond which he commanded to thaw open and trap them under after commanding it to close or freeze back upon them (pps. 301-304). As it can be seen in many of these stories the people-eater is a totally plausible pathway for people, yet which is regarded with the utmost disdain and repulsiveness. However, sometimes, whenever possible, attempts are made at

healing or curing the people-eater. People-eaters are not a single thing for any one people but often have multiple causes, characteristics and cures.

Traditional stories represent the authentic roots of the *windigoo*, the *wétiko*, and *wihtikow*, yet they are not restricted to Anishinaabe, Cree or Lenape traditions. I've located examples of the people-eater as transformed person (Curtin & Hewitt 1918; Parker 1923; Swanton 1923; Stevens & Ray 1971; Merasty 1974; Barnouw 1977; Bird & Grey 2007); the people-eater as evil spirit or of a dream being (Cushing 1901; Mooney 1900; Johnston 1995; Brown and Brightman 1988); the people-eater as monstrous devourer, a people-eating giant or other kinds of giants such as frost giants or stone-clad giants (Voth 1905; Curtin & Hewitt 1918; Parker 1923; Johnston 1995), and many other types in between and beyond. The prevalence today of many such European formed stories of the people-eater are complemented by the blood-sucker (vampire), and the numerous recent examples of people-eaters of the U.S. and beyond such as Jeffrey Dahmer and the Donner party, amongst the many famine survivors and the war-based and warrior type rites found after the Battle of Stalingrad and the Tokyo Tribunal. If people-eating was prevalent before the advent of industrial agriculture, it has become endemic everywhere as a product of industrial warfare. What does Windigoo mean? Basil Johnston (2001) says Windigo perhaps is derived from in Anishinaabemowin *ween dagoh* "solely for one self" or maybe *weenin n'd'igooh* meaning "fat" or excess (p. 222). The old English word was *sylfæta*, literally, "self-eater", of which can be applied to any creature. The Penobscot called them *Ki.wá'kwe* (Speck 1935, p 14).

In Onöndowa'ga:' lore, there are many stories beyond the second epoch related to the Great Peace. In Arthur Parker's (1923) collection of *Seneca Myths and Tales* the



people-eaters or *Ongwe'Ias* are sometimes transformed people, sometimes *Ge:no:sgwa'* or Stone Coats, also frost giants, who have ice-cold hearts, or monstrous Flying Heads; some are just simply evil people. Curtin and Hewitt (1918) shared a whole plethora of *Ongwe'Ias* stories such as "The Fox and the Rabbit" (p. 105), "The Ongwe Ias (the cannibal) and his younger brother" (pps. 118-121), "Hodadenon and Yenyent'hwus" (pps. 199-223), "The Crawfish and the Raccoon" (p. 229), "The Woman Who Became a Man-eater through the Orenda of Her Husband's Dogs" (pps. 231-236), "The Cannibal Uncle, His Nephew, and his Invisible Brother" (pps. 285-296), "The Morning Star and the Cannibal Wife" (pps. 464-469), "The Woman and the Cannibal Thunder" (pps. 469-472), "Dagwanoenyent and Gaasyendiet'ha" (pps. 474-481), "Ongwe Ias and His Brother Dagwanoenyent" (pps. 488-490), "The Legend of Honenhineh and his Younger Brothers" (pps. 525-537) and "S'hagowenot'ha, the Spirit of the Tides" (pps. 705-714). One story has a band of people trapped in a blizzard until they starved and began "to kill and devour some of their own nieghbours and friends" while others simply "became monsters" of the kinds already mentioned (Curtain & Hewitt 1918, 806n.). All these characters, even the monsters have normal emotions, dilemmas, and relationships.

The story of the woman who became a man-eater reveals a number of nuanced concepts found only in Onöndowa'ga:' lore. In this story, a woman lives with her husband and his dogs. She is so stingy and selfish to the dogs of her husband that one day, while cooking and cutting meat up for dinner, she accidentally cuts her finger, and instead of staunching the blood with a cloth she sucks on the blood until she empties it dry. A frenzy overcomes her then she moves on to all the other fingers, then one arm, then another, then one leg, then another, then eats her own flesh off of her remaining

body becoming a skeleton. Then she sees her baby daughter and eats her alive while only a bony creature. The story goes that this was caused first by her stinginess, but then also by the power (*orenda*) of the dogs who so much desired what she was cooking each day but had been withheld from them. The hunter returns to this scene. The story continues to relate numerous trials and challenges at destroying his transformed wife. The hunter succeeds through using his dogs *orenda*, which included turning into a dog himself. The moral being that if you love a dog completely, it will give its power to you, but if you mistreat them, they will use this power against you as was the case with the stingy woman. One could become a people-eater out of their own actions, but also out of the power and its influence from others. In the story of the Cannibal Uncle, his Nephew and Invisible Brother, it bears a strong resemblance to many *windigoo* stories in that the cure is boiled bear fat thrown at a flying skull which was a people eater, and like the previous one, the two nephews were aided by powerful dogs. In Onöndowa'ga:' stories, there are also Giant Stone Coats who eat people, and in one example, it was cured by drinking hot deer fat, afterwards turning into a regular person (p. 806).

Mi'kmaq stories of the *Chenoo* such as one related by Leland (1884) have it cured with kindness, patience, and a courageous wit. A doubting *Chenoo* aided the killing of another, which was hewn to pieces, "but the hardest task of all was to come. It was to burn or melt the heart. It was of ice, and more than ice: as much colder as ice is colder than fire, as much harder as ice is harder than water. When placed in the fire it put out the flame, yet by long burning it melted slowly, until they at last broke it to fragments with a hatchet, and then melted these". Next, the *Chenoo* returned to the camp with the couple that saved it, and with Spring upon them, "the *Chenoo*, with softened soul, went with

them. Now he was becoming a man like other men.” The next part demonstrates that despite Christian influence, or perhaps because of it, the story survived intact and contains only the following addendum, which is reminiscent of many hagiographic and other kinds of newly Christianized but originally traditional tales:

as they went south a great change came over him. He was a being of the north. Ice and snow had no effect on him, but he could not endure the soft airs of summer. He grew weaker and weaker; when they had reached their village he had to be carried like a little child. He had grown gentle. His fierce and formidable face was now like that of a man. His wounds had healed; his teeth no longer grinned wildly all the time. The people gathered round him in wonder.

He was dying. This was after the white men had come. They sent for a priest. He found the Chenoo as ignorant of all religion as a wild beast. At first he would repel the father in anger. Then he listened and learned the truth. So the old heathen’s heart changed; he was deeply moved. He asked to be baptized, and as the first tear which he had ever shed in all his life came to his eyes he died (p. 244).

Like the Onöndowa'ga:' stories, the Chenoo was a person deep down, and could be cured. In some stories, non-people like windigoos can be cured because they were seen as either people in the past, or were people-like enough to be saved as one. In studying a number of Algonkian samples Pratt (2002) finds the following facts apparent:

in each of these cases, cannibals are taken in as cannibals, are welcomed, made part of the group, and by degrees are transformed. Yet not all responses to cannibals are so peaceful. A wide range of stories describes times when cannibals

must be fought and killed. The use of kindness as a response to dangerous others is not to be understood as an absolute response mandated in every possible circumstance (p. 95)

We are not to be deluded that hard choices must be made when it's a matter of life and death for a person or their family, their whole village, or for all peoples. The twins of *Changing Woman* who come to the fifth world, our world, to slay all the monsters do so as a matter of fact, for they realize from their births what they must do, and it is for everyone's sake that they did. Wampanoag stories of Maushop describe a giant that helped the people and provided for them, often he would be defending them from people-eaters called *Pukwudgie* which were giant bird-like creatures that swooped up people and carried them as food to their nests on islands off the coast (Simmons 1986, p. 172-234). The heroes of Nanabush and Weyeskechak in Cree lore similarly come to the aid of people, devising ingenious ways to save them from people-eaters and also ways to destroy them as previously mentioned.

These stories are related because they show the massive traditional storyscapes which Forbes simply dismissed in order to describe the killing of Indigenous people by imperialists or "crazies" as the new epitome of people-eating, the consumption of their lands and lives in the process-progress of imperialism. One of the paramount hurdles Forbes runs into in utilizing an indigenous barometer of health and wellbeing is that very few, if any, have allowed for this transference to occur from "insatiable hunger for people" to simply an "insatiable consumption of anything and everything", aka, imperialism. There are simply no parallels, except the perspective given by Johnston which renders the Weendigo as a self-serving arrogant creature. However, as Kohl notes

that the power of suggestion itself, via dreams or words is like any good propaganda, takes on a life of their own. Forbes (2008a) too makes the same contention, saying:

imperialism, colonialism, torture, enslavement, conquest, brutality, lying, cheating, secret police, greed, rape, terrorism--they are only words until we are touched by them. Then they are no longer words, but become a vicious reality that overwhelms, consumes and changes our lives forever (p. xvi).

*Anthropological, Historical and Cultural Studies of the Wétiko Psychosis*

I have found, not unlike the section dealing with Forbes use of the descriptive term “Machiavellianism”, that there was an expansive scholarly literature, especially among anthropologists and cultural historians which had *prior* to Forbes usage, coined the condition, “Windigo Psychosis”, which Forbes used since at least 1975 as “wétiko psychosis”. Indeed, this literature and discourse was so vast, it was shocking, because, Forbes makes absolutely not a single reference to it, not once! In my conclusion, I will speculate more on this issue, but for this part, I will refer my readers to the ongoing discussion that has occurred among imperial authors and authors of the new imperialism, some of which have questioned the discourse altogether in defense of Indigenous theory-making, traditional ethos and community practices.

At the outset, Cevalco (2016) argues that we must be weary of these anthropological and narrative accounts such as the Jesuit Relations or the early narratives of New Netherlands. He says “it is impossible to discuss cannibalism without acknowledging how early modern Europeans produced and consumed stories of Indian cannibalism, then used these accounts to justify imperial expansion and settler

colonialism” (p. 567). Further, “the figure of the terrifying cannibal Indian exerted such power on the English imagination that writers often implied or invented cannibalism when it had not actually taken place” (p. 569). The people-eater was already an ancient fear embedded in the imperial psyche, yet it was something they experienced almost from their first visits to Turtle Island, and not by others, but upon themselves as relayed in George Percy’s *A Trewe Relacyon* (1625) narrative of early Jamestown starvation killings and grave-uprooting’s (Mancall 2007; Nicholls 2005). Many of the sources used for the creation of a “windigo psychosis” were drawn from external historical narratives which then casually ignore people-eating within their own communities as Forbes has already pointed out.

Anthropologists have conducted numerous analysis and original studies of the *windigo* and akin characters. The earliest known is that of Guinard (1930) & Cooper (1933) who coined “witiko psychosis”, followed by Parker (1960), and Teicher (1961) who created a psychological profile in neo-Freudian terms and named it thereafter “windigo psychosis” as a culture-bound phenom, namely to native Americans. Forbes tests this thesis by showing the prolific nature of people-eating by any name, by declaring a compulsive consumption of life seems to be bound to imperialists rather than its victims. This and other studies promoted a massive outpour that surely was known to Forbes in 1976 and then by 1981 when he attempted to publish in the psychology journal *Aggressive Behavior* which was rejected (D-046, B. 204, F. 5). These include studies that place the *windigo* as a non-culture bound phenomenon especially given the persistence in Christian, European and other sources prior to contact, a hypothesis or hunch that received widespread attention in the 70’s and 80’s from Imperial scientists (Bishop 1974;

Brightman, Meyer & Marano 1983; Brown & Brightman 1988; Brown 1971; Flannery, Chambers & Jehle 1981; Hay 1971; McGee 1975; Paredes 1972; Ridington 1976; Rohrl 1972; Turner 1977). After the sensation died down, studies focus on the people-eater within oral tradition, as contemporary figure or popular sensation and symbol (Bird & Grey 2007; Carlson 2009; DeSanti 2015; Root 1996; Smallman 2015; Waldram 2004). It is improbable that Forbes was unaware of these sources as he was trained as an Anthropologist and Historian, and as a Lenape descendent, he surely had heard of the *wintuc* (cognate of windigoo), as well as the Mhuwe (alternatively spelled as Mhuiwe, Mehuwe, Mhwe, Mhuuwe, Mamuui, Maaleew, Malew), or the people-eating frost giants of lore and legend (Voegelin 1945, p. 107; Bierhorst 1995). It is unclear why Forbes omitted such a vast literature on the subject, some of which relied on firsthand accounts while others were derived from oral traditions that show little to no Christian or imperial influence.

### *Forbes Stretching of the Truth and Its Consequences*

One of the key moves that Forbes makes in his use of the wétiko psychosis, no matter where he drew his inspiration from, was to find a contemporary application which suggested the deeply influential nature of imperialism, of evil, terror and the disregard for the sanctity of all life. With so much carnage and destruction abundant everywhere a person goes today, it is very difficult to grapple with the clear neglect and apathy prevalent from so many people who blindly or willingly participate in a full-scale war on the world, in so many ways. Forbes relies upon the malleability of language, or so he figures, in that for example, *wétiko* or *wihtikow* and *wihtikiw*, is built upon the root verb,

*miciw* in Alberta Cree and *micisow*, to eat in Plains Cree, or *micisowin* in Alberta Cree. Yet, Forbes (2008a) etymology begins this way, “*wétiko* is a Cree term (windigo in Ojibway, *wintiko* in Powhatan) which refers to a cannibal or, more specifically, to an evil person or spirit who terrorizes other creatures by means of terrible evil acts, including cannibalism. *wétikowatisewin*, an abstract noun, refers to “diabolical wickedness or cannibalism”” (p. 24). Forbes goes on to include a slew of characteristics that fall under the *wétiko* category including: evil, sadistic, racist, sexist, cruelty, lying, hypocrite, avarice, greed, envy, lust, predation, and others. He also draws attention to another Cree term, *matchi*, which he translates as “evil or bad” or *maci* as in *macâtisiwin* “wickedness” (p.74). As a non-Cree, I don’t understand why he insists on using Cree terms instead of Lenape or concepts he may have more knowledge in. This is perhaps a sign that Forbes lacks enough knowledge to use any of these terms on his own and is instead reliant upon many unknown others, probably dictionaries and ethnographic sources, which is most clearly represented in the immutable fact that Forbes cites not a single source for either a *wétiko* psychosis, a *matchi* syndrome or for his definitions. There is bearing of his definitions in Cree and Anishinaabe concepts but also I’ve heard the opposite from Anishinaabe and Cree speakers, who both corroborate and emphatically disagree with his usage. This is because word usage and language are specific, people-bound, family-bound, and place or experience-bound.

There are many such Cree and Anishinaabe young ones who have never heard of a witiko or wiindigoo in their lives despite growing up on a reserve because *it’s not a universal concept*, not even amongst supposed Algonquian language family speakers. *Machi* is a common Cree prefix found in such concepts as *machi manito* “evil/bad spirit”,



used later by Christians for “the devil, Satan, demon”, and also *machi tehew* “evil/bad heart”, and related *machi tehewin* “cruelty”, *machihtwawin* “bad temperedness, meanness”, *machisichikew* “He is doing something bad/evil”, *machi manito mamitoneyihtam* “he thinks evil”, and *machi manito mamitoneyichikan* “an evil mind” (Meskwaki Dictionary) or in Alberta Cree *maci* ᐃᐱ “evil”, *maci-manitowêyihcikan* ᐃᐱ ᐃᐱᐃᐱᐃᐱᐃᐱ “evil mind” or *macâtisowin* ᐃᐱᐃᐱᐃᐱᐃᐱᐃᐱ “being an evil person”. If Forbes was using the Cree term, why doesn’t he stick with Cree orthography? For example, the term *wétiko*, whose spelling he prefers that is supposedly Cree, I have not found duplicated, and seems to be his own invented spelling. Each of the following definitions and spellings is in reference to the people-eating figure of their lands, lore and history. I have located the following Cree spellings and definitions: *wihtikiw* also an insane person (Alberta Elders Cree Dictionary), *wîhtikow* (from Cree: Words, V. 2), *wihtikow* also refers to a greedy person (Meskwaki), *wîhtikôhkotâtowak* (from Cree: Words, V. 2), *wihtikowiw* (Alberta Elders Cree Dictionary) is a person who eats greedily, and the plural *wihtikiwak* (Alberta Elders Cree Dictionary), also from Plains Cree we find *k-dyztawihkwakanet wihtikow* ‘the two-faced wihtikow’ (Wolfart 1973) and *wihtikowiwin* “greediness” (Online Plains Cree Dictionary), Moose and Swampy Cree usage has *wîhtikôw* while some Eastern James Bay Cree have a whole other word in they use the term *atuush* ᐃᐱᐃᐱᐃᐱ “a giant cannibal monster”, also *achaan* ᐃᐱᐃᐱᐃᐱ (Eastern James Bee Cree Dictionary 2018). How did Forbes, who is one of the most well-respected researchers and historians of the 20th century miss such obvious renditions of Cree? Also, Cree language speakers have developed their own orthography from which I am sure more exact

spellings could be deciphered. If this analysis proves true, Forbes seems to have cannibalized the Cree language and people just as King suggests.

Chabot (2016) performed a recent study of James Bay Cree *wihtikow* conceptions and argued that Forbes use (and abuse) of the concept provided at best an “inconsistent critique” backed by a “political and moralistic nature” which devalued the original meanings (p. 12). For example, in her deep study of the issues involved when creating a definitive Native vs Newcomer paradox, she says that “many James Bay Cree might appreciate Forbes’ critique of imperialism (religious or secular) as a form of *wihtiko* cannibalism, but they might also debate his claim that adopting Christianity or Western culture can increase susceptibility to the disease,” offering the example that syncretic movements of the past such as one among the Cree in the 1840’s which combined aspects of both belief systems effectively rid themselves of a *wihtikow* leader [probably a reference to the Shaker Tent/Church] (p. 26). Forbes (2008a) position that Christianity and Christian influence “opens the door to Europeanization” and as such does not accept Cree definitions which place the devil and Satan as comparable figures (*maci manito* “evil spirit”), while Chabot, suggests otherwise, relying instead on her informants and deep research which demonstrably show that they accepted the fact that the *wihtikow* “has more in common with the Christian devil” than other known figures (p. 41). Chabot found Forbes arguments, like so many others, to be a stilted opposition, one whose purpose was inverted by offering to “perpetuate binaries of cultural difference” rather than find common ground, a charge seconded by King (p. 278).

Morrison (1979) published a treatise on the *kiwakwe* the “cannibal giant” of Algonquin lore the same year as Forbes first work on the subject of the *wétiko* was

published. In it, his view was much more sympathetic to a give and take relationship among imperialists and Native Nations and its members, arguing that, “while both Indians and priests adapted willingly to one another, the larger French society, like the English colonies, posed insurmountable economic, political and military problems for the Algonkians. Mutual acculturation did occur but never smoothly,” leaving it open as to whether Satan or the devil were forced upon peoples or were actually comparable figures to people suffering from deep winter cold and famine, resulting in people-eating and other akin conceptions (p. 55). King’s charge against Forbes, as one who cannibalizes others for their own personal gain and consumption (or dissemination) also fits Forbes own definition of cannibalism, consumption for “private or personal gain”. While incredibly influential as a complete textual argument, the basic conceptions fail to take root as they find very little substrate to hold onto, namely, traditional conceptions of peoplehood, stories or experiences. Forbes points towards traditional stories, conceptions of health/sanity and wellness, and Indigenous perspectives on life throughout the text, but does not engage the specific peoples or places who carry on these traditions. Paul Levy (2013) author of *Dispelling Wétiko: Breaking the Curse of Evil* relied for example nearly completely on Forbes for his definition, using the same spelling *wétiko*, with it appearing 260 times in his text from cover to cover. Levy’s naming of the madness is associated most strongly with a contemporary character, George Bush Jr. who has what he called “malignant egophrenia” or M.E. (p. 7). M.E. he explains is a “false sense of self”, a serious distortion to the point where a person might adopt a “Mad Emperor disease,” that is, when a person “becomes seduced by, addicted and attached to power” (p. 8). While although Levy brings up important points about the madness of George Bush, he fails to

describe why White people, Christians, Scientists, Technocrats, and even fork-lift operators so easily, so passively, participate and go along with the madness while they claim to be healthy and happy. Further, he too adopts the term under the assumption it's a traditional Native American motif, somehow widespread and unquestioned. Similarly, Ladha & Kirk (2016) make the same mistake, and I am sure many others, as they rely upon Forbes for a definition of the windigoo and then proceed to describe it as a "mind-virus", in line with Forbes sickness and pathology rhetoric. There is something unnerving about how this idea itself has spread cancerously, dangerously. I agree that imperialism is the greatest sickness, but I disagree that the various people-eating characters of lore have been given enough flesh to demonstrate the connection. Or, is it so clear that Forbes does not need to explain how and show his sources?

Meland (2017) who is an Anishinaabe scholar points out that "when scholars of Native studies like Johnston and Jack Forbes turn the lens of these stories on the contemporary world they see evidence that the spirit has possessed modern institutions like corporations and drives political/economic ideologies like capitalist colonialism and imperialism" (p. 2). Further, he points out that this has become institutionalized, not just in resource extraction but also in education via compulsory (consumptive) schooling efforts. Meland says:

In taking these forms, wiindigoo has "renounced" eating human flesh, as Johnston puts it, and instead now consumes human lives through economic exploitation or by eating the environments from which humans make their lives. Corporations clear-cut forests, for instance, displacing their human and other-than-human inhabitants, making it impossible for those who relied on that environment to

make a life there. They indulge their selfish hunger with the profit to be found in timber, insatiably moving from one stand of woods to the next and they feed their hunger for power over others, by forgetting the lives of those who call the forest home. They forget their relations in favor of self-interest. They forget they are part of a community. Riven with gullies and washouts, clear-cut landscapes reflect the erosion of principles that the wiindigoo embodies. Logging companies today even employ machines with massive jaws that grasp trees at their base and bite them off. These masticators, as they are called, literally chew their way through the forest. I cannot help being reminded that wiindigoo eats the flesh of its kin or that, in the absence of other food, it chews off its own lips: it is a tireless, obsessive masticator.

Johnston and Forbes point out that a society's institutions can become wiindigoo; institutions can forget their relations to their human and other-than-human communities, and can forget the principles and values which allow communities to develop and flourish in partnership with particular environments. Wiindigoo feeds on its power over others, whether those others are the felled trees of a clear-cut forest or the humans that live in anxious fear of what it might do—those who live in anxious fear of forgetting what it means to be Anishinaabe, to be a good relative (pps. 2-3).

This is a long process, and Forbes (2008a) points out “*tragically, the history of the world for the past 2,000 years is, in great part, the story of the epidemiology of the wétiko disease*” (p. 46, emphasis original). “There are many psychological traits that help form the *wétiko* personality. Greed, lust, inordinate ambition, materialism, the lack of a true

“face,” a schizoid (split) personality, and so on, are all terms which can be used to describe most *wétikos*. But one of the major traits characterizing the truly evil and extreme form of *wétikoism* is *arrogance*” (p. 52, emphasis original). One must accept Forbes definitions wholly, without any prior knowledge or experience of wihtiko/windigo theories or stories in order to follow his logic. If you have any of the stories already, you are bound to agree as often as you disagree because of the apparent lack of traditional knowledge which might otherwise be at the core of the analysis, and is not even periphery in Forbes text which says a wétiko is an imperialist not a people eater within a people’s specific lore and traditional knowledge base. Materialism for example, is not a good representation or characteristic of a “real” wihtiko or windigoo person, as manifested amongst the hundreds if not thousands of examples found currently or in the past as they are anything but materialists focused on consuming or having everything. Why did he not call it Columbianism if Machiavellianism was not spot on, and settle for “wetikoism”? Or perhaps Donnerism, so named after the Donner party members who with gold fever were stuck above Truckee, CA in the high sierras, and when faced with starvation, ate each other. Unlike many of the *wihtiko* murder cases handled by Canadian law during the 18th-20th centuries, none of the party members were brought up on charges for people-eating. The two Miwok members of the party who had come from the California side after others had gone for help at Sutter’s Fort were killed by William Foster and eaten. So named Luis and Salvador, they had refused to eat people (Johnson 1996, pps. 61-62).

The systematic and legally enforced practices of thievery, lying, and genocide enable an entire “civilization” moving from east to west and south and north to occur and

in this process, the Great Lie as Trudell names the whole construct of imperial exploitation (“mining our minds”), is perpetuated, casually, and without major fanfare. “Lying is also almost always a factor in *wétiko* behavior, and in fact may represent a key strand in the entire epidemiology of *wétikoism*” says Forbes (p. 43). This point stands in contrast to traditional beliefs and practices, which in many cases clearly demonstrate that people (men and women) who recognize they have become wiindigoo’s for instance, literally beg their children or relatives to kill them so as to prevent future harm to others (see also Friedland 2018). They do not “lie” about their transformation. They face the truth and ask for help. Thus Forbes use of the term is always with the preclusion that the “consumers” today offer very little recognition that they are killing others, and that their future acts will be any less destructive. Meland argues that the original wiindigoo stories are “like so many Anishinaabe stories” which is that they “direct us towards healing. They seek to restore the afflicted to a healthy way of living in the world—and with the world. Wiindigoo stories are not fairy tales or yarns told around the campfire that capture the exotic and chilling strangeness of Native culture. They are instructions” (p. 4). Although Forbes does not cite the stories, he focuses instead on the evidences of our current affliction, thinking perhaps that traditional stories may be distorted, deflected and disregarded. I think this was a great fault, for as Cajete (2000) reminds us, “science is storytelling for understanding of the natural world” which includes us Onkwehonwe, and in this way, we are the stories we tell ourselves (p. 80).

What is interesting about his phrasing is that Forbes has collected evidence from nearly every society for the past few thousand years which demonstrate aggression, terrorism, greed, caste-like systems, empire-building, etc., and given them the label of

“wétiko” and “imperialist” rather utilizing internal identifiers, or more closely related or relevant language or ideas. Forbes instead focuses on core values, like Johnston, who maintains that this is part of the resocialization process that has occurred in the new imperialism, which fits the definition he gives and those of the Moose and Swampy Cree who consider at its root that the *wihtikow* signifies “greediness”. Forbes (2008a) says for example, “on the other hand, *humility* is an essential value of traditional Native American life” (p. 53, emphasis original). In this passage, it is clear that Forbes has created an untenable dichotomy, that of, *wétiko* vs “traditional Native American”. There is in fact, no such thing on either end of the spectrum. Alcoholism, the scourge of every community today is known to seriously degrade a person’s health and wellbeing, for as the saying goes, the only honest people are children and drunks, that is, because they have no inhibitions they reveal all, good or bad. We all deal with this paradox of life, and it cannot be an isolated issue or experience, or one that is only perceived by so-called traditionalists. Many outspoken Native traditionalists have demonstrated drastic personal changes in their lives from changing their beliefs and religions, languages, clothing, allegiances, nationalities, and to be equally susceptible to the illness, drugs and alcohol. People are and should be allowed to change, to grow, to be different and develop according to their own visions and while walking their own paths in life. The real question is, how are we influenced by others, such as through coercion or violence, manipulation and deceit, and the teaching and modeling of good or bad behaviors? How do we embody the evil in the stories we tell ourselves and do we learn the necessary lessons in them? How do our values and strength in our relations, traditions, and way of life help limit or prevent our worse possible behaviors such as people-eating and



exploitation, aggression and abuse? And is killing always a violent act greater than an obviously maniacal killer, a people-eater, an *Ongwe'Ias* or *wétiko*, or mass-murderer that we in turn do nothing to prevent them either because of our self-imposed restrictions, for example as pacifists or valuers of peace, or out of fear of reprisal or other unforeseen consequences such as state repression or jail?

Friedland (2018) cites the case of Marie Courtreille who personally requested that her husband kill her before she killed him and others, essentially, she was faced as many are today of literally, kill or be killed (p. 88). There are many such cases, of which Teicher (1961) says “execution was not a vengeful act; it was a preventative act based on the belief that cannibalism was a compulsive behavior” (p. 49). As a carrier of traditions and as a member of an Anishinaabe family and community, Courtreille made the humble request to have her life taken in order to prevent future deaths among her people through her people-eating activities. In many cases where Cree and Anishinaabe community performed such acts during the 1800’s when the Canadian state claimed jurisdiction, the Canadian magistrates and the “judges” of them sought to murder their murderers, despite them being performed in order to kill off the *wiindigoo* that they had become which was the real killer in their eyes (Harring 1998, p. 237; Friedland 2018, p. 102). But for the Canadian imperialists, the law as they saw it demanded that their murderers suffer the same fate, although they were perfectly sane and healthy, and not people-eaters.

There were any number of cases in the 20th and late 19th centuries such as that of Zhaawano-giizhigo-gaabaw or Jack Fiddler, an Anishinaabe *ogimaa* or leader of the Sucker people who hung himself Sept. 30th, 1907 after escaping captivity while he was awaiting execution after killing Wahsakapeequay his brothers daughter-in-law who was

suspected of being a wiindigoo. Fiddler had admitted doing this fourteen other times (Fiddler & Stevens 1985). The Fiddler's were still respected leaders in their community after this event, while Imperial Canadians assumed their righteousness in the killing. Another such case was that of *Regina v. Machekequonabe* where Anishinaabe sentinels shot and killed a suspected wiindigoo and were summarily charged with manslaughter (Ontario Reports 1898, pps. 309-311). Another case, that of Swift Runner, a Plains Cree reportedly ate all of his family in 1898 leaving none alive to speak out and who was subsequently tried, convicted and killed by Canadian authorities (Brightman 1988, pps. 352-357). Who were the real killers?

This is a common dilemma in an imperial, terroristic, militaristic and punitive state which assumes control and power over the victims of its imperialism. In Forbes thought, the Imperial State were the real killers, the judges and police who *make no distinction between healthy and insane persons except through their own lens of justice*. Indeed the poor white benefits from the exploitation and theft of many below them, especially those not granted the same legal protections as those above for as Forbes (2008a) points out “*each social class seeks to exploit those below it*” (p. 54-55, emphasis original). He concludes, “*humility is the basis for democracy, just as arrogance is the basis for authoritarianism*” (p. 55, emphasis original). Was this arrogance or justice? The issue at heart is that the imperial state did not learn from the various Peoples it persecuted who had in fact, governed themselves since time immemorial. They used their own barometers of right, of good, of healthy and harmonious relations as imbued in the Rotinonshonni “Great Law” or *Kayeneshogowa/Kayanerehkowa*, Cree miyo-pimâtisiwin

ᑦᑲ ᐱᑲᑎᑲᑦᑲ or *Wahkohtowin*, the Anishinaabe way of Good Living, *mino-bimaadiziwin*, the *Diné be' iiná*, and the Payomkawichum *pom-mix changichngi-sh* to give examples.

Basil Johnston (1995) suggests that Anishinaabe peoples weendigo stories and traditional persona were “ostracized by disbelief and skepticism” and rather than disappearing he finds them again (p. 235). “Actually, the Weendigos did not die out or disappear; they have been assimilated and reincarnated as corporations, conglomerates, and multinationals. They’ve even taken on new names, acquired polished manners, and renounced their cravings for raw human flesh in return for more refined viands” (p. 235). The timber companies, the mining companies, the agribusinesses, the pillagers and exploiters of all life are what he calls the “new Weendigos” who “are no different from their forebears” (p. 237). Instead of an insatiable hunger for people flesh, they have an “unquenchable greed”, and are embodied in the common person as much as the CEO, for the consumer and corporate exploiter are bed buddies and need each other in a desperate cycle of subservience (p. 237).

*The wétiko disease is not limited to the brutes and goons who handle the gun, the lash or the instruments of torture. The nice people in the offices, the typists, the lab technicians, the clerks and, of course, the owners, directors, stockholders, senators, generals and presidents who use, profit from, and feed on human exploitation are also cannibals to one degree or another. The most guilty of the wétikos are, I would think, those who mastermind, justify and profit most from such systems. Such persons are the “master predators” (Forbes 2008a, p. 68, emphasis original).*

The final metaphor, that of *master predator* may have been lifted from John Trudell (2008) who began making this point in the early 70's and finally penned it in the 80's in such poem-songs as *Never Too Loudly* when he says:

We know the predator

We see them feed on us

We are aware

To starve the beast

Is our destiny . . . (p. 42).

In Forbes archives are found a few copies of Trudell's albums on cassette tape (JDF D-046, B. 194). Like Forbes, one of Trudell's greatest contributions was towards naming the consumptive empire which he says is "mining our minds", meaning also our spirits, our life energy. "In our human form in this industrial tech no logic programmed perceptual reality the miners mine the being part of human being by programming our intelligence" where "human beings are individually and collectively mined", that is, consumed, whole or in part for the "industrial predator class civilization" which he also names as Empire (Trudell 2008, p. 2). Forbes like Trudell, like Johnston and Meland identify the new windigoo as imperialism incarnate, a consumptive system, a psychosis, sickness, and disease, which infects all peoples, although seemingly, some more than others.

### *Consumption as Psychosis or Spiritual Sickness*

One problem Forbes argument ignites is that *psychosis* is a recent 19th century invention, adapted from a Latin borrowing of the classical Greek, ψύχ-ωσις, *psykhe* and

Latin *-osis* which denotes abnormality and is rendered via Latin script as *psykosis*, whose original meaning was “a giving of life; animation; principle of life” (etymonline.com; Liddell et al 1996). *Psyko* is the most common word, not for mind or brain, but for soul-spirit and was used to talk about numerous actions unrelated to western scientific hypothesis of the origin of supposed “material” or “neural” maladies. Indeed, the Diagnostic for Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) does not contain a single mention of spiritual or soul sicknesses, as they do not believe in a spirit or soul, because in their logic and reasoning, in their worldview, a spirit is immaterial (except for the term “spirits” to denote alcohol, perhaps), and therefore, unverifiable through their methods of deduction and objective testing. Equally, the International Classification of Diseases (of the World Health Organization) does not recognize the spirit or soul sickness and instead classifies “psychosis” nearly restrictively in the category of Mental, Behavioural and Neurodevelopmental Disorders. The ICD and the DSM do not generally account for any non-western scientific beliefs, completely discounting a majority of the world’s peoples, languages, histories and ideas about the causes and forces behind a person, people’s and living beings health. Psychosis is thus a neo-imperial invention used to describe not simply those who demonstrate abnormal mental states, but also the speakers themselves who claim to be “normal”. Forbes unfortunately recapitulated this term in order to appeal to a supposed common western scientific audience who all “agree” upon its contemporary meaning, without clearly differentiating it from his meaning as he provides the most limited etymological and traditional definitions, usages and background of his terms *wétiko* and *matchi*. My preference is for traditional English terms such as “corrupt” or broken-heart, “sick” or

unhealthy, “ill” originally evil or bad, and “crazy” shattered or “schizo” split, as in the words schism and shed. This is linguistic and cognitive imperialism of a new kind. Key to this new kind is not only the will to empire, but also the will of conformity, that is to make others in your own image. The problem with each of these “wills” is that they corrupt and defile the imperialist as well as the imperialized, to a certain extent. Those who readily accept the imperial mythology allow themselves to become completely reformed by it, believing nothing else. While those who are imperialized and brutalized often do not accept it or wholly change, oftentimes only in outward appearances.

“Colonialist-imperialist systems seek to create *wétikos*. They recruit them because colonialism is maintained by means of properly controlled *wétiko* behavior. More especially they need to recruit *wétikos* from within the native population in order to keep that group divided, exploited, and in a hopeless frame of mind” says Forbes (2008a) (p. 87, emphasis original). John Trudell (2008) frequently refers to the “Great Lie” which is that “civilization is a disease”, a sickness, a psychosis, and even closer to Forbes view, it’s a virus which spreads from person to person. What’s worse says Trudell (2008) is that because there is great knowledge about this virus and sickness among people that it has become the foundation of a civilization, a system, a people. These people act like “miners”, “mining our human being as a way of eating our spirit” (p. 3). Elsewhere in Trudell’s (2008) poem-song “Child of the Dream” he says the “predator infects in a predator way, diseasing intentions in a DNA, Slaying spirits with obedience rules, Capturing minds with mind control tools” (p. 152). The predator mind is Forbes (2008a) *wétiko*. This is learned behavior, and is cultured, that is, cultivated. Promoted by an empire, Trudell (2008) reminds us of the collusion and the deception involved which

does one thing, but then calls it something else. In this case, empire becomes democracy or as Trudell paints it, “we went to the emperor’s ball, The emperor sang, A song about sacrifice, A song about sacrifice, Sacrifice who sacrifice what, Sacrifice you sacrifice me, The altar of democracy” (p. 175). Where does democracy come from but from within the bowels of the empire: originating in Roman, Greek, British, U.S. and other sources. In a democratic state like the U.S. we find that the process is self-supporting through schools and other learning forums that develop internal monsters by even seemingly well-intentioned school teachers, parents, friends and family which adds weight to the Forbes (2008a) maxim: “from small wétikos big wétikos are made!” (p. 44).

Carl Jung (2014) was another person who carried the view that the afflictions of modern people are the result of deep-seated, spiritual maladies and sicknesses, where ideas can be an infectious disease, a form of “psychic bacilli”, however, as purveyor of imperial science Jung found it difficult to discern hallucinations (*Einfall*) from dreams and other phenomena (p. 601). “To be “crazy” is a social concept” he says, and reminds us that we are in control of our values and ideas, our words and ways of thinking and acting (p. 35). Although he developed a “psychopathological” framework which looked beyond the mind as brain, into what he called the four levels of consciousness, that of the conscious, subconscious, unconscious and the collective unconscious. Forbes found these concepts deranged and mere fluff if they never point out the real social problems of imperialism, racism, patriarchy, etc. (Forbes 1979a, p. 106). Forbes suggestion is that imperialism as consumption is a highly conscious practice, one which is merely mislabeled as a way of life, as a historical or “past” project, rather than as a psychosis or spiritual malady. Serial killers are labeled everyday under the false assumption that they

act abnormally, despite being totally surrounded by the past and presence of murderous behaviors.

By the time the U.S. becomes an independent empire, this process of teaching and learning consumption-imperialism as a way of life has infected most of peoples “original instructions” such that complicity is so normal that Christianity and Corporate resource extraction becomes a major consumer of souls, and its churches-factories nest on Indigenous lands while its teachings do the work of breaking down resistance. The empire finds many tools available to do the work of consumption and creating consumers such as through alcohol and by way of trading companies and fur-traders relations, but the most insidious of these, teachers-missionaries, becomes as Pratt noted: the common white person and the system they participate in, so-called capitalist, industrial civilization. This is a patriarchal system, one which has thoroughly traumatized and terrorized queens so that they become its main teachers in many ways, and when the public schooling system is finally and fully established in the U.S., it is queens, particularly white women who are the bastions of teaching white and Christian civilization to the masses. Forbes (2008a) concludes that “a Christianized Indian tends also to be a Europeanized Indian and as he enters the door of European culture, he also enters the realm of the *wétiko* psychosis. (This is, of course, not to say that all Europeans are *wétikos*, but only that expansionist European cultures have been among the major carriers of modern times)” (p. 89). In this instance, Forbes makes it clear that to be born into this world, into a family and community does not necessarily result in the insanity, psychosis or evil of that person. Evil is learned. Sadism, racism, sexism, homophobia, terrorism, arrogance, greed, avarice, lust, envy, etc., are all learned behaviors, they are



adopted and developed. Forbes (2008a), who I quote in full, maintains that the sick pass on more than just the sickness itself, they pass on the superstructure, a racial-caste system of exploitation that is seemingly benign or even beneficial as “democracy”:

the onslaught has always been psychological as well, and it is here that the *wétiko* does his greatest damage. The colonialists spread their notions of racial and cultural superiority and transform hitherto free people into super-chickens (as it were) with an especially intensive brutal pecking order. This pecking order (ranks, social classes, castes, and so on) is, of course, what maintains the system of exploitation and degrades the masses who become its victims. Such systems are a form of physical and psychological terrorism (p. 105).

Forbes base definition is the “consuming of another’s life for one’s own private purpose or profit” (p. 23). He elaborates further upon this definition to explain that even forced or coerced labor is the same thing as the “wealthy and exploitative literally consume the lives of those that they exploit” (p. 24). Further he says that exploitation of labor and resources:

is truly and literally cannibalism, and it is cannibalism accompanied by no spiritually meaningful ceremony or ritual. It is simply raw consumption for profit, carried out often in an ugly and brutal manner. There is no respect for a peon whose life is being eaten. No ceremony. No mystical communication. Only self-serving consumption (p. 25).

Given these frameworks or benchmarks to work away from, how can we utilize the stories, Forbes insights, and our experiences dealing with such a menace, which because

of cognitive imperialism, brainwashing, “mining our minds”, we can easily pass this on to our children, co-workers, upon the lands we inhabit, and all of our relationships? For one, we can transpose the dilemma, as Forbes has, of starvation, of madness, cannibalism or people-eating with our grave threats of imperialism, colonialism, racism and patriarchy that might buttress our traditional conceptions of health, wellness, balance and the good mind or good heart. Perhaps we are not starving as our ancestors have from lack of food but rather healthy foods, where we are now starving for open spaces, for communion with other free creatures, for a day without a myriad of threats from cars to shootings, from police to poisoned food or water. Perhaps Winter is not the most fearful season as it seems our Summers are hotter and drier than ever and with melting ice caps and glacial mountains, our worry is local and global warming, plagued with hot winds and dust bowl tornado monsters. The conjurors and sorcerers of the stories are identified now as corporate mining projects that dig the hearts out of the earth and mountains, agribusiness firms which create monster rooted Maize that infect our ancient strains and cause great sickness. There are forest logging companies who wield massive steel machines with large biting jaws that rip through the oldest stands of trees on purpose, or it could be likened to centralized States who wield monstrous armies of body piercing guns, terrorist nuclear threats that can destroy a city, a region, or the whole world. The new *Ongwe’las* is the imperialist and the white man, its primary parent. The new *Wendigoe* is the serial earth and queen rapist, killer and racist. The new *Chenoo* is the male terrorist and capitalist. The new *Gastongwes* are democrats and republicans, they are missionizing and passive Christians and Muslims, and their capitals and high rises, their churches and stadiums are built like the coliseums of old, like the pyramids of yesteryears, like the

plantation manors of the south, and the railroads that cross the land, that is, with captive labor, with the threat of terrorism and poverty, prison and depravity. Perhaps.

The Northern Cheyenne for example took the white man's terrorism and trickery seriously and instead of reinforcing his own superiority complex and play at power, they in turn, at least those who speak the language and know the concomitant stories have given their old trickster spider, or *ve'ho/veeho/vihuk* a break, for the new *ve'ho* is the white man (Erdoes & Ortiz 1998; Mooney 1905, p. 453). Indeed the stories, the language, the original instructions and paradigms are more valuable than ever to continue and to revitalize, but also as Johnston and Forbes suggest, to reenvision and creatively apply. Is this neo-cannibalism as King suggests or is this what Cook-Lynn (1997) meant when she suggested that we, like Beaver, "keep the plot moving", and make our stories, our values, our traditions, work for us? Will the naming of the scourge of imperialism-colonialism as the new *wiindigoe*, *ongwe'ias*, *chenoo*, *yé'itsoh* or *ve'ho* give our critique and analysis more flesh and bones so that we can effectively target it or does it degrade our own stories, languages and traditions? Will treating imperialism as a disease or psychosis aid in our mission of deimperialization and decolonization by naming it something we feel, something more real, something as Forbes says, touches us, and in turn infects us? Does it support the diagnosis and healing of the "soul wound" (Duran 2006), of trauma, ethnostress and dehumanization (Antone, Meyers, & Miller 1986), of the destruction of all life, peoples, and the earth itself? Where do the stories give us hope, help, and a healthy way to heal, to harmonize, and grow our own?

Further, how does this fit into our paradigm of education today? What role does it serve to promote imperialism-consumption-cannibalism, consciously or unconsciously?

Forbes (2008a) says honestly that “the people who rule the world today are, on the whole, highly educated (or at least highly trained). They are the graduates of the “great” military schools or the elite universities” (p. xix). Education, especially higher education is a special place where new Columbus’s are trained to take new voyages and perform new invasions, upon the spirit, upon Mars, upon our Mother Earth, on our children, on monkeys, upon the knowledge of Native Nations, upon our spiraling DNA chord, literally everywhere because these are research institutions. Forbes (2008a) summarizes his view of imperial education this way:

“Education” of the kind we know in the modern world usually has little do with ethics or with bringing forth the individual potential of the learner. On the contrary, it is largely technical in nature (whether in natural science, social science, or whatever) and seldom (in and of itself) serves to alter the class and ethnic “interests” of the graduates.

In any case, the *wétiko* disease, the sickness of exploitation, has been spreading as a contagion for the past several thousand years. And is a contagion unchecked by most vaccines, it tends to become worse rather than better with time. More and more people catch it, in more and more places, and they become the true teachers of the young.

Thus the youth in twentieth century societies are taught not primarily by underpaid public school teachers or “ivory-tower” professors, but by their parents, by movies, by television and the Internet, and in fact, by what they observe in the society. And this type of learning is often reinforced by the structure and content

of school disciplines, such as history, that exalt the aggressive and the exploitative (p. xix-xx).

Forbes did not leave much hope for us all because he realized that we learn everywhere, from everyone and all the time. It does nothing to teach one thing in school and see the opposite practiced by your parents, at work, on tv, everywhere you look, especially in places literally overrun with people, their structures, and their techniques of consumption. The problem today as he saw it was the disease of imperialism, renewed as consumption. The major issue is that it has literally infected everyone and everything around us, save the non-five fingered beings which continue to exhibit resilient ways, the vibrant sustainable and dedicated communities of tradition holding firm to the “good ways”, the “old ways”, and the “original instructions”. The issue at heart is that despite our best efforts, things have gotten worse and without major changes, drastic changes, we may be too late, and we may not have new generations who are carrying on the struggle for loving communities, for sustainable, respectful and harmonious ways of life, who are defending homelands rather than exploiting them, who are honoring our queen’s ways and wisdom which have survived yet too have also become infected. So how do we collectively combat such a struggle? The hope he does leave us is that we must each do our part, every second of the day. For Forbes, education was the way, the peaceful way, for if we negate this way, we resign our children to the way of war, and within the war machine, there may not be a peaceable outcome. Education is however not a neutral location or practice. It is a battleground. Forbes fear is that as we go to battle, we may become the killers we hope to overcome.

Imperialism is an extremely ancient psychosis in Forbes mind, one that infects children and elders alike and has spread everywhere in the world as we know it. As one film notes, *Schooling the World* (2006), education is one of the primary teachers of contemporary imperialism, which has itself become imperialistic and reflects the original goals of imperialist states who sought like the U.S. to pursue the policing, colonizing and civilizing of external and internal colonies and territories through education. Native Nations as “captive nations” or as “domestic dependent nations” were treated similarly as protectorates (Deloria & Lytle 1984; Holm 2005). In 1919, the U.S. government prepared a paper in order to facilitate the 20th century approach to dealing with its status as a “colonizing power” and “civilized State” among other imperialist powers. It argues that “protectorship” is not limited to military protection but rather this relationship “not only implies defence but active and continuous education and guidance” which follows the “state of pupilage” verbiage framed in the Marshall trilogy prior to Indian removal (Snow 1919, p. 71) whereby the Great White Father’s guarantees as guardian, trustee, and protector, is also a teacher or educator (Prucha 1984; Stanton 2014). The U.S. imagined this as its role before the eras of Indian reorganization (1930’s), Self-Determination (1960’s and 70’s), and Tribal Sovereignty (1970-current). The National Tribal Chairman's Association proclaimed in 1976 that the U.S. government had not been living up to its “trust responsibility” in its two major ways, first, by protecting Indian property and territories and in providing services in perpetuity such as education and health (p. 47). But what if the U.S. is not a trustee, but rather a consumer? For Forbes, this is the important difference we must face up to if we are going to re-educate new generations of “scholar warriors” who will challenge imperialism on all its fronts. As Lyons (2000) has

pointed out, Native Nations have become signatories not only to treaties which affect their own lands and peoples but also because these treaties became part of the “supreme law of the land” which are used to run the imperial matrix of global power. Thus, Native Nations, willingly or knowingly are complicit in internal and foreign wars, of mis-education and brainwashing, of the consumption of their own and other people's resources and lands, and everything that “civilization” touches. How an educational approach, one which seriously critiques and challenges the imperial and colonial order help Native Nations reenvision their relationships spelled out in their original instructions, reimagine their relationships with the “empire of liberty”, and reinvigorate the essential ways they raise “good people”? Forbes worked his whole life towards formulating and developing a decolonizing philosophy of education, one which questions the fabric of imperial life, and which gives all people a hope renewed in their own communities traditions of power and beauty, of democracy and freedom, equality and respect.

## Ch. 7: Forbes Decolonizing Philosophy of Education

The struggle for freedom, dignity and justice is *one* struggle. Seeing the relatedness of things is hard but it is so important (Forbes, 1979a, p. 8.).

In terms of education, the kind of education that takes place in the home and in the community, is at least and probably more important than that which takes place in the formal school. . . . That is not where the elite learn, in any society, not in a school, they learn in a very comprehensive way that includes the school (from a speech by Forbes (1967) “Indian Education: The Effects of Conquest”, retrieved from D334, B. 43, F. 4, and released on *Akwesasne Notes* circa 1975).

How can one introduce culture change gradually and lead a folk-group forward without creating social disorganization and individual alienation? How can one avoid the alcoholism, meaningless weekend violence , hopelessness, and apathy which more than anything else typifies the disorganized Indian tribe and is the most noticeable result of United States native policy? One answer, I believe, would consist in the establishment of folk-group oriented (and controlled) educational institutions beginning with a “university.” I say “beginning with a university” because local grass-roots education depends upon the development of a large corps of trained cadres (Forbes 1979a, p. 17).



*Fighting for Community Based Education: Lessons from Forbes Lifetime in Education*

This chapter will synthesize and build upon the previous discussions of Forbes particular vision of the world, his philosophy of education, his conception of peoplehood-nationhood, his analysis of imperialism-colonialism-racism, and finally, his critical view that decolonization was imperative for our survival as peoples, and for the survival of mother earth as we know it. Further, I will examine my own experiences and insights living in the diaspora, working with Native communities and students, and struggles upon the land and in education. Forbes (1966c) noted in his thickened and most widespread publication of his proposal for an American Indian University that “the possession of educational institutions is vital to the development and survival of a people” (p. 2). Forbes (2008a) found that often when Indigenous persons, even those who might possess a resistance or warrior’s identity “try to fight *wétikos* sometimes, in order to survive, adopt *wétiko values*. Thus, when they “win”, they “lose”, or at least, the people lose” (p. 62). This is because imperial white education institutions according to Forbes (1979a) “are not “neutral” seats of objective learning and unstructured self-discovery. Rather, they are centers of Anglo-American self-indoctrination (i.e., purveyors of the Anglo heritage to Anglo students) and places where young people learn how to make a living in Anglo society” (p. 18). Schooling is always a specific technique of socialization-nationalization (or denationalization, deculturalization, etc..) into a specific people’s vision of the world, and normally, to create people in the image of those in control of the learning process. So while we study basic imperial constructions of knowledge such as “science”, “mathematics”, “English”, “history”, “government”, etc., we are so thoroughly entrapped in a social sphere of influence, of pressure, of threats of violence and

starvation, for so many years, that a majority who come in with their sense of peoplehood may succumb to believe or realize our communities or homelands to be lacking any place for our imperial education. We may come in replete with strong values and relationships of tradition, coupled with an avowed sense of decolonization and resistance, but at some point, we may succumb like the new or old people-eater, by degrees, that is, we either are consumed, or become consumers ourselves. Today, with compulsory public schooling, Pratt's vision of feeding Indians to white civilization has become the norm. Today, Stanley's conquest by schooling rather than armies has become casually the rule. What can we do about this? Are more "schools" the answer?

Tom Porter (2008), an Akwesasne faithkeeper, a founder of Akwesasne Freedom School, a founder of the renewed Kanien'kehá:ka village of Kanatsiohareke, participant-leader of the North American Indian Travelling College among many other accolades, says we must perform "Carlisle in reverse" (p. 385). Deloria Jr. (1969) had desired an early "redefinition of Indian Affairs" which he answer answered with "retribalization" and "recolonization" (p. 263, 266). In education, Deloria Jr. (1974) had said whatever we do, it "must be "Indianized" if the venture known as Indian education is to succeed" (p. 18). Forbes (1998a) reflected on his vision for Native American Studies and American Indian Universities saying for him, it was "about self-determination, liberation, and decolonization, by which we meant *intellectual self-determination* as well as political and economic liberation for our communities and nations" (p. 13, emphasis original). Forbes (1991) dreamed big, but he was also realistic. He thinks of the struggle to always be a personal battle, a spiritual one, which forms the true education of a person and the people doing "together-living". In the interview with Lois Crozier-Hogle at a "crazy coffee

house” near UC Davis he spoke candidly about his views of the world, which he summarized this way:

I think that is one of the most horrible things that has happened to Indian people - the spread of an exploitative kind of way of looking at the natural world which has influenced some modern Indian people. But still, fortunately, I think in almost every Indian community, the old way of looking at things does survive. And it is on the basis of that survival that, I think, the future must be built. I really liked Philip Deere, who was, for many years, the spiritual leader of the American Indian Movement [and D-QU]. Philip used to tell us, “Hey, we’re not perfect Indians any more.” It is true. We have lost a lot. And we can’t do everything that our ancestors could do right now. But we can recover and we can rebuild because we can have dreams again. We can dream ceremonies just like they did. We can have new visions and we can re-create things. We don’t have to give up just because we have lost part of our tradition and culture. We can still go on living. We can still find the essential things in our life and we can make them work for us.

Forbes vision of Native American/American Indian Studies and Tribal Colleges and Universities was that it would pick up where our ancestors and elders left off rather than assume we were in some neo-civilized state of consciousness development. Anishinaabe educator and scholar Linda Grover, refers to the boarding school era (1879-1960’s) as the “Great Interruption”, and says while we hope that we are “coming back from it, it’s not like the Interruption is done. We are still dealing with this” (as interviewed in Kerr 2017). Forbes et al (2002) vision of NAS was that “Native American Studies is really not a

“new” field of study but rather a very old subject simply suppressed by colonialism and specifically by the “underdevelopment” (oppression) of Native societies” (p. 100). TCU’s like D-QU were projects which would focus upon taking back control of a communities destiny by creating a people’s institution of education which centralized Native knowledge and development while not shying away from the realities of economic subjugation and exploitation, spiritual persecution and recovery. Forbes hopeful view of D-QU and other institutions was that in 5082 A.C. (1970), as Forbes often used the Maya Calendar to correlate historical dates with traditional thought, he says, “a group of Indians and Chicanos broke through four centuries of colonialism by founding D-Q University, or perhaps we should say that they were called upon by the Great Creative Power to do what had to be done at this particular point in time” (Forbes 1971, “Why D-QU?”, p. 2). For Forbes, the purpose of D-QU specifically was two-fold:

- (1) to empower and strengthen the traditionalist intelligentsia already existing at the grass roots level; and (2) to train younger people in such a way so that they would be able to return to their communities and lead the intellectual and creative struggle for liberation, always in conjunction with the traditional elders (ibid).

Education was deemed as a rite of passage into community, but it can easily be the opposite, which is a rite of passage into exploitation, into the imperial world, into the way of consumption. Education is a tool, a structure, a practice and series of relationships which focuses upon limiting and learning from various influential sources. Today it seems to be a tripartite of teachers, texts, and technology. It’s not the only way. In Eduardo Duran’s (2006) *Healing the Soul Wound* he approaches intergenerational trauma from an imperial and indigenous psychological perspective, one which recognizes

colonization as an oppressive condition, often naming it to patients the “White Way” which is Forbes “wétiko way”, the way of imperial exploitation, or Trudell’s “predator civilization”. Forbes argues, the practice of imperialism in itself is a degrading, traumatizing, oppressive way beyond the numerous self-inflicting behaviors we perform after this fact, such as alcohol and drugs, or through abusive relationships with one’s own body or upon others. Further, the collusive condition of imperialization as a psychosis or sickness means that it is embedded in nearly every contact source, every medium, technology, knowledge or language base and people. Education as socialization cannot refrain from dealing with whole peoples, whole conditions and realities, from whole problems and struggles, from all aspects of an ensouled, and interconnected world. Deloria Jr. (1976) reminds us that “action or progress in one shpere [sic] must therefore result in a reevaluation of events and operations in another sphere and the watchword should be the “interrelatedness” of things”, which he says in context of focusing our educational efforts so narrowly so as to define schooling as the object rather than “Indian survival” (p. 9).

Community and kinship are what defines the basis of people and their traditions, while the land is the total venue from which these relationships are performed, as a part of the relationship we have with the sources of life. Forbes like Deloria Jr. and others understands the total matrix of relations involved in community life, but he is also hesitant to outline answers for people with specificity because as he says to Crozier-Hogle, “what destiny a particular group of Indian people will have, just like the destiny for a particular group of non-Indian people, is for them to work out. Whether it be Pomos or whether it be Crees or Maya people or Swedes or Swiss. I think the only thing that we

can do is to try and establish the opportunity for people to be free and to follow a spiritual path. But, we cannot do it for them. And we can't tell them how to do it" (BANC MSS 98, 144c). So while always defining Indian education as a particular people's endeavor, it must ultimately grapple with the real conditions and characteristics of a community rather than the tinned contents of media or market value, as the funding and accreditation organizations and institutions have clear policies which reflect what Forbes calls the "Overseas European" imperialism which does not recognize any people's views outside of its own.

The struggle Forbes complained was the softening or tokenization of foundational elements of peoplehood-nationhood such as clanship, territory, language and ceremonialism, which have and will always remain contested areas of social life that jar the hegemonic and normative states of imperial forms of education. Deloria Jr. (2001) reminds us that:

The old ways of educating affirmed the basic principle that human personality was derived from accepting the responsibility to be a contributing member of a society. Kinship and clan were built upon the idea that individuals owed each other certain kinds of behaviors, and that if each individual performed his or her task properly, society as a whole would function (Deloria & Wildcat 2001, p. 44).

This guiding premise is affirmed by Forbes (1995a) thesis that "kinship is the basic principle" and echoing Deloria Jr.'s Lakota relatives, he affirms the power of "Old American" axioms such as *mitakuye oyasin* "All Our Relations!" (p. 144). We find the inverse true in imperial education forms who have consistently reinforced the "Imperialist White-Supremacist Capitalist Patriarchy" or "dominator culture" (hooks

2008; hooks 2010). While talk of Christian “family values” permeates mainstream media it has been removed from textbooks generally and replaced with an imperial scientific framework, one that reinforces the “nuclear family”. The nuclear family has seriously eroded the basic survival mechanisms of most families which depend upon the power of the whole clan-calpulli network, focusing now on 2-3 individual children’s success. If we want to work on the core purpose of education, we must centralize familial and territorial relationships, the ethno-spiritual path, and the richness of linguistic knowledge as it relates to the total matrix. Actual governance of communities rests upon these foundations as does an “economy”, or the ways we survive off the land and in community. The importance of seeing the relatedness of things cannot be overstated.

### *Creative Control and Deimperialization*

Lehman Brightman (1976) summarized the active view of UNA’s study upon federal and public schools while teaching at D-QU in the 70’s saying that “the first step in improving and changing Indian education is to give it back to the Indian people, where it belongs. The curriculum, the staff, the plants, and the direction of Indian education must all be changed. This we know, but if this change is brought about by non-Indians, even if the change is for the better, it will be just another form of the same -- “colonialism”” (p. 133). This was a point Forbes made from the very beginning of his active work in education in the 1960’s, advocating for example in 1967 that “every school has got to be under Indian control to the maximum degree possible if it schools Indian children. If it’s an all Indian school it should be under all Indian control. If it’s a part Indian school it should be under shared Indian control” (“Indian Effects of

Conquest” in D334, B. 41). It is clear that control is paramount, as we could not imagine Indian schools in non-Indian control, the same can be said for Tribal Colleges and Universities, but also Native American Studies/American Indian Studies. While the former seem to be making headway, it is not the case for public schools as it always comes down to who’s in charge of the district and school board, and further up the line, to those in control of funding and accreditation, as well as local, state and federal policies, the current of which is the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) as of December 2015 which made new amendments to the 50 year old Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1966. ESSA mentions “bilingual and bicultural programs and projects” one time in its 443 pages of text, keeping Indian educational initiatives clearly within Indian “controlled” zones of education, that is, reservation communities.

The 1960’s produced some legislative victories but it wasn’t until the 1970’s that Indian control of Indian education would become supported at the federal level. This is backed by the hard-won legislative efforts which produced the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975, the Tribally Community College Assistance Act of 1978, the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988, the Native American Languages Acts of 1990, 1992, and 1996, and the Esther Martinez Native American Languages Acts of 2006 and 2008 which all represent key moves to insure tribal control of Indian education. This comes with some key caveats however, which are, this does not include for example, the numerous California Indians who are not part of recognized tribes but are recognized as persons who should receive services; it does not recognize non-U.S. Indians or their specific needs; it does not recognize urban Indians who predominantly attend public schools and otherwise are beyond the “limited sovereignty” of recognized



U.S. Indian Nations territories; and lastly, none of these efforts insure that public school efforts which involve Indians ever meet the standards of Indian peoples let alone content, relevancy, and control. Native American/American Indian Studies for example are always funded through their institutions, and are not overtly controlled by any Native Nation or even confederated urban community, of which many do not have oversight from local and national representatives. This is unique in that one the hand local politics and ideas do not govern while international views are equally disparate, as most programs take on a focus based upon their staff, faculty and original missions that are in turn guided by policy and institutional contexts of support or growth. Native Nations have supported Native American/American Indian Studies from their beginnings in the 1960's however, it has largely been the support of the state and federal funding sources which have guided their limited growth.

Part of the reason behind the distinctive character of NAS/AIS programs is that they represent the influential realm of the urban Indian, of which a majority of California Indians and non-California origin Indians live. In California, Forbes and others founded their program with the support of a grassroots base of traditional peoples and educators, namely the California Indian Education Association who purposely chose Davis over Berkeley or Los Angeles as the state's first hub (Caspar-Denman 2011; Forbes & Johnson 1970; Forbes et al 2002). The founders anticipated however the influence of the unrepresented mass of "Indigenous ethnicities" who in turn reflect "complex demographics, socioeconomic structures, and ethnopolitical processes, and with their intellectual expressions, artistic creativity and unique cultural configurations" and otherwise "constitute the main subject matter of the multidisciplinary study program at

UC-Davis” (Forbes et al 2002, p. 104). Part of this focus may be that only a few Tribal Colleges and Universities, and not all of the immersion education efforts demonstrate strong commitments to peoplehood-nationhood studies, especially at the highest levels of education. The exceptions of course are the unique ethnocentric programs of Lakota Studies, Diné Studies, and others, with the rare emphasis at Northwest Indian College for example to offer Bachelors of Arts in Native Studies Leadership, Tribal Governance and Native Environmental Science. Again, however, these are limited to the lower-middle echelons of study, and in order to pursue masters and doctoral level work with this emphasis, one must seek outside programs with Indians in them, or programs with an Indian foci available. Forbes search for the “greatness of the Native mind” is totally unheard of outside of these limited avenues for study as no other disciplines seriously consider the continuous and incredible influence native American Nations have upon U.S. life and beyond.

Forbes view was that the imperial condition affects all generations, and given this paradox, what was needed was the development of an “indigenous intelligentsia”, which was not a class of people in itself, but rather a group dedicated to long-range plans and community development within the mutually reciprocal relationships reservation-based and non-reservation-based communities fight for their survival. Henrietta Whiteman (1974) made the call for NAS/AIS programs to pull their weight in this effort, saying “while institutions are being developed they must not be allowed to sever our native traditions from their living roots and blind us to the need for studies consistent with our cultural heritage as the peoples belonging to Mother Earth on this Turtle Continent” (p. 4). Her goal is akin to Forbes (1981) conception of producing “warrior-scholars”, from

which she says “I visualize a total individual, a complete personality, who can assume a role any place in society. The end product I visualize being developed in Indian Studies Programs is one that I refer to as a warrior-scholar-community activist” (pp. 4-5).

Deloria Jr. (2001) complained that:

Education today trains professionals but it does not produce people. It is, indeed, not expected to produce personality growth, in spite of elaborate and poetic claims made by some educators. We need only look at the conflict, confusion, and controversy over prayer in schools, sex education, and the study of non-Western societies and civilizations to see that the goal of modern education is to produce people trained to function within an institutional setting as a contributing part of a vast socioeconomic machine (p. 43).

To summarize Forbes (1974a) view of education, he points towards creating the “warrior-scholar” who is a community leader, but for this to occur in any substantial way, the core education of the individual must be a community integrated education:

From the traditional American perspective the central essence of education is not, in any case, the acquisition of specific skills or factual knowledge (although this is a necessary part of a person’s growth through life) but rather it is learning how to be a human being, and how to live a life of the utmost spiritual quality. A person who has developed his character to its highest degree, or who is on that path, will also be able to master specific skills. A person, on the other hand, who has no spiritual essence or depth of character will either not be able to concentrate on learning anything else or will misuse what he has learned (as do our “mad scientists” and technicians who perpetually produce new products of questionable

value and who will not assume responsibility for the use others make of their inventions). The highest goal of Native American education is to help individuals to learn to live as self-directed, free human beings with a keen sense of their destiny in the Universe (p. 19).

Yet, in his view, this is not enough because we all face the imperial presence and present as an ongoing dilemma, an ongoing choice, which continues to destroy the ground we tread upon, literally. Thus, the need for a decolonizing and deimperializing philosophy of education becomes a central paradigm from which our educational efforts must grapple with. “In order to proceed with mental and spiritual liberation, we must first identify some of the key areas in which colonialism has distorted our thinking”, which is Forbes most basic conundrum, how do we deal with the imperialization of our minds, emotions, bodies and “core” (Forbes 1979a, p. 102). This is not something that can be sidestepped because we, like the universe as Deloria Jr. and Forbes have pointed out, are the products of “mind”, which is our thought and attention. Forbes elaborates on why it's so crucial to focus upon the “mind”, saying that deimperialization and decolonization are not overnight processes or actions:

It's a long trail to follow. European imperialism has brainwashed our people very thoroughly - so well in fact, until we're well along on our journey, we cannot conceive of the number of layers of indoctrination and mythology that have to be peeled off. And we always run the risk of falling prey to new European myths since we're constantly the target of each European sectarian movement (p. 102).

If one does not decolonize the mind first, they are susceptible to whatever new solution, technology, educational policy or innovation that imperial society comes up with, and

further, we may be ourselves deploying these new imperialisms upon our own people and lands if we are not the ultimate caretakers and responsible persons involved in their creation.

*A Decolonizing Philosophy of Education Begins with Decolonizing the Mind*

Among the Rotinonshonni or Kannensionwe peoples, agreement is paramount for survival, in order to keep the peace, to support our language and cultural survival, our national integrity and governing structures, the ceremonial cycle and dances, all economic and social needs. This also extends to the realm of understanding or naming the problem, having a united perspective on health and wellness, and knowing our enemies. In Kanien'keha or Mohawk, we use the term *tewakanonhwarawén:rie*, meaning literally, he is split-minded or mixed up (see also Bonvillian 1989). Similar terms exist across our communities. In the Gawennio or Seneca language the term for the crazy person is again literally someone who has a split or mixed up mind, or *Gowënoih* "he is mixed up/split" while *owenoih* is simply "mixed up" (Chafe 2015). In the Ononyoteka or Oneida language, the term is *tekanahalawawyehé*, again, "he is split-minded". In Cayuga its *teha'nigohayei* or *degenaha:we:nye*, meaning my mind is mixed or stirred. In Tuscarora it's something like *rehya?nader*. Each of the terms uses the noun of "mind" with the verb "to split/mix". In Kanien'keha and the related languages *Onòn:wara* or mind is also spirit, they are not separate things (see also Oneida *O<sup>2</sup>nikú-la<sup>2</sup>*; Cayuga *Ganíkoha`*). So the reference is to a total split or corruption of the spirit of a person. The goal of every Kanien'kehá:ka person is to develop and maintain a "good mind" or "good spirit", *ka'nikonhrí:io*, Oneida *ka<sup>2</sup>nikuhli-yó*, Cayuga *g'anigohíyo*, Seneca *o'nigoe:yoh* (Froman

et al 2002; Michelson et al 2002; Rudes 1999). This practice of the “good mind”, which is whole and healthy, is embedded ritualistically and ceremonially in the *Gano:nyog* or the “good words” of what is called the thanksgiving address is essentially a message which is to bring people together in peace by honoring all our relatives which support and nurture all life. The good words raise our spirit, conjoin our thoughts, and attempt to reharmonize us with one, good mind. Thus, at the Akwesasne Freedom School, they begin and end each day with the *Ohen:ton Karihwaterhkwen* or the “words that come before all else” in order to bring the youth, teachers and all present in harmony with their world, their purpose, their minds-spirits and to carry this into all they do (White 2015, pps. 89-90).

James Sákéj Henderson (2002) once referenced the massive goal of any indigenous education effort, especially among the adult population that has already suffered from mis-education and trauma and who thinks and acts through an imperial vision of the world. He summarized the predicament this way:

To acquire freedom in any decolonized and de-alienated order, the colonized must end their silence and struggle to retake possession of their humanities, languages, and identities. To speak initially, they have to share Eurocentric thought and discourse with their oppressors; however, to exist with dignity and integrity, they must balance Eurocentric knowledge with Indigenous knowledge and live with the ambiguity of thinking against the educated self. This keeps us as a member of the Indigenous split-brain society. The split-brain society was first generated in the horrific residential schools, but now exists in all Eurocentric educated Indigenous peoples who experience both sentiments of disintegration and

resignation at the same time. We must learn to create models to help them take their bearings in unexplored territory, to heal and to end the gaps between systems of knowledge and peoples. Educated Indigenous thinkers have to understand and reconsider Eurocentric discourse in order to reinvent an Indigenous discourse based on heritage and language (p. 18).

Forbes (1980b) opined his view that decolonizing the mind was absolutely essential, because otherwise we are in fact restricted in our thought, and in turn, in our relations and actions. Sefa-Dei (2010) argues that “we need to develop critical learners and thinkers who have broken free from the entrapment of their minds in the vestiges of colonialism and colonial education” (p. 15). “*The mind cannot function effectively if it is imprisoned.* An intelligentsia cannot exist if the minds of the people are programmed to accept whatever colonialism decrees “ says Forbes (1980b) (p. 80, emphasis original). He has said elsewhere:

I want to relate our seeking of intellectual sovereignty to Native Studies, beginning with the need for a hemispheric approach to indigenous peoples. When we begin to decolonize our minds, which is what sovereignty is all about, I think we can see that boundaries and colonial structures created by the European invaders are, first, transient and, second, barriers to our self-determination. If we were speaking about Native intellectual work in 1745 or 1783 or 1867, the colonial boundaries would be radically different. They may also be different in 2050 (p. 16)!

This is a point Forbes makes over and over again in relation to our mental decolonization, which is also a spiritual decolonization, and that is, our thinking traditions and

frameworks guide our analytical and ethical approaches to learning and problem-solving. In terms of identity and stereotypes, this is especially prevalent as Antone, Miller and Myers (1986) locate the issue where “an individual accepts the stereotypes of the western world, he/she becomes caught in a pattern that can best be described as being of a “split” mind”, as they are offered no real healthy model of growth and development from birth to childhood to adulthood to elderhood (p. 34). The “split-mind” person has become “normal”, as it is the expected norm in public schooling that we strive not to become intellectual leaders or “warrior-scholars” but rather “willing workers” and laborers in a globalizing imperialist society. Native communities do not survive in the imperial model of the world any more than do Native individuals.

One of the reasons that this may be the expected norm, is that Native, Chicano, African and other communities of color often must leave their communities in order to survive economically. Forbes says (1980b), “most of our potentially talented people are castrated! They are either afraid to be authentic, cannot “live” on authenticity (like air it provides virtually no protein!), or they have never discovered, in any case, what it means to have a “free mind” and this is precisely because they are constantly on the defensive, economically speaking (p. 20). Thus, most people attempt to find a happy-medium, whereas often working close to home involves a lower paid, non-ideal position or they leave their community for the high-paying position which however, rarely brings them back. In the latter case, people are forced to choose selfishly to maintain their “free mind”, while their community predominantly does not have this option available to them. Maintaining a free mind through following one’s path has its benefits. Yet, this choice to leave and survive has its loss, its disconnection, alienation and I am sorry to admit, its



drawbacks which might in fact be a deculturalization experience via education or economic institutionalizations which operate restrictively within Eurocentric and Imperial models (Goodman 1966; Pewewardy 2005; Spring 2007).

Forbes may be one of the privileged few who have been able to “decolonize” like W.E.B. Du Bois, but this sense of “breaking free” of being a liberated mind, may come with the caveat of disconnection from community, of becoming part of the imperial hierarchy or caste system as found in academia, or worse. The disconnected academic for example may espouse ideas so disconnected from the “grass-roots” that they are in fact untenable, pure nostalgia, or harmful in practice, and from which the academic-scholar has become a kind of intellectual sovereign over their own and other peoples rather than expressing Forbes ideal state of “intellectual sovereignty” or “intellectual self-determination”. The observed conditions in education and economic scholarship calls this the “brain-drain” (McKenzie, Jackson, Yazzie, Smith, Crotty, Denny & Elridge 2013; Smith 2000). But it is much more than that. It’s the loss of family and community. It’s the loss of national traditions and access to rich language sources. Take the case of Mexico! It has lost thousands of its potential persons who have crossed to the U.S. and who rarely if ever return to Mexico other than to vacation or retire, often when it is too late to raise the new generation within community (Velasco 2013). Forbes like Du Bois never returned to their original homes or homelands for good of which he saw over the years that it was utterly destroyed and turned ugly (Los Angeles, CA and Great Barrington, MA), they instead moved onto greener pastures (Davis, CA and Ghana), as many privileged persons do when they have achieved a level of economic returns which enables them their movement however in the direction of employment not community.

So it may be that a “liberated” or “decolonized” mind, the “intellectually sovereign” individual is also now free of any responsibility to any community, to actual Native Nations, elders, lands and ways of living. Deloria (1998) took this approach seriously and provided a raucous retort to Forbes program and linguistic liturgy on the subject of “intellectual self-determination and intellectual sovereignty”, arguing:

*Individual self-determination and intellectual sovereignty* are scary concepts because they mean that a whole generation of Indians are not going to be responsible to the Indian people, they are simply going to be isolated individuals playing with the symbols of Indians. Tribal societies were once great, as Forbes has related, but they were great because people lived in and supported the tribal context. People followed the clan and kinship responsibilities, took care of their relatives, and had a strong commitment to assisting the weak and helpless. Those virtues need to be at the center of our lives as actions and not somewhere in our minds as things we believe in but do not practice (p. 28, emphasis original).

So the real question then, is did Forbes, or Du Bois, or Deloria Jr. for that matter, not practice what they preached? Did they not train a new generation of critical scholars and leaders? Did they leave their communities behind and otherwise become “isolated individuals playing with the symbols of Indians”, as Deloria Jr. quips? Forbes never pulled away from the world, and taught for nearly 50 years, he fought for NAS and D-QU until his dying day, but were these Native institutions and communities or were these artificial playgrounds amiss from real responsibilities? What about those of us raised in barrios and ghettos, in the border towns and cities, in places where we are deprived of our ancient communities yet are also in the central forge of new ones, or old ones renewed?

Forbes family and elders he was raised amongst had been in Los Angeles for a few generations in some cases, while others were new immigrants from Hungary and Switzerland, and his Powhatan Lenape and Renape family were extremely distant, geographically and socially originating in tidewater Virginia, *Attan-Akamik*. We all find ourselves wherever our families have ended up, and indeed, this experience becomes a profound one as we learn new languages, about new bioregions, new social relations, kinds of knowledge, and in the end, we also make new family and relations. Can we express the virtues Deloria Jr. espouses without returning to the reserve/reservation, as for many peoples, these sites are literally, where we ended up rather than where our creator and stories have formed us? Are these the only sites which produce authentic community persons or do our definitions need expansion?

Forbes (1980b) core idea for decolonizing the mind is a positive approach of empowering Native people by bringing them face to face with what he calls, “The Greatness of the Native Mind”. The restoration of which is paramount to the development of an intellectual leadership, a new generation of artists and activists, visionaries and literati, healers and warriors. He says:

When I go out to give speeches now I don’t talk about Indian politics much anymore. Instead I speak of “the greatness of the Indian mind” . . . Why? Because the vast majority of Native People have been brainwashed into almost total ignorance about their own intellectual-creative heritage! Somehow we have to revive the “greatness of the Indian mind.” If we don’t we will all perish as Indians. Historically Indians were a philosopher-people, a race of “seekers after

wisdom.” Perhaps no group of people anywhere has so universally valued  
“wisdom” (as opposed to mere technical expertise). (p. 24-25).

Is this true? If we don't revive the mind, do we “perish as Indians”? Does the logic imply as Deloria Jr. hinted that being Indian is a state of mind rather than an active presence in a community or is this one and the same project? Does the alcoholic community member embody a more dynamic, responsible Indian than the scholar living in a college town teaching in the majority, non-Indians? If we are to understand Forbes approach, we must take into account that he did not have a greater, practical vision in mind which always demanded community creation and control of Indian education, governance and institutions.

Again, for Forbes (1979a) the first and most important step is the decolonization of the mind-spirit, as one cannot move in any direction unless they are fully conscious of the pathway it entails. If “we cannot conceive of the number of layers of indoctrination and mythology that have to be peeled off” at first glance, can we understand and tackle the layers of mental imperialism through prolonged study and research (p. 102)? The layers of “distorted thinking” is also a distorted spirit, a massive corruption process, and we cannot separate our spiritual suffering from our mental, our embodied, our territorial, linguistic, cultural, and other kinds of suffering. Part of his conception of the split-mind or split-spirit, is that this translates into a split personality or a person divided culturally, nationally, and also in terms of their allegiance. Etymologically in English the roots of our language use demonstrate some ancient rather than new concepts. To be “distorted” is to have a “completely twisted” perspective or embodiment. “Crazy”, whose meaning *shattered* or cracked/broken has common contemporary usages as in Gaeilge/Irish *craic*

“cracked”, Modern French *écraser* or Old Norse *krasa*, while “schizophrenic” or “schizoid”, meaning “split mind-heart” from Latin *schizo* and Greek *skheizen* “to cut/split” and *phreno* “mind-heart-spirit” are the most common terms we use to identify these related concepts today, all meaning a split, twisted, or broken persona-spirit-body. How do we embody the split mind-heart-spirit as peoples or castes? Forbes (1979a) says of the term *mestizo* or by extension *metis* that it refers to a split-person, and is a dangerous conception:

. . . besides a screwed-up identity. People don’t know who they are, they begin to think of

themselves in the terms that are laid down by the invader. They begin to think of themselves, for instance, as mestizos when the term “mestizo” is literally a term that means schizophrenic. One cannot be mixed without any ethnic identity other than mixed and not be schizophrenic. The truth is that very few of the people called “mestizo” in the Americas, however, are mestizo. They possess a culture that is unified. They possess an identity that is unified just as much as any other people on the face of the globe (p. 105).

Mestizo and Metis are derived ultimately from Latin *mixticus* also *mixtus* “mixed” from *miscere* “to mix up”. To become Mestizo or Metis, Mulatto, Cimarron, or any number of “mixed” personas are imperial inventions devised to limit upward mobility in a hierarchical caste-racism system of subjugation and control (see Forbes 1985 as his primer on this subject). Forbes named it a denationalization project aimed at making expatriate workers, and if not workers, fodder, and if not fodder, mascots or simply people missing in action. For Forbes, the split-mind, the mixed-up mind, the brainwashed

person, cannot even fathom the predicament they are in, cannot make sense of tribal traditions, cannot defend themselves against imperial psychosis, let alone decide why they should live a life of balance, respect, goodness, health and in harmony with all of ones relations. What if your whole community embodies the unhealthy or insane or abusive “split-mind”? The mestizo and the metis have arisen out of being split and splintered so as to become a unified people as was the case of Mexico which largely embraced Mexicanidad and a mestizo-consciousness not of mixed-peoples but of a forged mixture that became an amalgam.

The education system of schooling that was devised for destroying Nationalism in all its forms among native American and First Nations such as at Presbyterian Coqualeetza Indian Residential School (1861-1940), Carlisle Indian Industrial Institute (1879-1918), the Mohawk Institute (1828-1970), Sherman Indian School (1892 as Perris Indian School, 1903-current as Sherman), and hundreds of others was part of a multi-pronged effort. First and foremost, it is always rooted in the terrorism and war upon American and African bodies, upon the free creatures and lands of Anowarakowa, Turtle Island, for as Scott DeMuth (2005) names it, “colonization is always war” or as I would rephrase it with Carpio’s knowledge of the “colony” in mind, “imperialism is always war”. Through education, through prisons, and insane asylums such as Canton Indian Insane Asylum (1903-1938) (surreptitiously named Hiawatha Indian Asylum) we find not simply a destructive process as implied by deculturalization (Spring 2007) or denationalization (Forbes 1988) but rather as DeMuth points out, it’s “the process of dismantling and erasing Indigenous society and culture, and replacing it through religious, political, and economic conversion” (p. 102). Are these mental or spiritual

matters, material or economic, objective or subjective conditions, or are these part of the whole soul, the total spiritual experience? Frederick Hoxie (2001) explains that the boarding schools which began as “total assimilation” institutions in the 1870’s (earlier as religious institutions in 1819 in the U.S. and 1820’s in Canada) and which preyed upon Native Nations youth were by the 20th century not simply maintained to create brown white people for “the key to assimilation was no longer the act of becoming part of an undifferentiated, “civilized” society; instead, assimilation had come to mean knowing one’s place and fulfilling one’s role” in the imperial and colonial order (p. 243). The keys are replacement and resocialization. You cannot remove culture, ideas, language or memory but you can change them, replace them, and augment them. We can forget as well as we can remember. In this same way, we must choose to remember and forget. We must choose to fight back or give in. We must choose to speak, and to listen, look and learn. We must practice our own form of replacement, or as Porter (2008) reminds us, we must do “Carlisle in reverse” (p. 385).

Some call this decolonization which is to remove that which has rooted itself or settled into existence. We might raise a call for a kind of imperial or psychotic exorcism. This is also about healing for we cannot do anything without our health, and without healthy communities, lands, waters, winds and wisdom as it will be all for nothing. This is an ensouled, inspirited existence and we must work to heal and revitalize the depths of it. Also, this is a storied life, and we must embrace a new story of ourselves, tap into our ancient ones, and tell the stories that need to be told about the castrating monster we call imperialism and colonialism, what Forbes, Johnston and Fleming (2016) amongst others have rekindled as the *wétiko*, and the new *windiigo*, and embodied literally in the white

man, *ve'ho*. The curse of U.S. imperialism is not alone in its destructive, humbling course. Euro imperialism in many ways as Forbes points out started as a creative new ethno-religious spawn which at once pronounced its capricious sanctity through sacred kingship backed by a sacred religious and ceremonial system, and other accoutrements which reinforced a sacred law, language, and justification for theft, for invasion, for genocide, and for empire-building. The establishment of the doctrine of discovery which respected European sacred kingship (sovereign) rights to anything because of their basic imperial (desirous) acts such as declarations of possession (papal bulls), sanctified ceremonies of possession either through battle or aggression, in simple rites of sight, touch, and demonstrations of desire through claiming such as moving sand, planting a cross, stacking rocks, or really any act should be considered with respect to the total record of European trespassing and abuse. A new kind of people was created and a system of representation was developed specifically to wield the power of this group in the U.S. and elsewhere. These acts once established in the U.S. for example jettisoned sacred kingship publicly (while leaving the rights of capturer and exploiter through the servitude of queen, kin, children and captives intact) for a new sacred constitution or law made by white men and although there are many who are abolitionists prior to the declaration of independence, the empire ultimately was built, and a sacred union of new State imperialism (13 states) was created.

The State project is unique because it is the centralization of power beyond the reach of a certain majority population who are highly manipulated for consumption by a fractionated group. Recent state imperialism such as the formation of Israel and all the post WWI state projects of the united imperial powers, corporate imperialists, and



privileged white citizens has been as an unrelenting tidal wave, cutting through homelands, communities, and continuities of tradition, language, families and wisdom, and consuming them. This consumption comes always at a high cost. The destruction, outright or covert is clear to everyone who has been through it, and to those in power who know full well the origins of their wealth and privilege. Every tsunami requires high and low pressure to create the windstorm of destruction, and it is high time we developed our educational institutions and paradigms to whether the aging tempest of imperialism.

The U.S. Empire is anything but a benign monstrosity, and we'd be better off to engage this fact alongside Native National resurgence and survivance as the premier facets of our educational endeavors. Indeed, Niall Ferguson (2005) amongst others have demonstrated very clearly that the U.S. has only grown and extended its appetite to include upwards of 750 military bases over the globe, and Burns (2017) in following Walter Williams (1969) have shown that exponential growth is the mainstay of the U.S. Empire, in line with the *wiindigoo's* insatiable appetite for the flesh of all people, elders, adults, and even children, who willingly sacrifice themselves for it. Fleming (2017) notes that today is the day, now is the time for us to replenish our struggle with the memory and stories of the struggles of the past for the baton has been passed on:

Those old time Wiindigo slayers of the Termination era were wise and resilient. They united with other Indigenous American nations and organizations like the National Congress of American Indians. The American Indian Movement was formed at the end of this era in 1968, and by the 1970s, the self-determination era began with huge numbers of Indigenous Americans enrolling in college, producing crops of Indigenous lawyers, authors, and activists.

Deloria Jr. (1998) demonstrates his naivete when it comes to the case of California, to Canada, to Mexico, when he says in reflection of Alcatraz's leadership and strategy, that "in legal terms, these activities meant nothing" because they lacked the actual conflicting, yet valuable negotiating points embedded in the historical legal relationship between Indian Nations and the federal government (p. 244). This is true, but he fails to notice the many other players and movements *did* have a strategy of reclamation and revitalization. In the 20th century alone, we have incredible organizing attempts to draw from such as the establishment in 1909 of the Union Nationale Métisse St-Joseph de Manitoba, a collective Metis organization representing newly formed Manitoba province which spawned organizations in every Canadian province by the 1930's. The Mexican Revolution was a largely indigenous led land reform movement prompted by the work of the PLM or *Partido Liberal Mexicano* (1900) and later the Magon brothers, Ricard Flores and Enrique Flores own *Junta Organizadora del Partido Liberal Mexicano* (1905), who were themselves indigenous Zapotecs from Oaxaca (Poole 1977, p. 5). They would live in Texas and California and influence many efforts in the U.S. as well. They would later launch a 1911 revolt in Baja California and whose battle cry *tierra y libertad* printed in their newspaper *Regeneracion* (1898-1922) would become the Mexican revolutions motto and the *frase* of its most celebrated Nahua American leader, Emiliano Zapata. Ricardo died in Leavenworth Prison, Kansas in 1922 while his brother Enrique went on to found the *Confederación Campesina Mexicana* in 1933 which again represented a largely rural, landless indigenous and mestizo population. In 1997, an Oaxacan organization was founded *Consejo Indígena Popular de Oaxaca "Ricardo Flores Magón"* demonstrating the native American/Indigenous roots of their struggles.

There are more than 150,000 Oaxaqueño farmworkers currently working the fields of California, possibly 250,000 (Mines, Nichols & Rusten 2010). They have represented themselves since the 1980's as *Frente Mixteco-Zapateco Binacional* and since 1990 as *Frente Indígena Oaxaqueña Binacional*, and since 2001, as the statewide organization *Federación Oaxaqueña de Clubes y Organizaciones Indígenas en California* (Krannich 2017, p. 137; Kriesge 2007). The FIOB's Binational Women's Issues Coordinator Odilia Romero comments that their positionality as Indigenous is paramount to their organization, for "to call yourself indigenous is to take a political stand" (Gutierrez 2010). But because they are not U.S. Indians Deloria Jr. sees little to argue about, the point is mute: recognized U.S. Indians have the only rights or privileges to land and services the federal government should respect. This may be true in the 1860's, but this might not have been true in the 1760's, nor was it the only reality in the 1960's, and it won't be such a simply reality in 2060.

Divorced from Canadian and Mexican struggles, from Chicanismo, Indianismo, Mexicanidad and Metis struggles on the land, Deloria (1998) does not understand the imperial world beyond the U.S., except he knows, perhaps out of fear, "the indignities being suffered south of our borders are light-years worse than the few slights that we receive here in the United States" (p. 27). Deloria Jr. (1998) only refers to D-QU in one instance and otherwise dismisses Chicanos or any other Indian people living in the U.S. before or after 1848. His fluffy view of Canada (1969) was put this way:

In Canada, for example, there are Indian reservations in every province. Indians have not had their basic governmental forms disturbed. They still operate with chiefs and general councils. Nor were they forced to remove themselves whenever

and wherever the white man came. Nor did they have their lands allotted and then stolen piece by piece from under them (p. 49).

This is partially true, however, Band councils were forced on many people's 50 years or more *before* Tribal councils in the U.S., giving them more time to become adapted.

Further, removals were common and loss of land from means other than allotment was widespread. What he fails to realize is that Forbes was one of those old-time Wiindigo slayers. Deloria Jr. (1998) characterizes Native American/American Indian Studies as a restrictive discipline, one which should focus on recognized U.S. Indians and their relationships via treaties with the U.S. federal government while Forbes helped institute a hemispheric, a united American framework at Davis. Deloria Jr.'s critique was framed this way:

Conceiving Indians on a hemispheric basis is a good idea as it enables us to see that we are not alone in our oppression, although the indignities being suffered south of our borders are light-years worse than the few slights that we receive here in the United States. Unless we intend to spend our lives traveling to Central and South America and talking in nebulous generalities, too much concentration on things hemispheric will prevent us from understanding the latest proposal to quantify water rights, bolster community colleges, or even develop new courses about American Indians in this country. It is proper to focus on the shared sufferings of Western Hemisphere people caused by Europeans, but we should remember-Europeans did it to themselves first and in far worse situations. One glance at the instruments used by the Inquisition to torture heretics and we understand that the slaughter of villages was at least quick, and not prolonged

agony. It is not the Europeans but their mind-set that allows these things (pps. 27-28).

What makes it “proper” to dismiss the majority millions who make up the greater population of Indian people, that is people of Native Nations in nearly every state in the U.S., either of African or European admixture? When did the borders of the U.S., which have always been shifting, become stable enough for Deloria Jr. to dismiss the uneven imperial project which ignores native Hawaiians in its untreated with mass? Ignores Mexicans, ignores every kind of non-enrolled mestizo or metis person in the Americas, and every Native Nation that actually deals with more than the U.S. government such as the Akwesasne Mohawk, the Tohono O’odham and Iipai-Tipai, the Salish-Kootenai. and every group the borders have crossed, or the millions of California Indians who are untreated with, and whose legal relationship with the U.S. government is markedly different than the well-treated Lakota or Dakota one? So while on the one hand Deloria Jr. admits it's a “mind-set that allows” water rights to be pilfered and villages to be slaughtered, he also complains that “too many people think that being Indian is a state of mind” (p. 30). Forbes et al (1972) argued that D-QU for example should be heralded for its unprecedented actions, and while a self-promotional text, they bring up a key point not found in other efforts:

The D-Q movement has successfully brought together “Chicanos” (Spanish-speaking persons largely of Mexican Indian descent), English-speaking Cholos (Mestizos), and North American tribal people. The D-Q movement represents the first time that the many different groups of native race in the United States have successfully worked together on a project, despite intergroup tension resulting

from the past attempts of elements of both minority groups to “assimilate” into white society (p. 1).

In Deloria Jr.’s analysis the only authentic Indians are those claimed by the U.S. whereas Forbes who grew up in El Monte, Eagle Rock and other parts of Los Angeles (2001) explains how this experience shaped his thinking and work:

One thing it taught me though was that, um, uh, even though I didn’t have many Indians around me who were U.S. Indians, I still had a lot of people of indigenous ancestry around me. And I always carry that idea with me later on, uh, that, uh, when we talk about native people of the Americas, we’re not talking just about reservation tribal people from the United States or Canada. We’re also talking about millions of people from Mexico south (Get the Word Out #54).

So a major part of Forbes work, especially relative to “intellectual sovereignty and intellectual self-determination” was that we must jettison the artificial borders of our thinking, ones which build massive walls and ramparts around being a U.S. Indian, about when and where the U.S. begins and ends, what are the appropriate or “legal” means to put an end to imperialism and colonialism, who is a part of the American Indian Movement or Native American Movement (Movimiento Nativo Americano) and Chicano Movement? Indeed, Forbes points related to African indigeneity and the implications of racial purity expressed in whiteness, blackness, redness, etc., further demonstrate how many of these ideological and seemingly “real” constructs are wholly destructive, divisive, and thwarting our unified potential.

*The Development of an Indigenous Intelligentsia*

Part of the realization of Forbes vision of education is the development of a Native American intelligentsia, a group of educated, talented, wise, problem-solving, action-oriented, community-based Indigenous leaders that could do the groundwork and be a strong base for any community struggle. Forbes suggested that the problem with many so-called community struggles, community development projects, educational efforts, etc., was that there was a lack of trained leadership that arose from within the community. While Forbes recognized that internally trained leaders were the core representatives of any community, he was weary that many leaders were not critical of the changes that had occurred internally or externally which influenced the survival, structures and power of most groups. Further, as documented incredibly in the field of education, most all leaders today have attended imperial forms of schooling while only a fraction have received a critical course in decolonial thought and ideas, have received training beyond k-12 levels, have crucial political, legal and social knowledge in relation to ongoing imperialization, and otherwise have devoted themselves to the people while at the same time disinvesting their interest and promotion of the exploiters all around them. Essentially, how can we create a cadre of intellectually powerful persons who are grounded in the community while comfortable working between communities, issues and struggles?

If we began our discussion based on the assumption of relatedness, of interdependence and the family (kin and clan) and community (village, barrio, place) as the foundations of all life then we must return to these locations to find the intelligentsia. The intelligentsia as Forbes imagined is one he identified with personally, that is:

someone who was well-reared, well-educated (beyond childhood), well-trained (beyond adulthood), well-seasoned (beyond college and singular experiences), well-rounded (not a one trick pony or jack of no/all trades) and also someone who was well-respected (loved, and not beyond the people). Forbes had a deep admiration and respect for medicine people, healers, traditional community leaders, and those who did not have any schooling or external education at all. He felt, in many ways that these people were almost irreproachable because their knowledge could not be duplicated, and their values, ideals and experiences were unique, because they were formed on the land and in community, and above all, uncorrupted. This is what is called an “ideal type” in the field of psychology. Nobody actually meets the ideal, or they are so rare that they are idolized or mythologized in order to act as archetypes or benevolent models, but it is the symbolic and mythic master that we strive to become, as someone akin to the greatest of all our stories and dramas such as the Peacemaker, Jigonsaseh, Yeshua (Jesus), Changing Woman, White Buffalo Calf Woman, etc.. Essentially people who are unblemished, whose faces-respectability have never been tarnished, or as the old saying goes: they don't have a bad bone in their bodies. They are exemplary in every way. They sacrifice without payment. They give everything they have, including their lives and the lives of their children if need be for the sake of all life. Yet these models may also have a history of faults, of destruction or otherwise being the opposite of their ideal or realized self. Such is the case of the Peacemaker who although of virgin birth, was beautiful in every way and was able to do miraculous feats, he was considered to have something akin to a speech impediment, and thus required the support of Aiiionwatha (Hiawatha) and



Jigonsaseh in order to speak to and persuade the various communities, clan leaders, and confederated league of peace members.

W.E.B. Du Bois (1903) early expressed his position on this matter in a paper entitled “The Talented Tenth”, an imagined sub-population of intellectual-leaders. In the address he explains who they are, what processes are need to produce them, and why they are so necessary for a people. He gleaned this concept from Henry Lyman Morehouse (1896) (whom Morehouse College is named after) who had published a short piece titled “The Talented Tenth” in the *American Missionary*, and who was a white preacher and abolitionist. Morehouse said, “the tenth man, with superior natural endowments, symmetrically trained and highly developed, may become a mightier influence, a greater inspiration to others than all the other nine, or nine times nine like them” (p. 183). Further, he likens the higher education he envisions as “to dwarf the tree that has in it the potency of a grand oak. Industrial education is good for the nine; the common English branches are good for the nine; but that tenth man ought to have the best opportunities for making the most of himself for humanity and God” (p. 184). This concept was first developed during the failed Reconstruction era, between 1865-1875 when Black peoples were promised by the Freedman Bureau to have received forty acres and a mule (some say two), which was fought for and advocated by educated Blacks who were hoping to achieve some sense of political self-determination, which of course rests upon economic, social, cultural and spiritual power united upon a self-sufficient land base. Huey P. Newton (2002) invoked the Talented Tenth struggle when he told Black Panther Party members about its original usage, saying:

The Talented Tenth at the time viewed freedom as operative in the political arena. . . . When one operates in the political arena, it is assumed that he has power or represents power; he is symbolic of a powerful force. There are approximately three areas of power in the political area: economic power, land power (feudal power) and military power. If Black people at the time had received 40 acres and 2 mules, we would have developed a powerful force. Then we would have chosen a representative to represent us in this political arena. Because Black people did not receive the 40 acres and 2 mules, it was absurd to have a representative in the political arena (p. 147).

So while Black people already had effective leadership during the Reconstruction (of white supremacy) era, it did not transfer into a permanent or perpetual cycle for they were without landed power and in many cases, stable economic and community structures.

Du Bois (1903) vastly developed the concept beyond Morehouse and opens his discussion by defining the broad strokes therein, to be based on a crux, which was that: the problem of developing the Best of this race that they may guide the Mass away from the contamination and death of the Worst, in their own and other races. Now the training of men is a difficult and intricate task. Its technique is a matter for educational experts, but its object is for the vision of seers. If we make money the object of man-training, we shall develop money-makers but not necessarily men; if we make technical skill the object of education, we may possess artisans but not, in nature, men (p. 33).

We can see from this distillation that above all, he proposed like Forbes who sought to develop “complete persons”, that the greatest goal of education was to develop the

intellectual-leader who would stand as a bastion of his people because they grasped the larger picture of “true life” over simple labor and technical skills (p. 34). He argued that “from the very first it has been the educated and intelligent of the Negro people that have led and elevated the mass” rather than the laborer and it was the internal leadership of the people that helped rid itself of the slave system as a whole (ibid). By education, he does not suggest that “higher education” was the only route but it was in fact the pathway of those persons who returned to perpetuate the cycle such as the preacher Alexander Crummell (who he admired) who was a product of the Black church as well as Queens College and Cambridge while the abolitionist Frederick Douglass never went to any kind of learning institution other than local churches, which was his school. Unfortunately, at this early time when he first forged his idea of the talented tenth, he imagined it was comprised of “exceptions”, that is, exceptional people unlike the historical laboring serf of slavery (p. 43). He held at first a Europeanized view of this trained leadership of exceptional men which represented an “aristocracy of talent and character” of “the best and most capable” (p. 45). This was an idea that indeed plagued the white and European aristocracy who assumed they were the natural, god-given leaders of their people. However, he does readily admit that “each soul and each race-soul needs its own peculiar curriculum” and this could be attained through the university system of higher education, a system that helped produce himself, demonstrating a terrible arrogance at this early point in his life infected by European standards of “civilization” and Christianity (p. 46). The university and schools, he says, is a “human invention for the transmission of knowledge and culture from generation to generation, through the training of quick minds and pure hearts, and for this work no other human invention will suffice, not even trade

and industrial schools” which he deemed to be kind of incubator for the talented tenth who are akin to “yeast”, and from which the Black populace “must have for the talented few centers of training where men are not so mystified and befuddled by the hard and necessary toil of earning a living, as to have no aims higher than their bellies, and no God greater than Gold. This is true training . . .” (ibid).

Du Bois who was a graduate of one of the first and most prestigious Black colleges, Fisk University, as well as Harvard, had wavered on taking a professorship with Booker T. Washington at his Tuskegee Institute because he felt that he did not truly attempt to create leaders but rather workers, and chose instead to teach History at Atlanta University in Georgia (Lewis 2009, pp. 143, 148, 155). Du Bois joined the Socialist Party of America in 1911, took one of many trips to the Soviet Union and other states in 1917 and many times thereafter, and as such transformed his view of the talented tenth, of the major problems of his time such as his belief in the “color line” and racism being the paramount evil, as he later suggested instead that it was the “colonial problem” that was at the root all these evils, for it was “[t]he colonial system of government ... [which] is undemocratic, socially dangerous and a main cause of wars” (as quoted in Lewis 2009, p. 656).

Du Bois’s transformation is significant because it allows us to see how people can change or develop the core of their ideas beyond what might originally be considered as fast and rigid facts or ideologies. At first he believed that (1903) members of the talented tenth “ought to be, the group leader, the man who sets the ideals of the community where he lives, directs its thoughts and heads its social movements” (p. 54). At his core, Du Bois believed like Forbes that “a system of education is not one thing, nor does it have a

single definite object, nor is it a mere matter of schools. Education is that whole system of human training within and without the school house walls, which molds and develops men” (pps. 57-58). Thus, even the education system and what it teaches can be changed and augmented to fit the people, not the other way around. He concluded his first treatise on the subject with this moral dilemma:

Education must not simply teach work it must teach Life. The Talented Tenth of the Negro race must be made leaders of thought and missionaries of culture among their people. No others can do this work and Negro colleges must train men for it. The Negro race, like all other races, is going to be saved by its exceptional men [and women]” (p. 75).

But is this true, will it be the exceptional that do the saving, that will become the leaders, that are the “yeast”, or the most capable? In one of Du Bois (1968a) autobiographies he claims that the real reason behind his concept was that he “knew that without this [vision of character education that develops values or ethics and culture] the Negro would have to accept white leadership, and that such leadership could not always be trusted to guide this group into self-realization and to its highest cultural possibilities” (p. 236). Rather than distrusting Booker T. Washington and others call for technical, trade or industrial schools, he suggested clearly that the products of those schools would not rival the white intelligentsia who dominated all of the political institutions which essentially controlled the lever of their destiny, and admitted that they were necessary kinds of education. Reflective of his prior proposals he explains in *Dusk of Dawn* (1968b) that “my own panacea of earlier days was flight of class from mass through the development of a Talented Tenth, but the power of this aristocracy of talent was to lie in its knowledge and

character and not in its wealth” (p. 217). Admittedly Du Bois (2014) came to learn through rigorous applied study, observation and experience of the real conditions and outcomes of what seemed by many to be opposing kinds of education and ideologies. He admitted that during these convening years between the Russian revolution, and both world wars that the real leadership grew also from among the working and technical populace and not only from “trained leadership”:

They [the Black intelligentsia and skilled Black technocrats] naturally tended to become, as Washington hoped, themselves exploiters of the Negro and white workers, as acquisitive and as hard-fisted as the white employers. But, on the other hand, some of them did not. The miracle which I had regarded as probable did come true, but only after long years: this leadership for the workers came mainly from intelligent and better paid workers, trained as workers and not as exploiting aristocrats (p. 120).

In hindsight he was able to discern why this had happened but also still held out hope for a university-trained Black intelligentsia, saying:

many of the educated and gifted young black folk will be as selfish and immoral as the whites who surround them and to whom Negroes have been taught to look as ideals. Naturally, out of the mass of the working classes, who know life and its bitter struggle, will continually rise the real, unselfish and clear-sighted leadership. This will not be automatic or continuous, but the hope of the future of the Negro race in America and the world lies far more among its workers than among its college graduates, until the time that our higher training is rescued from its sycophantic and cowardly leadership of today . . . (p. 52).

As recalled in his early treatise on the Talented Tenth, he held up Blacks to a European “scale of civilization” which contrarily degraded their cultural, spiritual, artistic, and technical achievements. Green (1977) summarized Du Bois’ overall perspective on the subject, saying,

Du Bois’ Talented Tenth, the leadership of the race, had, in his opinion, not only cast him aside in a moment of great personal need but they had “sold out,” succumbing to the material things in life instead of sharing his moral convictions and serving as a trained cadre to lead the black masses out of their lowly condition (p. 365).

Indeed, this last point is crucial as Forbes saw the same thing occur during his epiphanic stage in the mid and late 1970’s while at UC Davis. Forbes saw how many major Native leaders were siphoned away from the “real revolution”, who sold the rights to exploit traditional homelands to corporations, and simply became materialists and symbolic showpieces at home or among the white elite. Forbes (1981a) analysis of the Nixon era upon the Native American Movement and the fomenting Indigenous intelligentsia which he felt suffered a major setback as Nixon had made grand speeches celebrating Indian “self-determination” which meant something different than what Native Nations meant, and says this was done to “stabilize and pacify Indian protests; that is, destroy militancy in order to pave the way for the exploitation of Indian resources” which has essentially continued until this day uninterrupted (p. 9).

Forbes believed this was because there was a greater underlying problem which was beneath the surface of all activities, peoples, institutions and ideas and that is, a person must be grounded spiritually and culturally so that no matter what happens in life,

whether it's a job opportunity, promotion or the loss of a job, one must remain steadfast in who they are and must continue to sacrifice and work on behalf of all their people, not just those who have money, or those they may see every day in institutions of higher education. Du Bois like Forbes believed foremost in an education of character and values, of which, a technical and industrial school must equally emphasize but often offers little of which move beyond being a stable, willing worker. Too often he saw that once people got their degrees and began teaching, or took positions in a political office or in leadership, they became different people, essentially two-faced. Du Bois (1996) articulated that his ideal was to create complete community leaders, of knowledge and wisdom, who were "men and women of character, and [an] almost fanatic devotion" to the people and to their cause of liberation and justice (p. 161). Later in life, his idea transformed from the talented tenth to the "guiding hundredth" so as to make clear that these trained leaders were not ever conceived to be separate or apart of the mass of people, but intrinsic to the whole (Du Bois 1948). This revisited address suggested instead that this select group was in fact destined for "group-leadership, not simply educated and self-sacrificing, but with clear vision of present world conditions and dangers, and conducting American Negroes to alliance with culture groups in Europe, America, Asia and Africa, and looking toward a new world culture" (see "Guiding Hundredth" speech). Further, unlike Forbes who undoubtedly read Marx and many other socialists such as Lenin, Trotsky and Fanon, Du Bois makes clear its influence upon his thought when he said:

Very gradually as the philosophy of Karl Marx and many of his successors seeped into my understanding, I tried to apply this doctrine with regard to Negroes. My



Talented Tenth must be more than talented, and work not simply as individuals. Its passport to leadership was not alone learning, but expert knowledge of modern economics as it affected American Negroes; and in addition to this and fundamental, would be its willingness to sacrifice and plan for such economic revolution in industry and just distribution of wealth, as would make the rise of our group possible (as quoted in Rabaka 2008, p. 111).

Following up this idea, he continues to redefine the talented tenth by drawing from his worldly experiences, saying,

The uplift of the mass cannot be left to chance. Marx and Lenin firmly believed it could only be accomplished by a dictatorship. I think in the case of Russia they were right; but in our plight, I think we can free our own mass by organization and group influence exercised through a self-sacrificing leadership. This is primarily a question of character which I failed to emphasize in my first proposal of a Talented Tenth (p. 172).

The epitome of character development was summarized in terms of focusing both on what kind of people we are looking to develop but also the society we hope to achieve, in which he says, “we cannot have perfection. We have few saints. But we must have honest men or we die. We must have unselfish, far-seeing leadership or we fail”. Du Bois dreamed of peace and democracy, which he saw as foundational to his socialist critique as it was originally described via “democratic socialism” or in Forbes (1979b) view as “revolutionary democracy”.

Given Du Bois (1985) held a particularly developed critique of colonialism and imperialism which he defined as stated earlier by “deliberately using the word ‘colonial’

in a much broader sense than is usually given it” because as he explains “there are manifestly groups of people, countries and nations, which while not colonies in the strict sense of the word, yet so approach the colonial system as to merit the designation semi-colonial” (p. 229, 236). What does this mean in terms of working towards a democratic society, one which is impinged by a legacy of hundreds if not thousands of years of imperialism? Du Bois summarizes it this way:

[L]et me sum up...the colonial problem: the depressed peoples and classes of the world form the vast majority of mankind today in the era of the highest civilization the world has known. The majority of human beings do not today have enough to eat and wear or sufficient shelter for decent existence; the majority of the world’s peoples do not understand what the world is, what it has been and what the laws of its growth and development are; and they are unable to read the record of this history. Most human beings suffer and die years before this is necessary and most babies die before they ever really live. And the human mind with all its visions and possibilities is today deliberately distorted and denied freedom of development by people who actually imagine that such freedom would endanger civilization. Most of these disinherited folk are colored, not because there is any essential significance in skin color, but because most people in the world are colored. What now can be done about this, in this day of crisis, when with the end of a horrible and disgraceful war in sight, we contemplate Peace and Democracy? What has Democracy to do with Colonies and what has skin-color to do with Peace? (ibid. p. 236)

The incredible task of rebuilding Native Nations, of destroying global imperialism, leaves us squandering to deal with daily racism, to find a little peace in our lives. It also leaves us wondering as Du Bois and Forbes do, is Democracy the answer? Has it ever entailed equality and freedom, autonomy and anti-imperialism? Power, beauty, health and peace?

*Decolonizing Higher Education: A Short Story of D-QU and NAS UC Davis*

“All effective resistance movements must have an intelligentsia” (Forbes 1980a, p. 76).

We continue to pick up those things taken from us by Wiindigo. At Leech Lake Tribal College, we teach that we are peoples of a nation. We have our own history as a people, our own land base, governance, and language and culture. We are not ethnic minorities. We study historical trauma in order to understand the historical loss symptoms we currently experience. Most importantly, we are healing ourselves. We’ve gone into the water to heal our spirits. Nanaboozhoo left us long ago. He and his grandma got into a canoe and paddled away because our people didn’t believe in him anymore. He said he might come back if we began telling his stories again and needed his help. “Nanaboozhoo,” I say, “We need you. I tell my grandsons your stories, and they want to know more and more. They’re dreaming their own five and six-year-old Ojibwe dreams, those little guys.” We are now building our own nations (Fleming 2017)

An intelligentsia, is not a group of the most gifted, wise or intelligent as Arthur Parker had hoped the Society of American Indians (1911) would create “race leaders” who he imagined would “not come from those so merged in American life that they have forgotten they are Indians or from those so ‘bound by lack of education’ or ‘reservation environment’ that their vision is narrow, but from the small company of Indians of broad vision” which were academically trained. Forbes shared these sentiments early expressed by Parker and also desired for leaders to be patriotic-nationalistic, and recognized they are effective only as much as they are good, righteous, strong and strategic. An intelligentsia is as Sarah Winnemucca suggested of her envisioned role of Native teachers, is that they are interpreters, or as Margaret Connell Szasz (1994) and others have suggested, cultural-brokers, and intermediaries. Perhaps the greatest task though as Forbes and Du Bois hopes is that they are leaders, or in the traditional Kanien’kehá:ka sense, *oyaner/roanyer*, good men and women, unwavering in their sense of justice, humility, values, tradition and fortitude. “In a “mature” (long-established) colonial situation the native intelligentsia, effectively “brainwashed” as they are, becomes cut off from the masses both economically and culturally. *The native community is deprived of their brain-power and creative abilities*. Not only that, but their skills are often used to harm the long-term interests of their own people” (p. 6, Forbes 1980a, emphasis original). Forbes argues that they are free-thinkers, not cavaliers in a military operation following orders, for they have the power of creation at their fingertips. Artists, herbalists, farmers, hunters, singers, can be a part of this resistance, can help lead this resurgence. Teachers must also be a major part, for teachers are really surrogate relatives. Thus, education in a family way is also a prime need today. Higher education is often far removed from the

foundations we establish in pre-k and elementary programs as it rarely maintains these unique relationships, structures and ideas except as mimicry and as mascot.

But perhaps also we have made a tragic mistake in supporting sometimes remedial and uninspiring junior college programs which in truth might not effectively challenge the better Indian high school graduate. Maybe we have put the cart before the horse. It is important that our youth learn to read and write English but isn't it also important to give them things to read which are free from the taint of colonialism? Who is going to do that? When? Are we only preparing our youth for more effective indoctrination by, and assimilation into, the dominant society? (p. 84, Forbes 1980a).

But what is "free from the taint of colonialism"? This is indeed a lofty goal as everything in this world bears some mark of Hobbes' "leviathan", Forbes "wétiko", which is the Columbian curse upon the world. Junior colleges, of all places, are often the least critical of institutions, as they provided in his mind and experience (Forbes graduated from a JC, Glendale College in 1953 and transferred to USC), a remedial function or simple transference of imperial ideas. Forbes (1980a) saw the peak of D-QU in his original vision in 1960 but by 1975, this vision was being thwarted and by 1978 had all but disappeared. He writes reflectively, if not pissed off about this reality when he says, in a still hopeful way:

We still dream of a D-Q University where Indian films are made, where bright young Indians share dialogue with great Indian minds, where books in Native languages are published, where Indian novelists get together to discuss Indian literature, and where the Native intelligentsia has a home-base, secure from white

control.

This dream has not been realized yet. A start has been made, but only a start. Will the national Indian community realize before it is too late that the struggle to create DQU is central to the Native movement for self-determination?

Tribally-controlled junior colleges are popular because they can be operated locally and can fit into the needs of the reservation tribal bureaucracy. Each tribe wants jobs and money flowing into its reservation.

A national Indian university is more difficult to create, especially if it tries to meet the needs of grassroots and traditional people as well as those of the emerging Indian middle-class.

Is there an Indian constituency to support a pan-Indian university? Is there an Indian constituency to encourage the development of an independent Indian intelligentsia? What happens with DQU will help to answer both of these questions (pps. 24-25).

And what has happened to D-QU? For all intents and purposes it has succumbed and closed down, yet it technically still exists on paper, and in the hearts and minds of a few people, of a few visitors, of the ailing, barely alive board of trustees, in its dingy, damp and dilapidated buildings, it survives. It has sunken into a deep hole, a crater, where one can go and visit itself in the deep but when one leaves, they realize how lowly it has become, how depressing it really is. It is not the face of Indigenous Intelligence, of the Greatness of the Native Mind, it is not a Leader of American Indian Liberation, not anymore. Given this depiction, should we still have hope, if not for DQU, for ourselves?

A number of lessons are apparent in this breakdown that we should all take note of. Deloria (1998) criticized D-QU and by association Forbes, remarking that “there have been few outstanding leaders produced by that institution, and virtually no intellectuals” (p. 28). Surely he is not talking about Dennis Banks who received his only authentic and useful institutional education at D-QU (Banks 2005, pps. 322-324)? Surely he has never heard of Henry Dominguez, the Chicano leader-elder of *Barrios Unidos* (Jesus Acosta 2007, p. 23). The combined experiences of Hoopa reservation life, D-QU and NAS at UC Davis helped forge and support the lifelong work of Steve Baldy, David Risling Jr. and many other northern California leaders such as Chris Peters, founder of Seventh Generation Fund and others. A number of D-Q students successfully transferred to 4-year institutions and graduate school such as UC Davis and continued their education while a number of D-QU and NAS graduates returned to reservation communities, while others also returned to urban Indian communities (“DQU: A Brief Documentary History”, D. 334, B. 3; Berger 1994; Risling 1975).

Forbes highlights many of the innumerable expositions but I will just touch upon them here for the sake of inviting further discussion as it involves 35-50 years of historical condensation. First, as Forbes mentions elsewhere, the kind of people who went to DQU were the students who often could not get accepted to other colleges, or had never graduated high school, or desired an Indian or Chicano learning community, an escape zone into or out of drugs and alcohol, a rural school, to be a part of the movement, and to decolonize their minds-spirits. Generally, DQU students were not your typical college-bound student out of high school. Next, DQU was plagued by an imperial education, accreditation and funding structure that forced them to conform consistently

when from the beginning they hoped to be something else completely. Thus, there is not a single student or teacher who was trained or educated *for D-QU*. It had not specific feeder schools or foundations that prepared students to enter it and thus, it tried to do the seemingly impossible, educate an unknown mass of Indians and Chicanos. Related to this was that it had no foundational support minus a few limited grants. Funding was hard to come by during its entire struggle from 1970-2005. Indian gaming operations were developed in the early 1980's in California and became widespread after a 1999 compact which certified the legislated measures found in the Indian Gaming and Regulatory Act (IGRA), and a number of important court cases. A few notable gaming tribes became extremely wealthy but not a single one ever invested in D-QU. Further, D-QU was literally under attack from the moment it began, from the BIA, DOI, DOE, FBI, by local Davis, Woodland and Yolo County residents, politicians and media, by UC Davis faculty, administrators and others, from state level politicians and from on capitol hill and inside the white house who according to one news source, the school had been dubbed "terrorist tech" by its enemies (Forbes 1985; "David Versus Goliath, Again" D-334, B. 4; Lutz 1980; Billingsley 2006). This is one of the few institutions where multiple members have FBI files and were brought to court frequently, of which only a few of these files have ever been released publicly or to me personally despite numerous requests. Also as Forbes notes, it was under attack internally as many people at the beginning hoped to ride the Alcatraz bandwagon over to the D-QU site and implement their own ideas, what Forbes had called the "Alcatraz Way" as the Indians of All Tribes who occupied the rock had advocated for Thunderbird University and when it didn't bear fruit, found themselves supporting D-QU (p. 5, D-046, B. 252, F. "The Future of D-QU"). A number of people



got onto the board at an early time and began to shift the direction away from Chicano integration as well as away from the grand vision of a Ph.D. granting University and towards a junior college so that by 1978, both had become a reality and by the time of Lutz (1980) report on the site, it had already weathered many storms and was still problem-laden. Chicano students were still a major populace on campus at the time, but no longer were there leaders of the same kind on the Board, only in the administrators, staff and faculty positions. Forbes taught at D-QU variously throughout the years and supported it in many ways, but he obviously was disparaged by the direction that people took it and the way they fought over it, and each other.

One of the interesting aspects of this infighting is Forbes developed his own perspective of the greedy *wétiko* through his experiences working in Native organizations, in Native community struggles, at D-QU and UCD just as much as with the white power structure that surrounded their every action. David Risling Jr., (1975) who was the coordinator of NAS at UC Davis from its beginning in 1969, and who was also President of the California Indian Education Association from 1967-1970, also Chairman of the Board of Trustees of D-Q University and an instructor for nearly its entire existence struggled to survive in the institutions he helped lead. In 1975, Howard Adams, the Metis decolonial scholar warrior and educator was hired to join UC Davis NAS but was also brought into the ABS faculty half-time. His appearance created a wedge between many of the NAS colleagues, staff and students as he desired coveted positions of leadership and seniority above those already on campus, namely Forbes, Hutchison and Risling. When unable to get these positions over the years he began to develop stronger relationships with ABS and its white cohort and was summarily

rewarded in status and seniority. In 1976, not soon after Adams arrived on campus he attempted to thwart the tenure-ship of Risling and Hutchison by instigating with a student his dismissal so as to replace Risling (D-046, B. 9, F. “1983 Outgoing”; “Students Rally for Risling Tenure”, *Third World Forum* 1977; “David Risling, Native American” in *Argus* 1977; D-046, B. 257, “Risling”; D-334, B. 77, “Misc info 1977”). Risling and Hutchison left UCD after many years merely as Senior Lecturers as they were never gainfully employed by the University as tenured faculty (they did not have the requisite credentials, as both only had Masters level degrees), with their jobs always on the line, while Adams moved up the ladder until he attained a Professorship in 1985, and then retired in 1987 along with Risling and Hutchison. Adams went back to Saskatchewan where he was from and taught variously afterwards (Adams and Lutz 2005).

Forbes and Adams have refrained from mentioning their bitter experiences in the literature as have others despite writing personal historical works, giving interviews and having to maintain a sense of cordiality afterwards. Dunbar-Ortiz (2016) who like Lutz was close with Adams reported that “Howard and Jack disagreed about many things, and their personalities and egos often clashed” (p. 23). Elsewhere, Dunbar-Ortiz (2005) reports that Adams UCD experience was “hell for him” (p. 255). Lutz (2005) couldn’t quite understand what Dunbar-Ortiz meant by this for he commented upon her analysis, “why did he not write at all about his fourteen years as a professor of Native American Studies with the Tecumseh Center, University of California-Davis, or his brief involvement with Deganawidah-Quetzalcoatl University” (p. 283)? Forbes points out that he was of the group that hired Adams, not realizing how hostile he would be towards D-QU, Indigenous religious traditions, and Risling or Hutchison (Dunbar-Ortiz 2014, p.

214; see Letter to Chairman Lee of ABS Dept. dated June 6, 1974 in D-046, B. 254, F. “NAS Faculty”; also Letter Rebuttal to Sacramento Bee July 17, 1983 article in D-046, B. 9, F. “Outgoing”). Forbes et al (2002) explains this historical struggle without mentioning Adam’s involvement, perhaps out of respect, in this succinct summarization:

the deepest threats to our existence occurred in the 1979-1986 period, when our major was temporarily suspended and personal attacks were mounted against several of our faculty. Things reached such an impasse that most of our space was taken from us, our unsold publications were put out for dumping, and our library was given away, saved only by Risling’s hard work. The able and wise leadership of Dave Risling and the courage of the majority of the other faculty enabled us to face such severe harassment and prejudice. In 1985 we attempted to transfer to the College of Letters and Sciences, to no avail. The Department of Applied Behavioural Sciences eventually had proven to be a very dangerous environment for us, being located in an increasingly hostile college (agriculture) under hostile administrators. Our faculty positions were greatly desired by other specialties, and we constantly had to fight against being cannibalized (p. 109).

His conclusion that they were possibly being eaten alive by the academy is not by accident. The takeover of Tecumseh Center by ABS faculty, staff and leadership occurred the Spring of 1982 while Forbes was a visiting professor at the University of Warwick, England. Risling communicated as best he could the situation to Forbes but it was too late and could only pick up the pieces and move on (Letter to Forbes March 6 1982 in D-334, B. 3; see also Letter to Risling March 9 1982 in D-046, B. 4, F. “1982 Outgoing”). ABS was too powerful, and maintained their status as a white junta of sorts that preyed on

NAS for they never really wanted them in their department to begin with. A number of memos and letters from that time period surfaced to the effect that one of them was titled “Witch hunt Against NAS and DQU-1983” and characterizes the bitter relationship Native faculty had in a white institution and departmental structure (D-046, B. 9 F. “1983 Outgoing”). In 1983, while NAS was still a program within the Applied Behavioral Sciences department, Forbes complained to the Dean in a letter dated April 8 that he, and other Native faculty felt “psychological stress”, and “personal animosity” from consistent “power-plays” and turf battles, and Forbes found himself at a point of disillusionment so much that he had concluded that “whether it is a systematic plan of harassment or not is of little relevance since the pressure is continuous and destructive of health and productivity” (D-046, B.9, F. “1983 Outgoing”). A secretary of NAS had filed a harassment case against UCD naming Forbes, Risling and Sarah Hutchison in March of that year. As it proceeded through the formal grievance process which convened a special committee to probe the issue, a UC employee slipped the internal documents to the *Sacramento Bee* newspaper who reported on them in a July 17, 1983 issue and which claimed a whole slew of charges were being brought against the three named. One of the issues brought to Forbes attention was about Darrell Standing Elk (Lakota), who was a NAS recruiter at UC Davis, and a ceremonial leader at D-QU, which the opposition claimed he was one of those people who manipulated the system and was working both sides while being paid only by UCD. Howard Adams, who was a devout Marxist-materialist was reported to frequently talk down about indigenous religions, traditional values, and philosophies as epitomized by Standing Elk who was in that collectivity of

persons so labeled (Letter to Miguel Marino and Ad Hoc Committee in D-046, B. 9, “1983 Outgoing”). Lutz (2005) summarized his take on Adams this way:

It is hard to define Howard’s political position. Certainly, he was a materialist. He had little patience with Christian or Aboriginal belief systems, and this is where he and I had controversial discussions--not about Christian churches or the missionary onslaught, but about Aboriginal traditionalism, which he was inclined to dismiss as ossifying, conservative and superstitious. He saw Aboriginal religious ceremonies not as of value in themselves but, if admissible at all, only as temporary expressions of Indigenous cultural autonomy, a means to the end of fostering revolutionary nationalism. Beyond that, he regarded cultural nationalism as reactionary and backwards, prone to become co-opted by the rulers, serving to retard rather than stimulate action for social change. In this, he obviously adhered to Marx’s notion of religion as a political pacifier and “opiate of the mass” (p. 293).

The troubles continued forth as the task force to deal with the grievances filed found no fault on the three instructors, except that now the NAS program was divided on many issues and D-QU was again bashed in the media. By 1984, NAS had lost Tecumseh Center, their central meeting place, including 20 office spaces, all their staff, and from which Risling sighed in a program review memo that “there is no longer a Native American Studies program as such” (D-046, B. 237, F. “NAS Program Review”). This lasted until Adams (1987), Hutchison (1987) and Risling (1989) retired, and Forbes took over the directorship until 1991, from which he passed it onto Inez Hernández-Avila until 1993, and then he put in one more year in during the 1994-95 academic year. In 1989

NAS finally moved to the College of Letters and Sciences as an interdepartmental program, and in 1995, the year Forbes formally retired, NAS became a full-fledged department offering majors and minors in NAS as well as its first graduate seminars (Forbes et al 2002, p. 110). By 1998, the program was offering a Ph.D. and had amassed a large, creative, and well-known faculty cohort (ibid, p. 111). NAS at UCD survived, and today is one of only two Ph.D. granting NAS programs in the U.S.. Forbes was an active emeritus professor at UCD until his passing in 2011, and had most recently taught at UC Berkeley and continued to speak, lecture, give poetry readings and carry out his vision for Native American National rebirth and development. As a true Windigo Slayer, Forbes stood up for the people and the struggle NAS had faced by learning the system, but also learning to thinking outside of it.

D-QU in Forbes estimation was successful in a number of ways: it brought hope to the hopeless; it served ALL Native and Chicano students, not merely those who had done well in high school or could afford a premier college; it supported the total development of the student through spiritual, technical, academic, physical, political and other kinds of education; it strived to include indigenous community in its leadership, faculty, and on campus by providing a space to organize, meet, dance, find sanctuary and camaraderie; and it ultimately supported the larger struggles of the time through concerted efforts as it was a founding member of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (1975), played a lead role in the passage of the Tribal Community College Assistance Act of 1978, held hundreds of community events and conferences including a yearly Sundance and Pow-Wow, was the organizational hub for the Longest Walk of 1978, as well as supporting the efforts of its many leaders who helmed and worked on

behalf of Native and Chicano peoples in many organizations and communities. Risling himself was a founder of the Native American Rights Fund and had earlier helped found the California Indian Education Association which inspired the creation of the National Indian Education Association. He was a representative of the Association on American Indian Affairs and was frequently on capitol hill advocating for Native Nations as well as back home on the Hoopa Reservation helping out wherever he was needed. D-QU and NAS at UC Davis was his home away from home, and they served to develop his leadership beyond the early lessons he gained from his father Su-Wohrom back at Hoopa and elsewhere. Deloria obviously discounted the work of Risling and Hutchison, the CIEA and other efforts which were not focused on individual self-determination but on National rebirth and revitalization, on Nation re-building and development through developing liberated persons and places able to follow their own paths in life where they found themselves enveloped in the real struggles of the day and where the goal of effecting national decolonization and survival was real, present, and engaged. The case of California is unique and required unique approaches as there are only a handful of reservations for example that can support even a physical structure of a school, let alone the economic vitality and resources required to fund any efforts. D-QU and NAS at UCD were created because of this.

Native American Studies at UC Davis on the other hand survives to this day and outside of the University of Arizona's American Indian Studies and the University of Hawaii at Hilo's Hawaiian Language and Culture doctoral programs, is of the few who provide the degrees which are needed to participate in academic institutions on the level that Forbes, Deloria, Thomas and others had done. Indeed, none of the above scholars

were able to purely focus upon Native traditional knowledge as they all attended programs which required them to some degree work within Eurocentric frameworks while their efforts afterwards created the first programs where Indigenous Knowledge could be centralized throughout their higher education programs. NAS at UC Davis has produced incredible scholars and scholarship that have truly challenged the core of western-Eurocentric and imperial knowledge traditions, law, relationships, and theories. Inés Hernández-Avila (2003) who has been at UC Davis NAS since 1990 and also taught at D-QU, speaks about the “messy area” she inhabits in the academy as a Mexican Indian and Nimipu (Nez Perce of Colville). Reflecting on more than a decade in the institution she says,

I have been knocked down many a time by the academy, by arrogant racist faculty who literally at times cannot even speak to me, who in committee meetings turn their backs on me, who cannot even begin to try to fathom what it is I do in Native American studies (p. 240).

A main point she stresses is that “we need to protect each other” as she shares also that it was not non-white faculty and colleagues that have caused her grief, but also other Natives. She cites none other than Dave Risling Jr. who she considered a great mentor for her at UCD and D-QU:

A person who comes to mind is one of my mentors, David Risling Jr., one of the founding faculty here at the University of California at Davis. He is now professor emeritus but still vibrantly active on the national and international scene with respect to Indian affairs; he is also still active in his own community. He never



forgets to go back home, to keep weaving the fields of energy together—  
community at home, community in the academy. Us.

Some of the most basic advice from my mentor regarding surviving and thriving in the academy was know the campus, know who's who, understand the governance, know how the system works, find your allies (sometimes in seemingly unlikely places—be open to seeing). Know your rights. Choose your battles, and only go to battle when you know you are going to win. (In other words, think it out. Prepare. Line everything up. Think ahead. Make the system work for you.) (p. 241).

In putting Risling and Forbes together, Hernández-Avila (2011) eulogy for Forbes recalls that:

. . . it is good to remember how Jack considered David Risling, Jr., another of our founders, his elder brother. Their relationship spanned forty years, and Jack always credited Dave with bringing him to Davis. Barbara Risling, Dave's widow, says the two had “a very good partnership on everything—Jack was the idea man, ideas way beyond what most people believed.” She says that Jack was “kind, conscientious, and he stood up for people's rights, he wasn't afraid of anything.”

Forbes believed that at the core of decolonizing and liberating the mental baggage, the spiritual beatings, the bodily trauma, the linguistic singeing, the territorial alienation and occupations, one must approach education with a core value system firmly in place. This value system does most of the teaching because it is based upon respect, humility, empowerment, and above all, love. Love was at the heart of Hernández-Avila's

impression of him, and also of his colleague Stefano Varese, who memorialized him with these tender words:

Otra vez me ganaste la mano! Once more your trickster spirit won the race!

Remember that in 1981 at the Russell Tribunal in Rotterdam we had compared ages and stages of life and agreed that our undertaking, although not difficult in essence, required immortality and that your commitment to unpopular causes and to justice and peace could be helped, like poetry, by the touch of love. You did it Jack, like the Blackfoot say: “Life is not separate from death. It only looks that way”. You are immortal, you were immortal already when we were young and you are teaching us, like Plato did many centuries ago, that “Death is not the worst that can happen to humanity”.

Jack stayed the course, not out of a prize at the end, of a retirement package for he had built relationships that would last beyond him and would ultimately take care of him. These relationships were founded upon his own gift to all he met, which is at the root of respect, unconditional love, what Forbes calls “the magic stuff of the universe”. We can only teach what we know, and Forbes knew this was the core of a decolonizing education, of a decolonizing pedagogy, of the deimperialized world he dreamed of. Indeed, it is out of people’s undying love that they execute their own family members who have turned into wiindigoo’s. It’s out of love that we work on behalf of unknown future generations.

*A Decolonizing Pedagogy is a Pedagogy of Love*

Hartmut Lutz (2015) who in reflecting upon he and Forbes' enduring friendship which manifested itself fully in 1979 when Lutz visited D-QU and NAS at UC Davis, had this to say about his pedagogical prowess:

I remember Jack as an incredibly sharp, creative, versatile, and productive thinker and writer, who was immensely proud of his Native American heritage, and who turned out ideas and books that were unorthodox and innovative. As a teacher and colleague, he managed to plant those seeds of curiosity and doubt in the minds of his students and friends, which are the sine qua non of academic enquiry and radical scholarship (p. 10).

Antonia Darder (2011) summarized the pedagogy of Paulo Freire as a “pedagogy of love”, and I would argue, in many ways, this was also Forbes practice inside, and outside of the classroom. Like Freire, Forbes (1973b) sought to develop or reinforce a critical consciousness in his students, and intimated that as a teacher of history his goal was twofold because in his mind:

the teacher in the United States has a tremendous opportunity, the chance to teach about two of the most inspiring sequences of events we can think of. First is the 20,000-year struggle of the Indian people to develop the art of living in harmony with the Universe. Second, is the 500-year struggle of the Native American people to resist conquest and to remain 'true to their heritage' (p. 219).

Yet, this criticality was based upon the desire ultimately to promote students who would create beauty, who would reject power and wealth over respect and humility, and would work always for and with the land and community at heart, with the richness of their soul

and the wisdom of the ages ever present. Again, he sought to create whole, complete, giving, loving peoples for this is who can save, heal and liberate themselves, let alone their own people, or the larger world.

Hernández-Avila (2011) memorialized Forbes by quoting from his poem Eagle Rock, which he ends with the chant, *El Aguila Vive*, and which she chants back “The eagle lives. El Aguila vive. He is this eagle, and now we must look up high to the spirit world to know that he is still there”. Forbes best friend Richard “Dick” Livingston, whom was one of the original “rebels” that he befriended in Eagle Rock and remained close comrades in Davis, CA, memorialized him after his passing with a similar pronouncement, saying, “Jack was an eagle”:

He followed a path that grew in his soul  
A path of learning. Not just to profess But to Act  
To make changes, to fight for justice and to enable others  
To join in the struggle  
He soared like the Eagle as a guiding light for others  
An example of just what an Eagle can accomplish when given the task  
(Livingston 2011).

Hernández-Avila (2011)also reflected on the sum of his accomplishments and contributions at UCD where she has been since the mid 1990’s, saying

We are known throughout the country and beyond for our hemispheric approach to Native American and Indigenous Studies. To say that Jack is one of the beloved founders of our hemispheric program is not enough—this man of magnificent vision, with a poet’s heart, devoted his life’s work, passionately,

brilliantly, as a true great spirit, with all the power of his words and actions, to finding indigenous peoples, recognizing them, celebrating their faces and hearts in all their colors. For him, “indigenous” is everlastingly embracing, generous, loving. This is the heart of his legacy.

Forbes, like Freire, like the poet Tiago de Melo used to say, was a bearer of “armed love”. So while Forbes (1973b) consistently focused on the values of humility, respect, kinship and freedom as some of the founts of education and teaching, behind this was love. His love turned always, like any passionate authentic love, into action. Forbes freely and openly loved life-death, and all living things he cherished as much as his own life.

The fight for all living things is the fight for the sources of one’s own life. One’s extended relatives are not less important, in the end, as one’s nearest and dearest. Forbes writes, in the poem “Looking for the Wise” (1981b) about one of his first entanglements with the destroyers of his hills and home, and the life therein he loved so deeply:

That mother oak tree, a group of pines, a prickly--pear thicket, secret trails, and the canyon itself soothed me from the pain of contact with white middle--class urban children and teachers with whom I could not relate. My first real act of civil disobedience occurred when construction-- equipment was moved in to build a dam in my canyon. I fought them at night, a guerrilla war of damaging what I could and spilling out diesel fuel and oil onto the sand. I was just a young boy then and I lost. The giant oak and the canyon exist now only in my mind. I saw a lot that I loved destroyed — not only there but in El Monte del Sur, which became an industrial zone, and all over southern California, where freeways, smog, and

development chipped away at a land that was still beautiful when I was a child (pps. 116-17).

Like Forbes, I experienced something similar growing up as a private destroyer “bought” (property rights to destroy) the hill that sat between our home and Temescal Creek, and who proceeded to gut it mercilessly for “fill-dirt” to be used in new construction around the valley. I would sneak under cover of night and destroy what I could in whatever ways I knew how at the time, such as putting a pile of rocks in the earth-destroyers gas tanks, in breaking windows, in ripping out plugs and cords, anything I could all at the tender age of 10. Often enough, a white man would come to the door and inquire to my father if he knew anything about it, or had seen some youngsters down there. He always said no, thank goodness. This fight continued all through high school and I enlisted many other friends, those who I freely loved, to partake and aid the rooted, the hills and stones embedded, and the elderberry trees, the prickly-pears, the *qaashil*, and buckwheat, the bricklebrush, and chia, the rabbits and rattlesnakes, the *pa’ash* and *wahawut* and all those who loved what I loved. In this way, I believe we come to know true love when we fight for it, even against insurmountable odds, even when have lost the battle, we win in the end, for we are forever armed with love. The losses though are heavy, they are painful and traumatic, real and unforgiving. So as educators and warrior-scholars, we must continue the fight and rather than become crippled or worn out by it, we must strengthen our loving ways to endure beyond their destructive ones. Forbes (1991) remarked that this fight must be a loving way, not a war without rules, not armed with pure vengeance, with the same avarice and evil found in our enemies. Education must be loving. He said,

I think the environment, the earth, will not be saved until non-Indians as well as Indian people come to really believe and understand their relationship, their oneness with the world around them, and with other living creatures. And, also to love the earth, to love other living creatures. I think that is absolutely essential. We must teach people how to love. We must give them the right to love (p. 12)

Like Freire (1998a), Forbes equated humility with *lovingness*, which in Freire's caveat meant "lovingness not only toward the students but also toward the very process of teaching" (p. 40). Further, "this armed love" is equated to Forbes "warrior-scholarship" and this is not just projected, its taught to students in the process. Forbes (1981) testimony at the First American Indian International Tribunal held at D-QU declared what the goal of education was in his mind, of what D-QU was founded to do, and also Native American Studies. The goal of education from his view was "to develop what I call warrior scholars and to develop people who are going to use the knowledge that is gained in the defense and in the interests of Indian communities and of all people for that matter" (KCP MSS , B.1, F. 4). Freire says again, that this "armed love" is "the fighting love of those convinced of the right and the duty to fight, to denounce, and to announce. It is this form of love that is indispensable to the progressive educator and that we must all learn" (p. 40). Elsewhere Freire says about the act of teaching, that "it is impossible to teach without the courage to love, with the courage to try a thousand times before giving up" (p. 3). Steve Crum (2011) reflected on Forbes moral and political commitments saying that no matter what the consequences or situation, "Jack stepped forward". Further he relates, "Jack believed so strongly in his political positions that he was willing to go against the so-called authorities who wanted him to keep quiet" (p. 11).

For as I mentioned earlier, this was an old warrior and windigoo slayer in many ways who had begun to fight with loving brilliance at an early age and continued as an elder. But are there limits to love and loving, especially when we talk about education, curriculum, structures and pedagogy?

Forbes (1992c) position was that love is the foundation. Love was the “magic stuff of the universe” (p. 39). Core to Forbes understanding and embrace of a loving kind of education was of the core aspects of Peoplehood-Nationhood, that of *kinship* and *relatedness*. These are paired equally with the ideas of the universe or multiverse, or as in Lenape, the *wemi-tali*, the “all-where” of the rich and rippling world. Further, these are interwoven and bound to a spiritual core, to an enwoven soul, that is enmeshed with everything that ever was and will be by the “big holy”, *Kishelemokon* (Creator), or *Keitanitowit* (the Great Spirit) (Forbes 1992c, p. 2; Forbes 1979a, p. 131). Forbes says (n.d.) “we have been given wonderful gifts by the *wemi-tali* and by the grandfather-grandmother (big holy) and that is why American Original Philosophy is grounded in love for the Wemi Tali and all of the beneficial powers of the Universe.” (p. 2). He contrasted this with the modern imperialist, white men who in his estimation “sometimes find the earth pleasing but Indians love the earth with all of their being. Indians also care for the earth, because it is holy. It is holy because it is a manifestation of the female side of the Creator and because it possesses power, one of the most remarkable powers of all, the power to nourish life.” (Forbes 1970a, p. 5). Forbes (1976c) insisted that the imperialist must be cured through becoming indigenous, a lover of the land and all its creatures. He dubbed this “Americanization”:



. . . the process of becoming assimilated to the tens-of-thousands of years of rich American heritage. It does not mean turning one's back upon European, Asian, or African inventions entirely. It does not mean wholly denying one's overseas heritage. But it does mean that you give yourself up to this land, that you love it, and that you try to relate positively to its heritage. Whether we like it or not, this is America, after all. Let those who want to be European go to Europe to do their Thing (p. 38).

He might be viewed as a segregationist or a chauvinist against all non-Indians but we should see that he had read all the world's literatures and studied peoples every moment of his life. He cherished a people's history, language and wisdom sometimes as much as they did. For example, Forbes (1989a) says part of this decolonization project in our teaching and curriculum should include combining "traditional American literature, from all parts of the Americas" and bringing it the fore, for it

needs to be removed from its present situation of obscurity in order that it might join with the literatures of Europe, Africa, Asia, and the Pacific in a new global exploration of the richness of the human mind. Such a journey will free us from the limited perspectives offered by nationalistic, racist, and chauvinistic prescriptions, and may well help us to create a new world wherein, in fact, love and the sacredness of the word can be realized (p. 121).

Forbes love was expansive. Forbes love was inclusive. Forbes love was a tidal wave rippling out:

I live in a universe. I am a point of awareness, a circle of consciousness, in the midst of a series of circles. One circle is that which we call "the body". . . .

Another circle is all of the other things I am completely dependent upon--the air, the water, and so on. . . . Another circle is the source of my dreams, consciousness, insights, gifts or powers, ideas, and “intuitions”. But all of these “circles” are not really separate--they are all naturally dependent upon each other. . . . And that natural dependence blurs into the circle of “love,” that mystery, that “glue” that holds all of this together (Forbes 1992c, pps. 38-39).

Forbes was humble in his approach to the world however, for he recognized “we live in a mysterious, marvelous universe and it offers us a chance to be cured by its loving embrace” (ibid, p. 39). The world, the earth mother, the sun father, the grandmother moon and her star brethren could heal us if we were to rejoin and reembody our roles as family members of the cosmos. “Thus it is that the process of learning from the Earth, the animals and “Nature” cannot be cold and “scientific” only, but must include love, the magic stuff of the universe” (p. 39).

To summarize Forbes (1992b) approach to life, to the world, to love, to his great vision of education, we must turn to Forbes the poet, for in his poetry he says it all at once, he travels, he soars:

And I am one of these driven people  
I am searching  
I am goal-seeking  
I wander from course to course  
Hall to hall  
And also from Idea to Idea  
Thought to Thought

Dream to Dream

Searching

Seeking

For what?

I suppose I am searching for practical things

And impractical things

Searching for meanings

For experience

For answers to internal questions

For a means of financing the expenses of living

and

Perhaps

For more noble things

That is

Ways to achieve Ideals

To achieve dreams of a more than selfish nature

To support ideals already full-grown

Ideals of love

Of democracy

Of religion and philosophy

Ideals which are personally mine

Which mold my outlook

Which merge in me

Their merger making me a Being  
A Being resembling other similarly constructed  
creatures  
And yet  
A separate Being  
An Individual.  
And I search  
To fulfill my needs I search  
To find myself I search  
To find my soul I search  
Yes  
One searches for one's soul  
For a Being's soul Is  
Not within his fleshy body  
Nor within his spongy brain  
Nor within a self-centered spiriting thing  
One's soul is In the world. . . .  
A soul is found in love  
This has been well-shown  
For men strive for love  
In its greatest sense  
Being love  
Not of self

Not of measly things  
But love of creatures  
Of men and women  
Of compassion for the Universe  
Of oneness with all.  
A soul is found in love  
Someone out there  
In the world  
Has our soul  
We are looking  
Calling for them  
But we can't find them.  
And we must.

The world has our soul and we must go to the world. (pps. 16-17)

Forbes recognized that the goal of education, was to find a good path, a path of beauty and love. As an educator, he is on the same path, which for him is not to “teach” but to walk for a while with those who want to learn how to walk themselves. “We make the road by walking” was a famous dictum espoused by Paulo Freire in his “talking book” with Myles Horton (1990) which encapsulated their concept of teaching and the learning process (p. 6). The saying comes from the pen of the poet Antonio Machado who once wrote, “se hace camino al andar” meaning roughly “the road is made by walking” (Machado 1982, p. 143). The Highlander Folk School of Horton for example trained laborers and labor organizers since its beginning in 1932 including the likes of

Rosa Parks, Martin Luther King Jr., Septima Clark, Ralph Abernathy and many others until its charter was revoked (no thanks to an FBI investigation and the “red scare” of the 1950’s) in 1961, and which eventually left its original tract of land and became a broader advocate for social justice and action as the Highlander Research and Education Center which still exists in this form (Glen 1988; see FBI Vault “Highlander Folk School”). For Forbes, his pedagogy of love was not based on a fictitious or abstract love, a superfluous love. Forbes as an everyday learner of Native knowledge, history and ideas, he constantly drew upon the innumerable sources material he found all around him embodied in ancient and contemporary living traditions. This wellspring is what Horton and Freire did not conceive, did not ever entertain. In this way, Forbes might question the American nature of their thinking for perhaps it was truly still European Christian in many ways, as their core stories from creation to today were rooted in a European and Christian mythos and theology of nature-universe and of learning. Forbes (2006b) on the other hand always reminds us:

Native Americans have hundreds of nations, each with its own stories about the making of things. I think, however, that we can see a few common ideas. First, there is a tremendous love for Mother Earth, for all life and for the creative power inherent in the birth of all things. This love is closely intertwined with a sense of profound gratitude, indebtedness, and thankfulness. Ancient Americanism commences thus not with arguments about metaphysics or how the Universe originated but rather with our profound debt and love for the grounding of our existence (p. 2).

Within this framework, one finds the values of American love. They are humility and respect which he describes as “the cornerstones of Indian philosophy” yet within the same breath he goes back to the core, saying

but another element is also essential to mention and that is love, love of the earth, the plants, the trees, the animals and, in fact, a deep appreciation for the beauty and mystery of the universe. This is important for several reasons: first, because it provides the ground for a positive view of life and second, because it prevents one from saying: “well, man is only an animal after all, and animals are brutish, therefore, man is brutish.” Indians do not, of course, view animals as “brutes”. Instead, Indian people live, traditionally, in a supportive and beautiful, although at times demanding, natural world. (p. 13, Forbes 1983).

Forbes references the Hobbesian depiction of Native American Nations to have “No arts; no letters; no society; and which is worst of all, continual fear, and danger of violent death: and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short” and the Christian *modus operandi* of having dominion over all the earth and its creatures. To summarize this pedagogy of love, as a concentric circle of relational loving we must turn to what Forbes (1979e) called “traditional Native science” which was “was and is wholistic”. Forbes use of the terms “Science of Appropriate Behavior or the Science of Good Living or the Science of the Good Road” for the real question is not what can people do with science or how can science be used as a tool to control or manipulate the world. Instead, Forbes says, our core educational question “has to do with the most significant question facing all humans and that is “how does one live in this life” (p. 135).

Forbes would say that we need to focus our educational efforts on spiritual development, on character, on core values, on creating a people, and creating critical thinkers and leaders. In one of his many speeches he refused to be dissuaded about maintaining a peaceful, loving and respectful disposition in his approach to living, but also to revolution and resistance, even to the most unloving, disrespectful and violent of people and shapes of imperialism. He said, “most Indian nations are small nations and ultimately they will be able to secure the right to autonomy and self-determination only when their neighbors change their values. I think that this is the real revolution and this has to take place” (Forbes 1974b, p. 38). Interestingly enough his answer implies that Imperialists, white folks, scientists and their ilk need to change themselves, need to return to their ancient cores, their traditions of love and respect, somewhere, somehow. It is not up to Indigenous people to do this for them. They must do this themselves. I liken this to a person who needs great healing and help. You cannot help them until they come to you for help, and then, you can only heal what is not beyond your power, or beyond their own, or the spirit powers. Some things are not able to be healed. Some people can't be healed, like the Windigo who begs not for healing, but for a mercy kill. This is one of many options, but it's a real one, an authentic one based on truth. Perhaps this is what they need to do. Beg for healing, beg to learn, beg for mercy, even beg for a mercy kill. But if they are turned away, they are still responsible to end the madness. To end the suffering of themselves and others. To return to the source. A mercy kill might entail killing the people-eater within, killing off the imperial system, killing the bureaucratic nightmare called the federal system, or other sites and structures of mass destruction. Whatever it is, imperialists need to do this, for themselves, for all of us. Perhaps they



need to love themselves first, their ugly innards, their despicable history, their nasty transgressions, their curse, warts and all. Joy Harjo (1990) argued that the “real revolution is love” (p. 24). Indeed it is. Love is the “magic stuff of the universe”.

*Deimperialization and the Need for Wise Leaders*

Native Californian civilization was of such a nature that at least five hundred autonomous republics could exist within the present boundaries of California in relative harmony and without imperialism. More significantly, in these republics the fundamental dignity and self-rule of each individual person was virtually universal. Can we imagine today numerous republics without armies, living largely at peace with each other, each without police or other formal instrument of societal coercion? Can we imagine societies bound together into leagues covering large areas, the links consisting primarily or solely in religion (ceremony-sharing) and kinship, with no formal “international” machinery or “peace-keeping” armies? Can we understand political systems where chiefs and leaders are powerless in a formal sense, depending upon the agreement of the people for all major enterprises? Can we imagine systems of decision making where all of the people are involved and where everyone has a right to be heard even? (p. 235, Forbes 1971d).

Traditional Native American societies formerly possessed intelligentsias which were thoroughly integrated into the general population. Native leaders were

usually also “thinkers” and creators of beauty. These leaders, whether “secular” or “ceremonial” or “healing” (or all three) were ordinarily at one with the masses (the general population) and consistently served the interest of the community (p. 75, Forbes 1980b) .

The leader, the creative and organizing mind, is the master-need in all the societies of man (p. 287, Crummell 1992).

One of the goals says Forbes of an imperial system is to deprive people of its National leaders and the development of new leadership . Part of this is performed by diminishing or destroying local governing relationships, structures, sites of action, territorial boundaries, laws, religious rites and free movement. The other way is to transform the emerging leaders into contractors of the imperial system, that is, they become leaders whose allegiance is swayed in so many ways towards the imperial system and people rather than their own. Forbes (1966) original proposal for an American Indian University began with the core statement, “one of the greatest problems facing the American Indian today is the lack of trained leadership”, a point he had made in all previous drafts and subsequent proposals (p. 1; see “American Tribal Higher Education” in D-046, B. 228; also Forbes 1985a). As he points out many of those in the past who had attended white universities and institutes, imperial institutions had “ill-prepared them for leadership among their own people. They may have, in fact, abandoned their people in favor of living among non-Indians” (ibid). Forbes (1979b) describes the historical consequences of this approach by imperialists, saying,

you have to try to bring about a situation where the conquered people control themselves. This is the key to destroying the native mind and the native society. What happens, of course, is that the caciques, or the native leadership, have to be bribed and sucked away from their people and integrated where possible into the colonial structure so that native leadership - instead of serving the Native people - becomes part of the colonial administration. So the Spaniards are very clever: they give a “baton” of office to each cacique, they let them wear uniforms with fancy epaulets and so on, they give them the right to collect tribute from the people in the villages, they give them the right to personal service from their own people and they even allow them to be called “Don so and so” so that the cacique begins to identify himself with the colonial system. In that way, the Native leadership is corrupted and taken away; or, in the United States, it is in the form of bribed chiefs and tribal councils which are completely under the control of the colonial system (p. 107).

Now of course, this is a stretch as not all tribal councils are completely anything, however, they are the only recognized form of leadership (besides money) which imperialists respect. Further, as Forbes (1994h) notes with regards to being enveloped by an empire, participation within the legal avenues for representation as “citizens” especially via taxation and voting has unfortunately resulted in his mind a weakened leadership base siphoned into participation without transformation via elections:

Indigenous people are now voting for Congress but as long as it is through the medium of white-controlled states we will continue to be colonized by the white

majority and white political structure. The same is true for Mexicano-Chicanos and African-Americans (p. 13).

If there are no avenues or policies which demand specific outcomes or responsibilities to Native Nations or Nationals, those deemed minorities, for queens, for elders, etc., then the system of participation in his mind is rigged towards maintaining its traditional imbalance of white power. Indeed, this is one of Forbes most defensible arguments, which is that, the imperial system of exploitation is corrupt and teaches corruption and disempowerment because all available legal avenues in fact perpetuate the war machine. It is no coincidence or distortion of facts to suggest that many a president have lead the U.S. to war, while no vote of the people has ever prevented or stopped these actions which is technically the prerogative and power of Congress (see Article I, Sec. 8 vs Article II, Sec. II of the U.S. Constitution). Not a single court case has ever prevented a presidential action, and not a single congressional act has stopped an ongoing invasion. Indeed, as many authors have noted, white public support for war has been a mainstay since the U.S. founding. Will the color of the participants reshape the empire, and is this the purpose and responsibility of Native Nations and nationals? Further, as Forbes points out, does our participation promote our own colonization-imperialization?

One of the precepts to Forbes arguments was grounded in his eagle vision, which not only saw the world from great heights but also his portended historical view which looked deep into the imperial and ancient traditional past in order to understand the present. This is perhaps one of his greatest contributions. He was always taking a long look, a long view of things while so many others seem to be perpetual teenagers acting on a whim without much thought or experience to draw from. Forbes had published a

number of historical and op-ed research articles prior to his 1959 dissertation which hammered home the idea that Native Nationals were the resistant figures in the Spanish imperialist mission which would have otherwise connected their outposts in Texas, Arizona (New Mexico), California and the northern states of Mexico and during the great southwestern revolt from 1680 to 1698. Further, they were so successful because of their prescient unity in the face of unabashed terrorism and only suffered defeats when they accepted individual peace agreements and fought each other, which the Spanish exploited (Forbes 1960, pps. 250-280). Forbes learned from his studies of Tecumseh, Pontiac, Powhatan, Crazy Horse and others that “divide and conquer” strategies, including gift appeasement, conversion, and singling out specific leaders for either special benefits or to disarm them was highly effective (Forbes 1960, p. 284; Forbes 1973a, p. 180). The development of a racial-caste system, or restrictive institutional divisions which gave certain groups privileges, based on color, blood, religion-culture, and allegiance, was key in Forbes mind to prevent people from both retaining their national identities, allegiances and historical relationships but also it prevents them from developing new nationalities, allegiances and relationships which might challenge the imperial system. Forbes (1990) points out that:

it is certainly one of the secrets of all imperialistic and oppressive societies to deny the knowledge of history to those who are oppressed, I mean that’s a fundamental element. That’s why our schools are so lousy in the United States, it’s not just that there underfunded and everything else. What would the ruling classes in this society and others do if all the people were educated? If they could all read and all wanted to read? If, if they all got a sophisticated education that

really told, you know, what happened to their ancestors, you know, not just Native Americans but other people that have been oppressed too, you know? But they couldn't deal with that. That's why we have lousy schools and that's why teachers are underpaid even though they are amongst the most important people in this society (D-046, B. 192, "Columbus Day").

Education was a key battleground because it involves not just socialization but critical thinking, leadership development and training, opportunities to follow a learning path, to study under masters and the wizened. Or it may simply be a path to incorporation and envelopment, to exploitation and denationalization.

This perspective is hammered home by drawing out the unique experiences of other groups as represented in Historically Black Colleges and Universities, the ancient Calmecac of the Mexica, the *yeshivas* of the Hebrew descendants and others. Forbes (1966c) says:

What is essentially needed is a post-high school institution thoroughly oriented towards tribal needs. It might very well resemble Negro "freedom schools" more than Howard University, but it could partake a little of both. Above all, it should attempt to train large numbers of Indians, both old and young, for leadership within the context of the tribal community. In this manner the entire folk group can be led forward as a unit rather than periodically having its most promising young people drawn off into Anglo-American society (p. 3).

One of the ways this has occurred is through incorporating Native governing structures into the federal system, which is always an unequal relationship. Most tribal councils for example have adopted republican majoritarian voting techniques and ignored traditional

familial, clan-based, ceremonial, and other community-based forms of law and leadership. Another thing that has occurred is that many leaders, instead of representing their own people (which is hard to do when your traditional governing structures are disempowered, discredited, in shambles, divided, gone) instead are siphoned into democratic republican systems of representation such as city, county, state and federal governmental structures where they must take oaths of allegiance and swear to uphold the laws and policies of these systems over their own peoples. Forbes (1968) in speaking to a crowded room of Native educators on the topic of “Educational Liberation” in California characterized the situation at that time to be one where leadership was largely “shadow politics”:

Those that seek recognition, those that seek to become leaders, instead of being able to acquire real power which would make their leadership more meaningful are forced to engage in shadow politics within a powerless community and because it is shadow politics without any real substance to the kind that’s being striven after, and the groups splinters into all kinds of small little entity, little groups of people, a leader with a few followers there, and another leader with a few followers there, all scrambling and fighting over what is essentially fictional power because there is no real power to grasp people are free and in fact apparently are driven to engage in this destructive kind of factionalism . . . (D-334, B. 43, F. 5).

Not all factionalism is destructive, as it might well be imperative, healthy and an important learning and growing experience to do things as a new group, as a new unit or family, community or nation. But what Forbes is speaking to is those that are fighting

over the scraps, and break apart because of their lack of maturity (goodness), health and quality leadership. They are fighting over the lack of power in their community, which is the power to act.

In any case this is where it has to be done because the real answer I think to the problem of powerlessness, and the problem of negative self-images, inferiority complexes and the other kinds of things that go along with conquest, these kinds of things all have to be overcome by particular Indian communities, particular Indian people obtaining power over schools. There is no way that I think we can talk about a kind of national Indian leadership, or even state Indian leadership, or regional Indian leadership acquiring power and then saying that this power is saying that all Indian people have power. It doesn't work that way. It has to be each Indian community that has power over its own destiny, over its own community self-development, that is meaningful in the long run as apart of American Indian liberation (D-334, B. 43, F. 5).

Lastly, he makes the point again that schools can provide this option because they are specialized, that is, they can focus on training people to be the kind of leaders their communities need and want. This is especially true if it is a community-controlled institution whereby the traditional processes of raising young leaders has already been initiated, the foundational skills are being brought forth, and the university can merely certify these results. Forbes says,

I firmly believe that the ongoing self development and the very survival of a people depends upon there controlling what I'm going to call higher education. And I don't mean by higher education just what White people call higher



education. I mean any kind of education that begins to be specialized, that begins to be advanced, beyond what is available to the normal pupil. Much of traditional Hopi education is higher education. You can't get any higher than that which Hopi religious leaders have to go through. And the same is true of much advanced Navajo education available to Navajo religious leaders. But higher education is specialized education. And that kind of education is necessary for the survival of a people. It has proven to be necessary for every ethnic group in Europe to have its own universities. For the new developing nations as soon become independent, what do they do? They try to establish their own universities and their own colleges which they control (Speech on "Educational Liberation", D. 334, B. 43, F. 5).

For Forbes, the future leaders needed to be trained specifically to deal with the issues faced in their own families and communities, and within the "Imperialist Patriarchal Capitalist White Supremacy" of hooks (2008) designation.

Further, and perhaps more importantly is that traditional leadership structures and systems often provided a balance of queen, *yakon:kwe* and man, *ron:kwe* power. Forbes (1994c) points out that:

One of the great problems in the world today is that key political, cultural and social decisions are being made by men alone, or by a large majority of men, with only minimal participation by women. This presents a great danger for the world because men, by themselves, are not wise enough or balanced enough. It takes both men and women to keep the world balanced and to protect the interests of future generations (p. 1).

Most all treaties signed by Native Nations with the U.S., British, and French governments were made amongst conventions of men and did not *require* any queen ascension or discussion, while Native women's leadership was consistently undermined or ignored. And today most tribal councils, most major leadership positions in the "business council" and other invented avenues of power are dominated by men. Yet, it is not enough to have structures dominated by queens. The system must be based upon a queens total influence and way of life, their gifts and traditions, for they are the backbone of any nation, people, or family. Incredible numbers of Native, Black and Chicana women have entered higher education yet the field has not opened up traditional avenues for the development of leaders because these original locations have been disrupted, have been channeled into other highly exploitive avenues such as business, education and environmental areas, or are simply undervalued as possibilities for women enter. The influence of Native women leaders such as Wilma Mankiller as the many who have attained leadership positions of Tribal Colleges and Universities, Native American, American Indian and First Nations Studies programs, and within k-12 schools has been profound. Yet, these often-singular efforts have yet to reproduce Native women leadership programs and transitions back into the community, something that must be done if we are to have real impacts upon community structures and traditional governance.

Important also for this discussion is that most institutions are led by white males, and are essentially white supremacist and white power houses of privilege, prestige and influence. Many historical efforts and movements once led by Native, Black and Chicano leaders were effectively co-opted by allowing white leaders to infiltrate the core group, to become leaders themselves, or to transform their approaches based around white led

efforts let alone have military or federal intervention and antipathy from the outset. Or as the case of the W.E.B. Du Bois school demonstrates, of which Baldwin (1979) utilizes to demonstrate how interest-convergence principles works in a racial state, a nearly all-Black school named after a Black revolutionary is forced to desegregate in the wake of the *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, KS* (1954), while the real problem of white supremacy was not dismantled in total. Du Bois (1935) said this about the issue prior to the ruling based on the reality of white supremacy during his time, “I am no fool; and I know that race prejudice in the United States today is such that most Negroes cannot receive proper education in white institutions” (pps. 328-329). By a proper education of course, he means that Whites can only teach what whites know about: racism, imperialism, patriarchy, capitalism-greed, and supposed “white culture”, which is really a mash of whatever this political group can control, amass and reign over at a given time. Prior to the 1960’s for example, public education was heavily inundated with Christian values and precepts, and now it has been thoroughly replaced by imperial scientific, corporate and industrial attitudes and ideas. The white vision of education has dominated the U.S. for far too long, at times denying education to non-whites, or providing a segregated and differentiated education to Indians, Blacks, interned Nisei, Mexicans, poor whites, the rich, for migrant workers which compares greatly to whites and the sons and daughters of CEO’s, the wealthy and elite. What we need, as Forbes has said, is new visions of education which come out of our new visions of life. Our great leaders have had, and will have new visions for the people, for all life. These new visions of leadership would ensure that we are thinking about the youth and elders, about queens and mother earth, about all creatures large or small, or in the words of Cajete (1994) they will be “for

life's sake" because "education is an art of process, participation, and making connection. Learning is a growth and life process; and Life and Nature are always relationships in process" (p. 24). Thus leadership training is not about simply training labor leaders, but it's about training leaders for the spiritual world which has become inundated by an imperial order. The relationship between queens and men is indeed one of the most virtuous ones we can focus upon and any new vision of education must seriously take on the task of training queens for leadership roles in their community while supporting the dismantlement of male power structures. Coming from a people where women were the backbone leaders of the nation, it is easy to see why traditional leaders such as the Peacemaker, Aiiionwatha and Jigonsaseh helped reinvigorate the original matriarchal clan system of governance by affirming the clan relations (women's power over the family-nation), and giving once monstrous men the lessons of humility and fortitude which most women had forever survived on. Our ancient traditions, stories and ways provide important avenues and opportunities for us to challenge further imperialization especially in the area of leadership and in training new generations of leaders which respect and honor queen power. The question remains however, can we have new visions in education and ancient ones renewed?

*"We Can Have New Visions"*

Cajete (1994) points out that "it is no wonder that visions held and continue to hold such an important place in many Indian societies. The process of visioning is a basic creative response to making meaning of life. Visions are, indeed, for life's sake" (p. 145). Forbes (1991) once said "new traditions also come to the people. New ceremonies

begin to develop - largely through dreaming - which come from the individual. The person or the individual has the dream or the vision, a song or a new dance. Something that the people should do. And then it becomes part, perhaps, of the community's tradition" (BANC MSS 98/144 c B. 1, F. "Forbes, Jack D."). Buttressing this idea is the concept of loss and recovery, which Forbes candidly speaks to in the same interview:

It is true. We have lost a lot. And we can't do everything that our ancestors could do right now. But we can recover and we can rebuild because we can have dreams again. We can dream ceremonies just like they did. We can have new visions and we can re-create things. We don't have to give up just because we have lost part of our tradition and culture. We can still go on living. We can still find the essential things in our life and we can make them work for us (ibid).

One of the most salient points Forbes makes, and that I stress, is that we must follow our own paths in this life. Our people and traditions, ceremonies and history offer us a large path, one which many people can follow. Yet, within this larger pathway, we must follow our own paths. Akin to the sun's southern path, our traditions and "original instructions" are great enough to provide light, warmth and direction for all of us. However, life is always a matter of perspective and that unique perspective comes from our personal visions. We cannot follow any one person exactly. The best we can do is to approximate ourselves, to follow in another's footsteps, to walk with others, but never do we share the same shadow for we have to do our own walking. Tradition-bearing communities are able to provide youth the tools, techniques, language, values, models and wisdom, the stories and ideals which form the basis from which we are able to go off on our own, yet these are all found also deeply embedded within the land itself, as "first teacher", among the

ancestors and free spirits, the other creatures and life beyond, above, below, within, enveloping us, our circles. Rites of passage into adulthood is one of the most important and specific forms of educational experiences a people can offer its youth. These foundational ceremonies are much more than one-time experiences for they are built upon traditional leadership and educational frameworks which seek total incorporation of a person into the community as an adult. More importantly they honor a person's unique struggle and contributions through their connection to the land and landed-community as one integral role.

The current lower and higher education structures in Forbes (1980a) mind provide the opposite experience where "Native intellectuals and artists, to be even moderately successful, must go through a "rite of passage" completely controlled by aliens" (p. 81). Further, this is complicated by the basic orientation of the university to the imperial structure at large, one which constantly demonizes the truly empowered, unleashed Native leader who seeks independence in thought, action and reality of their nations, territories and relatives:

White colonialism, in short, forces the authentic Indian intellectual or artist to identify with the Native masses because, once his eyes are open, he can see that he is just another "red dog" insofar as the ruling classes are concerned. Moreover, he is a "mad red dog" and his authentic artistic or analytical statements may cause him to be seen as a "frothing at the mouth, rabid red dog" whose works are

“shocking” or “biased” and “repulsive.” (Can one write or paint the truth and please the white power structure? Probably not for long!) (p. 82).

Autonomous and creative activity and leadership is not normally tolerated in education if it seriously rouses the collectivity of persons and those persons who are truly empowered by their unique pathways are often met with the instruments of empire who seek to channel their abilities back into the power structure and the accepted norms of white colonialism. Originally a person's entire youth experience would be pinned up to that moment where they are officially recognized as adults because they would expect to be so. Essentially, your required training, your official education is complete, and whatever you do afterwards is a matter of choice. This is the reason why it was so important for youth-cum-adults to be prepared in such a way that when that time came the community would relinquish any kind of paternal-maternal power over their youth because it was expected that they had been dutifully prepared for life and as such, they will have stepped into new roles as caretakers and providers rather than being cared and provided for. A queen's first menses, a boy's voice cracking were signs of the change and preparations would then commence. These are real changes, for youth will begin to seek to create life and start the cycle anew with the birth of a child generation. Various rites could be performed which “tested” new adults, also they would include a public or familial centered procession and actions from which the community and family would witness and reinforce the ceremonies outcomes. Rites of passage would also culminate often with a “talking to” by the elders, leaders, ceremonialists, parents and family, a kind of final and parting teaching about their place in the universe and amongst their people. Through ceremony and ritual, every step, every word, every symbol, every moment was prepared

in a sacred way so that not a single thing would be forgotten in this momentous experience. They would in turn be able to share this with their children (Cajete 1994, p. 173, 210; Cajete 2000, p. 126).

For young Kanien'kehá:ka boys and girls guided by tradition and "original instructions", separate ceremonies would be prepared for the rite into adulthood at the appropriate time, usually not alone but when a cohort of similarly aged or readied youth could perform the rite together. In Onöndowa'ga:' tradition, the puberty rite of the boys involved years of training and preparation (education) by family and community, and then culminated in performing purifying and preparatory acts such as fasting and sweating, constant bathing and gift-giving, prayers and visiting with elders, uncles and leaders. These would continue as a cohort of boys would be led into a special and guarded place in the woods or on a mountain, in order to be secure, alone and focused in their attempts to secure lifelong support and a clear vision, internally and externally for their step into adulthood. They would be guided throughout by elders, wisened and experienced men after having been prepared for years by the leading women in their lives. The most important foci of the youth would be to have time alone to pay attention to their dreams, visions and visitations of either spirits, ancestors, creatures or medicine powers. The attainment of *orenda* or spirit power was the goal, but if it was not attained during this rite, it wasn't the end of their world for dreams-visions and *orenda* could be gained at nearly any time and in many ways. Yet this experience was to create a model of how one could go about their own daily search for *orenda*, for vision, and to live with the awareness of our kinship, connection and relationships with the sources of life and power everywhere. Sometimes a guardian spirit, a medicine power or being such as the False



Faces, a clan elder creature or a sacred object would be engaged during the rite which propelled them into special educational societies, professions or pathways afterwards. One could only be admitted to the Little Water Medicine society of healers for example, through such a vision where the person would dream of a *Gagöhsa*' (face) or *Sagojowéhgowa* (he who defends them), also known as a *hadoui* (False Face), a mysterious spirit bound to aid people since the beginning of creation (Fenton 1991; Fenton 2002). For young girls this would occur not long after the first menses as this was a key period of recognition because they could become pregnant after this time, create life, and would need to be prepared to take care of life and raise a family. If they didn't receive this "test" and "rite" imbued with important teachings and lessons, they might thwart their own children's education before they were born. Further, this entire regiment was backed by the recognition that as adults they were free peoples, to make their own decisions, to be responsible, to suffer the consequences of their actions, but also reap the benefits from them as well (Wallace 1972, pps. 37-39). As Wallace reports, the rites of passage which hoped to induce a pathway, or vision, as well as lead a youth to their guardian spirit or power was preparatory for moving beyond a parent's original educational foundations, as "the guardian spirit, in a sense, took the place of the parents" because they would be with them everywhere they went, and might have imbued them with *orenda* or spirit power (p. 73). Also, key for the rites of passage was that a youth might experience something (a vision, visitation, etc.) that would affect the whole people, which could make or break the tenuous and sacred relationships they had with the spirit powers of the universe as everything rested on preserving harmony, balance, peace and health among all relations in life. Related to traditional rites of passage such as among my

people, we must go back to the original stories and teachings such as that of the *Ongwe'Ias*, and the *Gagöhsa'*, and those that highlight the trials and tribulations of the people and how they came to be, how they fought seemingly otherworldly battles for survival as well as those they fight within themselves. These would often be rekindled and recited during this time and show how closely related all the original instructions have become towards the ultimate goal of creating a complete, aware, and empowered person and people enveloped within the totality of the stories and spiritual ecology of the people. One youth as reported by Wallace via the Jesuits was visited by a powerful guardian spirit after sixteen days of fasting. The voice came from the sky and told him he would take care of him throughout his life, he would live to be a white-haired, to have children, and do great things. Then before parting he tested him. He offered him a piece of raw flesh from a person, to which the youth turned down in disgust. Then he offered him some bear fat, which the youth ingested with gusto (p. 67). Reportedly, all came true and he was very successful in life.

However, this ancient rite was virtually lost during the height of imperialism, theft and loss of traditional territories, through the massacring of elders, knowledge keepers, ceremonialists, storytellers and then the theft of new generations to religious and federal penitentiaries called church and school. Recently, a new ceremony has evolved in order to rejuvenate this tradition and provide an akin avenue for youth-cum-adults to become their potential, to get on a good path, and become individuals and community members with vision and power. The new ceremony known as *Ohero:kon* or “under the husk” is rooted in the traditional practice of raising seeds to maturity, as in *O:nenste* or sacred white corn which becomes fully mature, able to reproduce itself at the height of its

growth cycle only after it comes out from under the husk of its protective home, womb, family, and traditions.

Ohero:kon is not an easy process. It's a four-year commitment during which nieces and nephews will gather every Sunday in the longhouse for 20 weeks throughout the winter months to prepare themselves for adulthood. They will learn to build a fire using traditional sparked flint and dry grass; they will listen to advice from their elders on topics ranging from intergenerational trauma, to traditional health and wellness practices, to how to foster healthy, loving relationships. They will plant seeds and tend traditional three-sister gardens of corn, beans and squash. They will make regalia, learn their traditional songs and practice their own indigenous languages. But maybe most important, they will learn their own strength and go on spiritual fasts in the woods until they are eventually ready, in their fourth year, to spend four days and four nights in the woods without food, drink or contact (Wilbur 2017).

The rite was rejuvenated in particular by two women, Louise Wakerakats:te Bear and Delia Cook and supported by men who had maintained some rites for the boys such as Darryl Thompson and others. Women are the original teachers of the children, for the children are owned by them, the names are the property of the clan mothers or *Oyaner*, "good women", also the seeds and the fields, the longhouses and everything in them are the property of the *Iakón:kwe* "queens" (Johansen and Mann 2000, p. 106). The rite of passage was originally shared in the creation story, and as such reveals how important it is to maintain and continue these to the youth for they contain the seeds of the future.

Bear explains it this way:

““It happened in Skyworld,” she said. “An uncle takes his sister’s children when he realized that they were children of destiny...so he set them aside from the rest and put them under the husk,” covering them the way corn ears are swathed in their husks, because they were destined to fulfill a prophecy.

“In our language we call corn *o’he:ra* which means ‘it’s fully husked,’ ” said Bear. “It’s not until the corn is ripe that you begin to peel back the layers of husk to get to the regenerative seed. When our children hit puberty, we begin to pull back the layers and equip them with knowledge about who they are. A big part of Ohero:kon is to offer them knowledge about their creation story so they can understand the genesis of ourselves . . . so they know who they are before they become influenced by other people.” (as recorded in Indian Country Today 2017).

The American Indian Institute provided funding and support for the initiative-ceremony which although started up more than 15 years ago, has since 2014 given yearly grants to the effort. According to an unnamed Kanien’kehá:ka elder involved in the program, the purpose and results of the program are profound, highlighting the unique benefits gained by their *o’he:ra*:

There is a place over the bridge down near the river, my granddaughter goes there, a place where young people are honored and respected. They go to this place from other reservations, to learn about the natural world, and learn to live comfortably on Mother Earth. They are given guidance by their aunts and uncles; they are given challenges, to learn and to grow in the old Indian way; they express love and appreciation for creation. They sing songs and dance in the firelight. And they also spend time alone. They fast while thinking about what they really

want out of their lives. They think about what's really important to them  
(Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development 2014).

In a film about the revived ceremony *Ohero:kon: Under the Husk* (2016) producer Katsitsini Fox explains the significance of it all in her eyes after the filming of the rites in action and its effect upon the community, saying,

I think that going through this process makes them better human beings. . . Being out there in the woods, they are connected to creation and it really makes them appreciate all the things that help you to live. . . . You look at modern society today and what do we do for young people? We have a sweet 16 party and give them cars. What are we teaching them? (as quoted in Fox 2016).

*Kahsenakohe*, one of the two women featured in the film explained her understanding out of the experience of the rites of passage to be “about really connecting with mother earth, and connecting with yourself, and finding that person that you want to be in your life” (Akwasasne TV 2016 “Ohero:kon “Under the Husk”). In a Q&A session held at Concordia University after a screening of the film in January of 2018, Katsitsionni Fox spoke about how “we still have alot of our teachings”, yet also “as a Native person I always hear that, you know, we had things taken away from us, like our language, like our land, like our ceremonies” which is true to a point, but as Fox points out, we are survivors (Cinema Politica Concordia 2018). Part of this may be because the colonizer is the one who has lost so much, or perhaps because they have taken so much and hold it captive in their museums, private collections, and is part of their own identity. Further, and more importantly she explains the reason she made the film which was that “we have that power to get that back. So we have the power inside of us to bring back our

ceremonies even if they haven't been practiced for a hundred years. That knowledge is in our DNA and it can come back out". The idea of genetic memory isn't new, but we are using new terminology for it, like "in our DNA". Many people have used the term "in our blood" in order to identify one of these traditional sources, but we must be careful that we don't draw from tainted imperial blood theories such as white supremacist and anti-blackness, patriarchal and misogynistic theories. As Kim Tallbear (2013) states:

Like many other Americans, we are transitioning in Indian Country away from blood talk to speaking in terms of what "is coded in our DNA" or our "genetic memory." But we do it in a very particular social and historical context, one that entangles genetic information in a web of known family relations, reservation histories, and tribal and federal-government regulations (p. 4).

Also called "ancestral memory", it is sometimes not a specific identifier or coded relationship. Many are not referring to any specific way of remembrance but any kind of internal memory. Relatedly, the Lakotan concept of *mitakuye oyasin* "all our relatives", has become another byword, which when taken out of its linguistic, cultural and actual kinship contexts becomes a watered-down framework, nebulous in its meaning. It's not that there is nothing to these concepts, however, we must be cautious always of adopting the easiest or simplest idea because it's convenient.

Like Louise Bear, David Risling Jr.'s sister Lois Risling was another one of these special people. An artist and innovator, a visionary and leader, Lois helped reignite the puberty rites for coming of age women in her community at Hoopa beginning in 1994, of which the Flower Dance was revived as a public coming of age ceremony for women in May of 2001 (p. 12, Risling-Baldy 2017). Cutcha Risling-Baldy, her daughter, credits her

grandmother Viola and her mother Lois Risling, but also her grandfather for bringing the ceremony to her. The ceremony was not simply derived from ancestral or genetic memory, from in the archives of blood or DNA, but rather her mother and others “would pour over anthropological records and sit with elders, gather with the other women and recall the songs my mother’s grandfather had taught her” (p. vi). Risling-Baldy (2015) explains that the connection between imperial, Christian and patriarchal education was a destructive force upon the Hoopa people and valley:

The post invasion assimilation efforts of the government were particularly directed towards regulating Native women and their bodies. Boarding schools tried to control Indian women and normalize the practices of violence against and surveillance of their bodies. This is precisely why the Flower Dance represented such an important point of resistance for Hoopa people. And one reason why it was targeted for eradication (p. 12).

David Risling’s father Su-Wohrom, a leader in the community and founder of the Indian Rights Defense Association, who was the grandfather of Lois Risling, stood up against these schools as he led an effort to take over the boarding school and take over the school board which was dominated by whites, which they did, creating a new kind of education for Hoopa and Karuk youth (Risling quoted in Argus 1977, p. 2). Lois Risling’s (1980) story reveals many layers and lessons gained along the way, through ancestors and family relationships, through key experiences like the occupation of Alcatraz and D-QU sites, but also, from deep within herself. Education is about bringing forth that which is within us already and which connects us to the world already created and to our most ancient and embedded relations. Her own perspective of education she explains was shaped by all

these factors such that when asked “If I was a school teacher, what would I do?” she simply responded with, “I would not teach” (p. 66). What do you mean, aren’t we supposed to teach people what we know? She clarifies that

I would allow my kids to learn because Indian children are not taught, they learn. And one of the things I said then, and that I still say now is that when a person is trying to get an Indian child to learn, he takes that child and allows it to develop the knowledge inside of itself. Let that knowledge come out. Every child, every person has some natural ability (ibid).

In other words, every child is gifted. Every child has it within themselves to become only one thing, themselves. Their potential is unique and special. This potential, has the power to destroy and create. It also is a renewable resource, for each new generation has new potentialities. Forbes (1997) once said, “we can have new visions”, but in order to have new visions, we must give our youth a foundation from which to walk upon so that these visions can manifest themselves continuously rather than as hippie-culture and the drug-inducing world have perpetuated in the idea of “tripping out” and “getting high” (p. 247). Forbes (1991) also said that “I think the only thing we can do is to try and establish the opportunity for people to be free and to follow a spiritual path. But, we cannot do it for them. And we can’t tell them how to do it” (Forbes with Hogle 1991; Forbes 1997).

Whilst medicinal and powerful plant allies are often important mediators in traditional communities quest for wisdom and power, they are always utilized in the context of ceremony, and structured around a community support system rather than as “individual” experiments. A related question might be framed as “can we have new ceremonies?” yet as we see from the work being done at Hoopa, Akwesasne, Tyendinaga, Grand River and



elsewhere, this is not the right question either. We can have new ceremonies, and we can have our old ceremonies renewed. The real question is then, will our education efforts support our new visions, our new ceremonies as well as our old visions, and our old ceremonies? Are they responsible to the community so that we can entrust schools and educational institutions to not corrupt them, to sell them as products to a new age market, to not turn them into purchased curriculum packets? Without community control over every aspect of education, we cannot be sure about the outcomes of institutionalization and in every case, we must be weary to incorporate what we hold sacred into these settings. But on the other hand, why do we let our children attend institutions which we do not control and which might turn them into the very monsters our stories warn us about? Is this because of powerlessness, as whites, Christians, even the lead singer of Pink Floyd, have pulled their children out of public schools because they knew they were not getting the kind of education they felt they deserved. In this way, our educational systems also must be transformed into institutions of healing as much as they are institutions of learning. For healing is one of the absolute necessities of which most schools deprive our youth of as they are forced into a system of trauma and abuse, neglect and terror, of exploitation and persecution, of brainwashing and fear-based value traditions, foreign foods and rigid fence lines. People might say this is an extreme exaggeration of schools today, but, like democracy, where is the proof that its working, that students are coming out as loving, respectful, and empowered people? Where is the proof that Native, Chicano and Black youth are returning to their communities? Where is the proof that schools are doing anything other than socializing them into a racist, imperialist, women-hating, earth-destroying matrix of relationships, one that actually

rewards this kind of behavior rather than condones it? Could it be that the education system, and imperial schools and churches are doing the opposite of what they say they are doing, and instead are providing a kind of rites of passage into a society based on killing, theft, lying, greed, avarice, terror, torture, deceit, and destruction? Doesn't this have so much to do with an entire way of life, a way of being, a religion, a system, and its concomitant behavior that cannot be separated or distilled? This stands in stark contrast to the actions of an embroiled war machine today which Forbes (2002d) poem written about "Bush's Six Day War" explains it this way,

"And it's all the same

over the world

and young men

are trained to die

in old men's wars. . . .

Human sacrifice

for a state power

a test of manhood

a rite of passage" (pp. 1-2).

Indeed, this is one of the primary avenues our young and brave leaders have gone through instead of traditional rites of passage, as well as through white or whitened educational structures. Denetdale (2009) once asked Deloria Jr. why this was the case, why so many Native youth go off to fight for U.S. wars abroad, and he suggested it was in the vain hope that the U.S. would live up to the treaty promises of protection, trust relations and responsibilities, such as support for higher education (pps. 133-134). However, is this a

direct route back to community and do these avenues actually support National resurgence and deimperialization or do they bind us each individually and collectively to the growth of empire and the empire way of life? Many leaders such as John Trudell, Dave Risling Jr., Lehman Brightman and others served in the U.S. military yet it seems there was a core, an original vision and potentiality, their own path and giftedness which helped them make the transition back into community life and struggles that the military experience could not take away. These are, however, are the lucky survivors, not the rule.

One of the key points Forbes makes over and over again with regards to education is that a new vision is the result of the visionaries connection to the great creative power (*ketchi manitou*). In this same paradigm, giftedness is the result of a person's connection to themselves, their ancestors, their traditions, and the spiritually imbued universe, which has given them life and constantly provides the gifts or blessings that maintain life. Forbes (2003) says about this entire dependent construct, and its relationship to education:

It is safe to say, I think, that Native American peoples have generally believed that the Creator or Creative Power ("God") and other sources of spiritual knowledge have been communicating with human beings for tens of thousands of years and that Grandfather--Grandmother have given us many prophets, messengers, teachers, guides, and elders with gifts of ceremonies, songs, prayers, rituals, way of healing, etcetera, all of value, all to be respected, and all offering paths of spiritual knowledge. Thus each nation, clan, group, family may have its own messages from the Creator and all are equally to be respected, since every

people are “signs” of the Creator’s work and all have had messages from the creator.

So while environmental education and place-based education provide one kind of opportunity, to learn on the land, often they are detached culturally, from the community, from the stories, ceremonies and economy of life which supports life. Bound together, we must “look to the mountain” as Cajete (1994) was reminded as a youth by his elders, for the mountain has power, wisdom, strength, and is the source of life. Yet many may be still on the fence about whether schools can do this work, that is, if they can provide a spiritual education, can train leaders, can teach indigenous languages, traditions and ideas, let alone support traditional vision processes or be places of healing, health and life-supporting activity. Cajete (1994) reminds us of the crossroads we are facing when he advocates superbly what this means in terms of enacting this in education:

The potential of teaching for vision and engaging students in the creative process of visioning is literally revolutionary in its implications for contemporary education. Through facilitating the understanding of their dreams and conditioning them for the creative process of visioning, we allow students an avenue for learning that capitalizes on one of the most basic and ancient contexts for developing self-knowledge. This would require a complete restructuring or what we now know as the school. Whether or not this can become a reality in the institutions of mainstream American education is debatable. But for Indian people and Tribally controlled schools, a contemporary expression of this concept would seem essential. The reintroduction of such a process into Indian education would allow Indian people to cultivate in themselves the efficacy of Tribal modes of

knowing and understanding. It would be a culturally based methodology whose principles are recognized and applied in traditional Tribal settings where visioning rituals still exist. The difference would be only in the nature or the approaches used: that is, the Tribal setting focuses on 'Tribally specific ritual and values, while a school version would focus only on universals and views using combinations or tools and appropriate media Indian young people need to be given opportunities to learn again how to live through vision and reconnect their contemporary lives with that of their Tribal heritage. By living through vision, young people learn how to reconnect with and honor their own nature; they learn how to live a life in touch with their individual creative sources. They learn to live life purposefully and understand life and education as a process toward becoming complete (pps. 147-148).

Perhaps we need to change the name of what we do as educators such as how many of the immersion programs today have relinquished the Greco-Roman tradition of being “schools” but rather like Hawaiian efforts have taken on new names and are formed out of traditional educational paradigms such as *Pūnana Leo* “voice nest”, or in Dinétah we find *Tséhootsooi Diné Bi’Ólta* “Navajo House of Learning at the Meadow Between the Rocks”, while in Ganienkeh there is *Karihwanoron Kanienkeha Owenna Tsi Ionteriwaienstahkwa* “Our Precious Things, Mohawk Language Immersion Home”, and among Anishinaabe at *Waadookodaading* “A place where people help each other”. All of these efforts focus on the heart of the community through the language (history, stories, relationships, language-rich activities) and are some of the many examples of the ways we can reimagine education today (see Pease 2003 for a summary of immersion

education). We can have new visions. We can create not simply sectarian “schools” or holding tanks for an imperialist, racist, capitalist and patriarchal dunking project (Pratt’s immersion model). We can “do Carlisle in reverse”, from atop the mountain, we can drain the Mush Hole’s swamp, we can plant new seeds of love where fear, greed and terror once existed.

Every people originally had a practice of recognizing the unique individual, their coming of age whereby they would become full-fledged adults and primary contributors and caretakers of community and tradition, and finally, an approach to seeking a vision for their life which would result in them following a guided pathway of power. For the Lakota, the *hanbleceya* “crying for a vision” rite was performed for young men while the *Isnati Awicalowanpi* “they sing over her menses” was performed for women (Black Elk 1953; Powers 1980). The Diné still perform the *Kinaaldá* for young women and men, however, the men’s ceremony which is more private and familial rather than communal is less demonstrable in its survival (Frisbie 1993; Shepardson 1995; Schwarz 1997; Lee 2013). One of the more unique coming of age ceremonies local to where I grew up practiced by the Payomkawichum involves numerous aspects that other communities share however it is distinctly their own way. The women’s ceremony was not practiced by the time Villiana Calac Hyde (1994) was coming of age in the 1920’s and she reported to never have seen either the boys or girls ceremony performed in her lifetime and instead only received stories from her mother (pps. 269-273). The boys ceremony seems to have lasted longer and may or may not be still practiced as is the case with many ceremonies today, perhaps it might just be lying dormant or performed in private or underground. Boscana (1846), Stedman (1908) and Du Bois (1908) provide the most complete outlines

available while Harrington's notes to Boscana's text provides insight into how it was perceived by the most recent of informants in the 1930' and 1940's (Boscana 1934). The rites of passage provide a unique southern California, place-based example, one which treads precariously close to the limits of what's possible in the community and what is possible via educational institutions detached from community life.

What can we learn from the traditional rites of passage for Payomkawichum boys to adulthood? To summarize, boys who came of age were brought together as a group and were ritually bathed. The ceremonies were led by elder initiates and *pu'l* or medicine people of power. They would gather the people together around a central fire with two opposing camps at the *wamkich* which are traditional ceremonial open-faced houses, one for each of the distinct aspects of the rites. Boscana says the "ant ordeal" was performed second while Du Bois says it came first, whereas Sparkman omits it completely. The whole ceremony would last three to five days. In "the ant ordeal" the initiate boys would be buried in a pit full of ants to test their strength, and upon emerging after given permission to do so, they would be whipped with nettles (which feels similar to the ant bites). The other part of the rite involved the youth being presented to a ceremonial fire, and guided by the leaders who prepared a ceremonial drink of *náqtamush/nuktamush* or *mááni/mani*, what is known in Nahuatl as *toloachatl*, and in Spanish as *toloache* and *datura*, in English as "jimsonweed", and Latin as *datura stramonium*. They would be exhorted to pay attention to everything, to remain in a state of fasting during the entire time of its influence upon them and to pray for a vision or visitation by ancestors, a creature of power or spirit power. This would last often more than a day and they would be required to dance until they could no longer do so and then would enter a rich sleep-

dream-vision precipitated by the drinking of the powerful *náqtamush* of which they would come under its influence. Upon their waking they would continue to be counseled and share what they had seen or experienced to the elders in charge, sometimes more than a day would pass by. They would perform other rites such as the rope-jumping ceremony and the whole ordeal would end with a ground painting (some say sandpainting) which depicted their entire universe and from which the neophytes would be explained their place in it, how to live a good life, the rules and laws of the people, and what do with their visions such as if they were given powers to be healers. *Náqtamush* is considered one of the most potent, and deadly of medicines available, even in small quantities, from which specific plants were carefully selected by the elder initiate leaders and similarly, carefully administered. This ceremony, or one like it was performed also by many neighboring groups such as the Acjachemen, Tongva, Cahuilla, Kumeyaay and in variations throughout California and is one of the few places *náqtamush* was ceremonially used with any regularity. One informant provided Sparkman provided a generic sermon which shared the following important life prescriptions that were culturally-relevant to Payomkawichum based on his own literal translation, which contains messaging related to the symbolic universe seen in the ground painting and as prescribed and passed down by their elder-leaders:

See these, these are alive, this is bear panther; these are going to catch you if you are not good and do not respect your elder relations and grown up people. And if you do not believe, these are going to kill you; but if you do believe, everybody is going to see your goodness, and you then will kill bear panther. And you will gain fame and be praised; and your name will be heard everywhere. ... See this, this is



going to splinter you, this is going to give notice what you do, this is going to see you, this is going to know if you have bad thoughts. And if you marry, you will not approach your wife when she is menstruating. The rattlesnake is going to bite you, the stick is going to splinter you, consumption is going to catch you, the earth and sky are going to see if you do anything bad. Listen to this speech and you will grow up and become old. And you will think well of your elder relations, and they will say of you: He is good, whose son is he? In this manner you will counsel your sons and daughters. And if a bear or panther will wish to catch you, they will not overtake you. And if a rattlesnake or black-spider should bite you, you will not die. But if you are heedless and a despiser, right there you will die. And your spirit (heart) will not rise to the north, or your soul (*towish*) to the sky (pps. 223-224).

A similar speech would be given to Nahua youth at their own coming of age explaining *tlamaniliztli* “custom or rules of the people” and as related by Leon-Portilla’s (1988) translation of one such transcription originally found in the *huehuetlatolli* “old speech [book]” it is a pronouncement of the “ancient rule[s] for living” (p. 146). Many versions are found scattered in various Indigenous rooted texts such as the *Cantares Mexicanos*, *Codice Florentino*, and elsewhere. They all admonish the young neophyte, the new adult, the future elders, with advice to “live the good life”, such as the following examples translated by Leon-Portilla (1988):

Act! Cut wood, work the land, plant cactus, sow maguey; you shall have drink, food, clothing. With this you shall stand straight, with this you shall live. For this you shall be spoken of, praised; in this manner you will show yourself to your

parents and relatives. Someday you shall tie yourself to a skirt and blouse. What will she eat? What will she drink? Is she going to live off the air? You are the support, the remedy; you are the eagle, the tiger (p. 148).

And another example:

Receive this word, listen to this word. I hope that for a little time you will live with Our Lord, he who is master of the Close Vicinity [reference to *Tlohque Nuahke*, “Of the Near and Far”]. Live on earth, I hope you will last for a little time. Do you know much? With good judgement, look at things, observe them wisely. It is said that is a place of hardship, of filth, of troubles. It is a place without pleasure, dreadful, which brings desolation.

There is nothing true here . . . . Here is how you must work and act; safely kept, in a locked place the elders left us these words at the time of their departure. Those of the white hair and wrinkled faces, our ancestors. . . .They did not come here to be arrogant; they were not seeking; they were not greedy. They were such that they were highly esteemed on earth; they came to be eagles and tigers (p. 149).

The traditional narratives in Cham’teela and Nahuatl bear a strong resemblance to each other linguistically and conceptually such as in the use of an admonishment style rite, similarly couplet-conceptions of the universe and the focus upon attaining goodness, becoming steady providers, and towards future eldership. These are however completely distinct peoples, local to specific places and knowledge traditions, and continuously developing within their own unique contexts and relationships. It is clear however that we cannot possibly ever live in a self-contained bubble, and must recognize the ancient connections amongst peoples, the shared and differentiated features of each people, and

the continuous transformation and development of peoples not within a linear trajectory or progressive hierarchy but according to their own sense of social change (Champagne 2007). Indeed, while Nahua speakers number in the hundreds of thousands, there are possibly only a handful of master speakers of Cham'teela, who at the turn of the century as reported by Hyde who was of the most replete and knowledgeable elder of her generation consistently lamented that her people's traditions and way of life was lost, gone, irrecoverable. But, perhaps her trauma and loss were so great that she could not foresee a recovery in any comparable sense to what she experienced as a child when she was of the last of her people to be totally immersed in her language and traditions (Hyde and Elliot 1994). She did however pass on the torch and the work of Pechanga with the support of Dr. Eric Elliott who apprenticed with Hyde for over a decade in order to learn the language, have brought the language back to the people and to the youth through many educational avenues such as the *Pechanga Chámmakilawish School* and college-credit courses on and off local reservations.

How can educational efforts among southern California peoples possibly revitalize or support such a rich socialization and ritualistic experience among current or future youth, which served a tremendously valuable role in bringing youth directly into connection with the spirit world, with their power, vision and pathway, into the depths of their embodied strength and fortitude, and impressed upon them the most significant teachings and guidelines of their power as they embarked on their new role as full-fledged adults who now must bear all the responsibilities of the parent generation and become caretakers and producers of life and life-giving products (food, water, shelter, security, etc.)? Du Bois predicted that the ceremony had not been performed since the

1850's, but yet its description is extant, however recognizably dangerous if in the wrong hands. As a youth, I witnessed numerous individuals to have taken *toloache* without any of the cultural mores, traditions, ceremony, support, guidance or administration from learned elders, and they all suffered, if not died or become irreparably damaged from the experience. Key aspects of the rite such as the learning of the ceremonial songs, the use of the sacred powerful plant-medicine, the preparatory knowledge and communal support, the use of ceremonial structures and objects of power, the use of ceremonial language, and the perceived functions and use of the vision and power coming out of the initiates may all be limiting factors for today's community revitalization and implementation via current educational models and efforts.

Although I've purposely left out many of the details of the rites, I note also that nothing has come close to replacing in any substantial way the ceremonial tradition which was the norm among these peoples. A middle or high school graduation is nothing compared to this. A hazing ritual of mass alcohol or drug consumption will never equal the power gained through this kind of stamina-rich and ritualistically power-centered experience. A new job is not a rite of passage into life as much as it is into a system of exploitation, where selling our bodies (labor, time, products) is a paramount concept absent in any traditional rite. Joining the military is incomparable as the rite involves a personal quest for knowledge of self and other, for spiritual power, vision and a pathway, and is a cultural incubation and honoring ceremony which recognizes the person as a new adult member with responsibilities and relations of supreme importance, let alone the probable or intimate encounters with death, with the mystery, with greater powers or spirits who instead demand a humble, peaceful petition. It is unclear for example if any of

the tribally-controlled education efforts found are setting their children up to participate in such a rite, new or old, in any comparative fashion or otherwise supporting a cultural renaissance as such outside of speaking the language and learning basic cultural knowledge. Thus, while education efforts seem to be promoted often as revolutionary or transformative, we must always look towards the future generations way of living and back towards the ancestral ways which provide a map of how to live a good life. Some might wonder what use this would have in our world today. But I ask the age-old question in response: did we ever leave the old world behind, or merely are content to ignore its daily signs, its veritable and valuable existence? With obvious reasons from other communities who continue or to perform for instance the rigorous Sundance rites among many different groups, the vision seeking ceremonies, the flower dance, the *kinaaldá*, and other rites of passage or coming of age ceremonies, it is clear that every community has the same need to recognize and honor their youth, to promote their lifelong journey as adults into elderhood, to recognize their gifts, powers, visions and purpose, and to make education work for their total survival. Key aspects of the ceremony are obviously lacking today such as trained leader-elders, medicine people, perhaps also ceremonial knowledge, linguistic knowledge, community support, plant knowledge and access to ceremonial sites, objects and ideas. It is clear from the revitalization efforts that have been successful, from the perpetuation of traditional rites, and the founding of new educational institutions and endeavors that leadership, especially in the form of tradition-bearing elders and knowledge keepers is imperative for any rebirth to succeed.

Cajete (1994) summarizes his original treatise on indigenous education and concludes:

Leadership in and of itself was never a goal of Indigenous education but rather a result of living in community and striving toward becoming complete. Traditional learning was always geared toward understanding and applying what was useful and beneficial. Indigenous community was predicated on the perception that all things can be useful, and the qualities of being useful and beneficial intertwine. These perceptions imply reciprocity, support, benefit, purpose, and vision. These perspectives combined with an ingrained love for one's people and orientation to act for the good of the people formed the foundation for the expression and development of Indigenous leaders. Leadership was a role that had to be earned in Indigenous community. It was earned by achieving a level of integrity that was irreproachable (p. 175).

The primary purpose in Forbes mind of "higher education" or what he calls "specialized education" is to create successful community-rooted leaders, or the people who will ignite the fires of tomorrow. There were many other reasons identified to form an Indian University such as the need to create Teachers, Artists, Social Workers, Historians, Coaches, Doctors, etc.. There are now many Indian community members who are college-educated, and perhaps possess doctorates or other kinds of specialized degrees in their fields. But do they have vision? His original proposals suggested that white, male, Christian, and western scientific dominated institutions might complete the task of college training and specialization, but they might also cause students to "have abandoned their people in favor of living among non-Indians" among other issues (p. 1).

This is because most all institutions are not “Indian-controlled” or “Indian-centered”, two stipulations which formed the foundation of the Native American Studies and Tribal College and University movements in the 1960’s. Now today, we have many such institutions. Even the federal government has created higher education institutions supposedly for this purpose such as at Haskell Indian Nations University, the Institute for American Indian Arts, and Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute, and to a lesser or lower extent, the transformed boarding school Sherman Indian Institute into Sherman Indian High School. All while there are at least 24 in Canada and 39 higher education institutions in the U.S., with a few also now defunct such as D-Q University and Comanche Nation College to name a few. Other institutions were started for Chicanos as a group, such as the Universidad de Aztlan, La Academia de la Nueva Raza, and Colegio Cesar Chavez to name a few, and all of which are now defunct. These institutions were “Chicano-controlled” and “Chicano-centered”, for the purpose of creating critical minded Chicano leaders in the Chicano community. A number of k-12 schools exist also that perceive the needs identified by Forbes yet do not specifically feed into any higher education institution outside of their own tribal colleges, which are primarily community or junior college level institutions. Thus, they do not produce “leaders” in the sense Forbes is speaking of, or those who are performing research, are trained to become the new teachers, let alone teachers of teachers or wise elders. When Forbes (1969d) argued for an American Indian University he hoped it would do what other universities such as HBCU’s had done for Black leadership development, saying, it:

would be geared specifically to the needs, values and experiences of tribal Americans. It would be designed to train leaders to live and function in a tribal

society. It would in some respects be similar to the “freedom schools” being established in Mississippi by SNCC workers but might also partake of a character similar to Howard University or other, more orthodox, Negro approaches to self-development. For example, there is a great need for the development of grass-roots Indian leaders who are familiar with Constitutions, Federal, and State laws as it relates to tribes, and who have acquired some basic knowledge regarding political organization, strategy, and tactics. Other leaders need to become familiar with the problems of organizing cooperatives, and with the marketing of goods. These, and many other subjects, could be taught in a few weeks of intensive study and discussion (p. 522).

Yet, are these institutions completing their mission? Is it merely enough to train upcoming leaders for work within a Tribal or Chicano or Black community? What if the prospect of having a community at all is at stake, are we training leaders for survival or to simply fill a position imagined by the educational institution whether this is what’s needed or not? Are our communities even sustainable anymore or do our graduates need to focus upon this aspect in the prime?

One problem with many of the TCU’s is that they do not provide a specialized education, but rather a generalized higher education. Only Oglala Lakota College, Sinte Gleska University, Sitting Bull College, Navajo Technical University, and IAIA provide graduate level work in the U.S. and none of them offer a Ph.D. in any discipline. While these institutions do provide a more specialized education, they do not produce their own instructor-leaders, nor do they do doctoral level research, which are key in Forbes mind as to whether these institutions are fulfilling the total needs of a developing society which



is capable of solving its own problems. Thus, we might stretch Forbes thinking from Authentic Teaching to Authentic Educational Leadership so that we are concerned with leaders who are problem-solvers rather than problem-makers, vision-seekers and makers, as many specialists perform roles afterwards as functionaries of despots, greedy corporations, destructive public policies and colonial style social institutions. For example, one can study sustainable ecological knowledge from a Native American perspective or Chicano perspective at many institutions today, yet nearly all of these institutions are exploiters of their own lands through entrenchment in the imperial power grid and nexus of relationships. I believe we would be hard pressed to find courses on Diné or Lakota liberation, or courses speaking about divestment from destructive energy structures from none of the STEM degrees available across the U.S.. Most of our educational stratagems and degree programs revolve around participation in systems of exploitation, where if we are to use the words of Forbes, are pimps for imperial power structures, corporate futures, and a desiccated mother earth. The contradictory nature of our programs must be at the root of our educational policies and practices. Leaders would take these positions and in turn bring forth powerful paradigm shifts, would aid in the organization and communication of students, teachers and community, and otherwise, challenge the status quo's at every available juncture and nexus. Part of problem is the foundation, the vision, the mission and organization of any institution must clearly articulate how and what it will be, not simply for accreditation purposes, but in light of the real struggles communities face today, namely, imperialist, white-supremacist, capitalist patriarchy and the needs of students to receive healing support, healthy learning

approaches, and the revitalization of endogenous traditions which support community total survival.

For example, only a few TCU's offers a Tribal-centric Science degree as found at Northwest Indian College. Not a single TCU offers a People-centric sustainable economics degree. Not a single TCU has a Linguistics degree dedicated to Language Revitalization or an Education degree aimed at reforming the National school system. Yes, there are many persons, separate programs, courses, etc.. but these are drops in the bucket compared to the weight of the issues at stake. In 1969 when Alcatraz was occupied by students and community, Forbes had developed a course which his graduate student Steve Talbot was teaching entitled American Indian Liberation that came on the heels of recently forming the organization United Native Americans in 1968 alongside soon to be Alcatraz leaders such as Stella Leach and LaNada Means (Boyer) (Talbot 2015, p. xv; Forbes 1994e, p. 128). These were catalysts for what transpired on the rock as much as the San Francisco Indian Center's community work (which had recently burned down in October of 1969), or the Black Power, Red Power and Chicano Power movements activities. Forbes was a visionary leader and a catalyst in his own right. Local foci on problems, on taking action, on plausible solutions, must form the foundations not only of courses, but also of leadership at educational institutions. One of the first steps Forbes and others set to their many tasks after starting the UC Davis Native American Studies program in the Fall of 1969 was in the "liberating" of unused spaces, specifically, an army barracks looking set of buildings in the old Aggie village which would become the new Tecumseh Center, the central organizing space of the new program, a precedent they had set already at UC Berkeley (Forbes 1994e, p. 127; Risling 1975, pps. 2-3).

Forbes, Brightman, Boyer, Risling and others were empowered with their needs and visions and found ways to move upon enacting them, with or without permission. In this case, they located the buildings and moved in and then told the university afterwards what they had done, leaving them no choice in the matter. Alcatraz similarly was occupied out of sheer will and determination, not by asking for permission. The Black Panther Party's survival programs such as the free breakfast effort, the Ideological Institute, and its highly developed and original copwatch were all created out of sheer will and determination, as there was hardly continuous or stable funding ever, and it was out of the vision and leadership of Huey P. Newton and Bobby Seale. The CIEA, D-QU, and UCD NAS were equally created out of such visionary and knowledgeable leaders. When D-QU was founded in 1971, it was originally envisioned that it would train leaders and practitioners of the highest quality, who would in turn serve community, authentically, faithfully, and could make the changes necessary to improve the lives of everyone involved. A number of significant ideas were planned for the campus from the very beginning, including the creation of four interwoven colleges that represented the cornerstone of their educational leadership development program, which Forbes (1971e) describes in an early advertisement for the university to include:

DEGANAWIDAH, with [an] emphasis on Indian Studies, culture and law and named after the founder of the Iroquois Federation, Six Nations;

QUETZALCOATL, with [an] emphasis on Mexican Studies, culture and law; a vocational school; and CARLOS MONTEZUMA MEDICAL SCHOOL, named for an Indian physician (p. 9).

Thus, we see from the very beginning, this was a University, not a community college, and was dreamed of to be a major center for advanced learning, teaching and leadership. Within its first few years it had enrolled a number of Masters level students to train and aid in the development of the doctoral program it had proposed, which was called the D-QU Center for Advanced Research, but again, this vision was deflected from in order to focus upon “concrete conditions” and the realities of resistance, internal and external to these ideas (Forbes 1980b, p. 80). He explains that these conditions consisted of, first, the issue of accreditation based on the terms of the deed and insistence of federal government and accrediting agencies which they did not receive until 1977 through WASC as a community college. Second, was the issue of funding of which most white agencies, centers and institutions refused to support them and thus they ended up focusing on federal funds (which were not forthcoming either). Third, was the lack of funding from or support from religious institutions. Fourth, as he explains:

the Federal government since Nixon’s 1972 electoral victory has turned away from the support of grassroots-controlled programs of all kinds. DQU has, in addition, suffered as a specific target of anti-“militant” policies directed at the American Indian Movement. It seems very likely that DQU has been “black-balled” by most Federal agencies (p. 81).

Fifth, “most powerful Indians are themselves linked to the colonial system and are very much afraid of DQU. It is clear that some of them have used their positions to block grants to the university” although he does not name any names at this point (ibid). An unpublished tract on D-QU’s struggle “David Versus Goliath, Again” written by Forbes in the mid-1980’s pursued this issue further after they were taken to court by the feds and

learned even more how bad they were despised, targeted and attacked. Forbes concluded “the main thrust of what I have found is that even without access to all of the internal government memos and secret reports, a picture of conspiracy emerges, a conspiracy to consistently deny the legal rights of D-QU” (D-334, B. 4). Thus, even visionary leaders cannot singlehandedly battle a raging giant out to destroy them. All educational endeavors, great or small require a community and circle of support, something D-QU obviously lacked as it was an international institution that was not invested into by any single or multiplicity of communities unlike other tribal colleges. Forbes underestimated this aspect and assumed that there was enough individual Indian leaders and visionaries, educators and activists who would support and defend them. One aspect of the need of any educational institution is not only visionaries and leaders, but it is also a healthy community, students, instructors, administration and environment. Further, this is a perpetual need that goes beyond a one-time effort for even the hardest of persons, prophets and spirit powers, as exhibited in our traditional stories, as people always are in need of healing and their health to succeed.

### *Education for Healing*

Forbes was not alone in his critique of the craziness, the sickness, the psychosis, the schizophrenia and madness that we find everywhere we look today. Cajete (2000) refers to a Tewa saying of his grandma and community of Santa Clara pueblo, *pin geh heh*, or the condition of split-mindedness (pps. 186-188). In reflection upon this as an educator, he says, “I do not consider myself successful in the teaching process unless I can at least begin the process of healing this split” (p. 187). For Cajete, “teaching is a way

of healing and a way of life” (ibid.). Forbes (1980b) remarked that many of those who came to attend D-Q University were as much in need of healing and loving support than “schooling”, book-learning, or manual skill training. Forbes (1991) shared in his interview with Lois Crozier-Hogle what his big dreams were, his great hope was,

You see a good bit of difference between Indians who have come to realize that they have to be spokespeople for the earth, that they have to be involved in creating things of beauty, that we cannot just sit back and ignore all of the problems that we have been talking about. I think that a part of the rehabilitation process for Indian people is becoming involved in a spiritual movement, in traditional movements, and in working with non-Indians to save the earth. I think it is very important for Indians to do that. (BANC MSS 98/144).

Forbes (1991) consistently pointed towards our own power to heal, and where this power comes from which he considered to be connected to our inspirited existence, or what Cajete (1994) has called the “ensoulment of nature” for we are creatures of an all-pervasive nature. For this reason,

I think that Indian people feel that they play an important role in the maintenance in the wellbeing of mother earth and of other living creatures. I think that they believe that through ceremonies as well as individual thoughts and actions that they can contribute to the beauty and harmony of the world. And that is a healing force. In other words, when you have good thoughts and good prayers and you think of that which is good, you will behave good. And you will put out influence around you that will affect other living things. So you, yourself, are a source of power. Power is found in everything, potentiality. But you, yourself, are

potentiality. And so, what you do is important. If we do evil, that will have its influence. And if we do good, that will have its influence. And it begins with your thoughts. It begins within you. What you expect to do in terms of your inner feelings is extremely important. In other words you can't go out and just pretend you are going to be it holy. You can't pretend that you are going to be good. You have got to feel it inside (BANC MS 98).

Forbes (1973) attended a colloquium focusing on issues in education for Chicanos and chose to highlight the struggles of D-QU at the time. In this regard, he shared the reality that a majority of the students who were attending the school came with a swelling of baggage gained from their predominant living contexts.

Most of the students at DQU are drawn from the barrio, from the fields, from the urban Indian communities, or from the most oppressed sectors of the rural communities, thus most of our students therefore when they come to DQU are not middle class oriented, they have very little middle class background. Many have very severe social problems when they come to DQU, in terms perhaps of drug use, alcoholism, [inaudible] like fighting, quick to anger, and use violence to try to settle disputes, things like that. But DQU is not an artificial setting. DQU is very much like the communities from which the people come, and this has meant that all the problems that one faces in the community, one faces on the campus at DQU. All the hassles, the hang ups that have to be overcome in the real world, have to be overcome at DQU (D-046, B. 191, F. "SEPA Chicano Colloquium Series Number One").

This rightly could be the same as any of our schools. This was the case at SIPI, at the Native American Community Academy, with the American Indian Recruitment sites I worked at, at Sherman Indian High School, in the barrio schools I've taught and worked in and elsewhere. Thus our educational efforts cannot simply "teach" students as if they come from or live in healthy environments, families, communities and contexts.

Education must be part of a healing process which brings forth all of these issues so that a person can overcome them, not simply "move beyond them" without facing them. At D-QU, there was a Sundance held yearly after 1975, there was a well-used sweat-lodge or more properly an *inipi*. At UC Davis, the Native American Studies program has consistently pushed for students to have access to counseling beyond academics. The Vermont farmer, author and visionary Thomas Berry (1988) once remarked that "the primary educator, as well as the primary law giver and primary healer would be the natural world itself" (p. 79). Yupiaq educational leader Oscar Kawagley and Ray Barnhardt (1999) argues that among their own people this was common knowledge, especially in their extreme Arctic living environments where life and death decision-making was required of youth at an early age. Today he says:

they have now come full circle and are seeking to heal the breeches that have put their life in jeopardy. As the Yupiaq people say: Seggangukut' - "We are awakening, we are being energized!" They have adopted nature as their guiding force and have drawn energy from the earth (p. 127).

Linda T. Smith (1999) has long argued that "cultural survival, self-determination, healing, restoration and social justice are engaging Indigenous researchers and Indigenous communities in a diverse array of projects" including transformative and



health-centric higher education and k-12 programming (p. 142). If healthy bodies and relationships are our barometers alongside freedom and justice, how can we create learning environments which reflect the rich traditions of our ancestors while keeping the people-eaters at bay?

We must keep in mind the lessons of the *wiindigoo/ongwe'ias* stories, many of which provide obvious healing lessons, plants, ceremonies and paradigms from which to bring even the most extremely sick and psychotic person back from the brink, from becoming killers or from being killed. Antone, Miller (now Hill) and Meyers (1986) tackle this issue in their treatise on empowering people and community towards reeling from the debilitating experiences of imperialism and colonialism which live off a dehumanizing system and matrix of relations that produces ethnostress, depression, trauma and alienation. They argue coherently, as the title of their text suggests, that we have the power within our people to do this healing work:

If we realize that these destructive feelings and behaviours are only patterns of distress, then we can move to rid ourselves of them. We can learn to heal ourselves and move towards our personal and collective liberation. We believe that these patterns can be destroyed or reversed, provided that we are committed to healing and to re-evaluating our current reality. We have a strong and vital alternative to the culture of dehumanization. We have been born to cultures that have belief systems which are rooted in positive human behaviour and interaction with all life. By revitalizing these beliefs, we can improve our current social reality and liberate our hearts and minds. We possess the knowledge, tools and power to attack and eliminate the distress patterns (p. 37).

Further, they suggest that

we need to re-evaluate our thinking and feelings about the cultures that we were born to. We must break the narrow pattern that defines them as something of the past, and see them as being of today, and the future, in a very real way (p. 38).

This is precisely the nexus where our educational efforts can institute a program of learning that is rooted in our traditional conceptions of peoplehood, are armed with a critical revision of imperialism and colonialism, and are dedicated to healing the spirit, land, and bodies that are burdened with the trauma of the last 527 years of imperialism and counting. The issue we have is that most k-12 and higher education institutions are completely uncritical and removed from this basic fact of our existence and our ongoing resistance. They rarely offer students, let alone faculty, staff, administration or community opportunities and support to perform the healing work necessary to learn, to grow, to become and to be healthy students and leaders. While many universities have made it mandatory that students have health insurance, and while most have onsite student health services, they rarely are apt to confront the lengthy, intricate and complete kinds of trauma and terror Native Nations, and people of color come into schools with including intergenerational trauma, ethnostress, racism and matricidal violence, illness related to poverty and environmental pollution, rampant suicide and drug addiction, and the list goes on.

TCU's have yet to develop community-centric medicine institutes, nursing and mental health projects, healer apprenticeships (outside of Rough Rock Demonstration Schools Medicine Man Project of which Carl Gorman helped work on which is now defunct) and the like which reflect the unique ways their communities have traditionally

maintained health and wellness standards. Native American Studies programs are often limited by the paradigms and approaches of their whitestream institutions and funders and are often barely able to stay afloat as academic disciplines let alone attempt to implement traditional healing projects or programs. Daily the case is that those of us who survive these institutions are in fact drawn away from our communities where traditional herbs, healers, ceremonies and practices would be more available. Further, and as is clear in the minds of Forbes, Kawagley, and Cajete, the core location for healing our communities is by focusing on healing our lands, our disconnection to our homelands, sacred sites and centers, our traditional foods and medicines, our healing waters, and core elements of land-based and sustainable or life-sustaining economies. Cajete (1994) argues that this has occurred primarily at the foundational level of having healthy relationships with the land as kin:

Traditionally, the connection of Indian people to their land was a symbol of their connection to the spirit of life itself. The loss of such a foundational symbol for Indian tribes led to a tremendous loss of meaning and identity that, only with the most recent generations, has begun to be revitalized. Indian loss of their homelands took such a toll because inner kinship with the world is an ancient and natural extension of the human psyche. The disconnection of that kinship can lead to a deep split in the inner and outer consciousness of the individual and the group. It also brings with it a whole set of social and psychological problems that can only be healed through re-establishing the meaningful ties to the land that has been lost. Revitalizing ancestral connections with Nature and its inherent meaning is an essential healing and transformational process for Indian people (p. 85).

He points out that “much of the healing ritual and ceremony of Indian tribes involved re-establishing the harmony between the individual, family, or clan group and their immediate environment” (p. 106). Thus, in going back to Forbes (1995a) foundational premise that “kinship is the basic principle of philosophy” we can see that focusing upon both territory and relationality in terms of specific kinship relationships within our multiverse based on our original instructions and dynamic development out of Nation-centric creationism, we can find an alter-*Native* pathway to healing our lands and communities. Education could be this centralized force of healing change and transformation if it truly returns to its original source as a process and relationship with our relations to self and other that seeks to “bring forth” the potentiality of all beings that can only occur in healthy minds, spirits and bodies. As Cajete (1994) reminds us, “in the philosophy of Indigenous systems of healing, illness and disease were often caused by improper relationships to the natural world, to the spiritual world, to the community, and/or to one’s own spirit and soul” which he concludes is because “illness, as defined by Indigenous groups, was an environmental imbalance” (p. 107). A poetic Forbes (1996a), says:

As we seek justice

we seek them out

As we create beauty

we honor them.

As we liberate the world

in which we live

we liberate them.

As we end the suffering  
of people today  
we give meaning  
to the suffering  
of all those,  
our relations,  
who have given us this life.

Tepi lahapa (p. 84).

Akin to how a predominant of wiindigoo cases from the past were the result of severely stressful environmental conditions such as wintertime starvation, trauma induced by terror, abuse or neglect, and being persuaded or forced to commit initial acts of people-eating by spirit possession, by other people-eaters, and other kinds of inducement, we must be prepared to combat the realities that face us every day, every season, and possibly carried by every person we meet. As mentioned in my earlier discussion of the value of the idea of “influence” or the permeability of the world (the spirit, mind, body connection), we must be forever weary of the possibility that the kind of education we are performing or is being performed upon us may turn us, our children and community into the psychotic monsters and afflicted personas we fear most. Friedlands (2018) recent study of Cree and Anishinaabeg wiindigoo stories and experiences elicits the positive affirmation that “the vast majority of wétiko cases demonstrate the most conventional response to a wétiko has always been healing” (p. 123). Our stories provide the basis for an educational institution founded upon the principle of healing. As educators, we are first and foremost, storytellers. As Cajete (1994) notes about what is common to all

people is that “we make stories, tell stories and live stories because it is such an integral part of being human” (p. 116). Further he articulates that because of this, in essence “all education is the expression of storytelling” (p. 40). “Teachers are always creating their stories even as they are telling them” because they are living in a dynamic world where movement, even within what might be considered an ancient or stable language, tradition or community, is the actual constant (p. 17). Cajete’s critique extends further into the common curriculum found in nearly all schooling environments we are confronted with today, noting that the paradigms and the curriculum offshoots of these knowledge bases are really, stories divorced from their roots, and are labeled as “facts”, “information”, “history” (which means story, not necessarily a past) “science” or “research”. Instead, he argues “what are called “modern educational disciplines” are bodies of stories. These stories explain and describe knowledge accumulated through the application of specific methodologies characteristic to each discipline,” from art to biochemistry, physics to archaeology, English to algebra, they are all rooted in a story of their creation, of their becoming, of their virtue, and of their promise (p. 138). Thus, if we are to perform the arduous task of providing educational institutions that are truly healing, we must heal the stories we carry inside about ourselves, about our peoples, about our lands and the living cosmos, and about each other. One of the missing aspects of Forbes analysis of the contemporary colonial wétiko is that he bypassed the traditional stories, the stories which did more than just relate instances of insane or killer behavior, but also traditional ways of healing from diagnosis to cure. If we are to perform the seemingly incredible task of rebuilding Native Nations, we must centralize health and healing as intrinsic to community education efforts. Further we must recognize that the

*Ongwe'Ias* and *Windigoo's* are still out there, but perhaps, it may also be inside us all in many ways. We must seriously approach education so as to survive external antagonism as much as internal economics for those who would see Indian communities fail seek to exploit the divisions and weakness of individuals, families and groups within as well.

*Nation Re-Building, Decolonizing the University and Decolonizing the Universe*

The real failure in Indian education today has to do with the development of Indian communities, because the way to major success in education is the way in which education contributes to the ongoing development of a community of people. Not by measuring how an individual student progresses along some path in the school, that the school authorities have decided it is the proper thing for him to do. But how that individual once he's out of school contributes to the society to which he belongs. And if people are contributing successfully then the community in which he belongs is developing successfully. So the way we have to really measure Indian education is by looking at Indian communities and conditions in Indian communities where people are returning or perhaps not returning after they have been exposed to schools.

(From a speech entitled *Educational Liberation* (1968) given at the second Ad-Hoc Committee Meeting of the California Indian Education Association held at Feather River College, Quincy, CA (D-334, B.43, F.5)).

Forbes (1998a) explains that in the 1960's and 1970's when Native American Studies, TCU's and similar efforts were being developed that what he and others had vast

goals and values which “spoke in strong terms about self-determination, liberation, and decolonization, by which we meant *intellectual self-determination* as well as political and economic liberation for our communities and nations” (p. 13). During the 1969 high-tide of the Native and American Indian Movements Forbes was riding the wave he had inherited from influential relatives and past revitalization and resistance movements. Forbes (1969e) envisioned, like Tecumseh and his brother Tenskwatawa a truly internationalist movement for liberation predicated upon a “rebirth” of the people:

I believe that the salvation of Indian people largely depends upon the rebirth of the Indian nations and all that goes with it, especially the resurrection of the Indian soul. ... The Indian nations must be recreated, must be brought to life again and at the same time the Indian people must be reborn to the old spirit of brotherhood and unity, to the old way of beauty and oneness with the universe. . . . I have had this dream for many years. Many times the vision of reborn Indian nations has come to me, and I believe this vision can be realized. This dream is a joke to many whites, it is a joke to those Indian-hating Indians who have no faith in their own people, it is a joke to the brainwashed products of BIA schools and white colleges, but it is no joke! It is the dream of all mankind really, because only in small nations or communities of people who love each other and work together in brotherhood can there be any hope for the world (p. 4).

Champagne and Stauss (2002) clearly articulate that they believe Native American Studies and University-based centers can play an important role in nation-building or rebuilding among Native Nations. They argue that these programs, institutes and networks “are often located particularly well to assist Tribes with issues of law, policy,



the environment, repatriation, recognition, state-Tribal relations and other concerns” if they are focused upon “direct engagement” with said groups (p. 9). Champagne (2003) reiterated this opinion when he argued that although a degree, in Native/American Indian Studies or otherwise does not necessarily produce proficiency, and that “while Native communities retain considerable wisdom in law, social life, government, and culture, they also need the knowledge and understanding of their history, community, laws, rights, and government within the context of U.S. or non-Western history and policy to be able to defend their land, sovereignty, government powers, and cultural ways of life”. Champagne and Stauss (2002) argued that Native Nations have been “incorporated into the U.S. state system and are increasingly confronted with a competitive world market, competitive state and federal agencies, and cultural inroads from a variety of sources” and further, “Indian Nations will need to meet these challenges in their own ways and under their own terms” (p. 10). It might be argued in the 1950’s and 1960’s prior to Alcatraz when many Native and Chicano students began to gain an education at the university level, there were in fact no outlets to adequately engage community issues, let alone adequate teaching and support resources for them as they had at that point no teachers from their communities represented in these institutions. This was the case for Forbes, Risling and Hutchison, Bobby Seale, Huey P. Newton, Angela Davis, Richard Oakes, John Trudell, LaNada (Means) Boyer, Wilma Mankiller, Tomas Atencio, Adaljiza Sosa Riddell, and many others who did not have any representative teachers from their communities when they went to school nor were the programs they attended attentive to issues and causes relevant to their own communities. They had to go their own way and meet their communities where they were at and get involved directly without institutional

support. Many of the founders of immersion schools, TCU's, and other projects had to make things happen with or without institutional, federal, national or public support.

For me, I had to leave the community where I was raised in order receive an "advanced" education, either traditional or academic because there was simply a lack of trained and wise persons to learn from and no institutions of higher education. My own experience within the American Indian Studies program at UCLA was one of the unique opportunities found often only in this kind of convergent setting, namely for me, through the Tribal Learning Community and Educational Exchange (TLCEE) program of UCLA (started by Native Nations initiatives, along with the institutional support of Dr. Champagne, Dr. Goldberg and others circa 2003) which required degree major students to participate in a year-long "Working in Tribal Communities" course series that culminated in a service-learning project with a Native Nation or organization. It is only within ethnic studies majors and degree programs is this a requirement including Chicanos Studies, otherwise, a majority of students attain a degree that does not specifically relate to the work they hope to do in their own and related communities or provide opportunities to engage directly with community while learning. Forbes et al (2002) suggest that universities can and should be one of the principle producers of the "indigenous intelligentsia", the cadre of trained leaders who principally work on behalf of their people, not the university. Champagne and Stauss (2002) suggest so much, saying,

Indian studies programs should create communities of students, Elders, scholars, administrators, and Tribal members. Student services, student organizations, graduate students, faculty, administrators, and Tribal members should have many opportunities to meet, conduct research, and teach in a continuously interactive

community environment. Students should see and interact with scholars and graduate students who will serve as role models and inspire them to seek graduate and professional education. Students should be exposed to active Nation-building projects engaging with local Indian Nations. Students should be trusted with leadership and responsibility (p. 10).

The unique program developed at UC Davis contains a hemispheric focus, that is a focus upon the American island as one contiguous relational field of study, history, and identity, one of Forbes specific efforts that he is uniquely identified with. This is in line with Forbes historical analysis and perception that the whole Americas represent a single field of study guided by 20,000 or more years of continuous development, interaction and influence between all of the peoples of Anowarakowa. This is a unique development in that it is inclusive of Chicanos, and Native Nations from Chile to Mexico, and throughout Canada. Although Forbes is gone, the program lives on and this is one of the kinds of developments which has been undertaken not to provide a single person a job or place of study. NAS at UC Davis was often the only supportive link for D-Q University during its heyday and in California, is the northernmost UC which serves the north half of the state in a unique way very unlike UC Berkeley which remains more of an elitist, Harvard-style institute often.

Champagne (2006) explains the history and events that led up to TLCEE's creation and from which the establishment of an ongoing leadership development institute program which would directly engage Native Nations "on their own terms" and in projects relevant to them. This I believe is one of the most basic efforts a Native American Studies or similar people-serving program can perform, which is the

engagement of students directly into Nation-building efforts. Former director of the TLCEE program, DeAnna Rivera (2013) perceived the unique contribution of the community driven program was that it was “designed to address this us-them barrier. Indeed, as a program it exists between that barrier. As part of the university setting, it is built into the colonizing narrative and yet aims to address and foster decolonizing narratives” (p. 89). Rivera’s hope, like Champagne’s and I think many of us students was that we were participating in a process of “indigenizing the academy and promoting the decolonization of their own educations” by placing Nation-building at the center of our own process of character-building, or becoming complete and capable to live and work within community settings and struggles (p. 92). However, if a university, with all of its other allegiances, influences and relationships with the centers of imperial power and knowledge is unwilling to fully support Native Nation-building, it might merely use and abuse Native Nations all over again. The program itself is supported by an endowment from the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, yet, is this funding matched by the university, the state or federal government? No, it is not. Thus they are not equal partners and are not equally invested into the outcomes of programs. Further, all of the efforts are year-long and thus are not engaged in any specific long-term goals or visions, although some individual participants reinvigorate old projects or participate in ongoing efforts this is not always the case. The NAS program at UC Davis for example originally attempted to develop a community-based and responsive effort by first locating themselves in Applied Behavioral Sciences where Forbes and others taught courses which had a pragmatic and community-centered focus yet this department was extremely hostile and never fully supported their engagements with local Native Nations, D-Q

University or the urban Indian students of Sacramento and surrounding areas. Forbes et al (2002) note that almost immediately after the establishment of NAS at UCD, there was a “backlash” which stunted their original development and vision (p. 109). This is a recurring problem in nearly all of the imperial universities for they cannot allow Native Nationals or people of color “free reign” to develop their grand visions without an “interest-convergence” dam, or a bounded “safety zone” to control this development. This is why Forbes (1972) many times shared the view that any institution or program developed by and for Indians and Chicanos needed to represent to fullest potential the interests of the community, a focus on the rebirth or rebuilding of Native Nations, and the complete personhood of the individual:

Every Indian or Chicano who attends a white college has to fight to retain his indianism or chicanismo. Nothing in the college prepares him for or helps him return to his people. He is being siphoned off, and unless he resists, he will become truly “a man without a country” - an Anglo in values and a Brown Man by race. Our concern must be, not so much the “success” of the individual, but rather the destiny of our entire people. Our education programs must be developed so as to meet the needs of our communities as well as to meet the needs of individuals. We cannot separate the two. D-Q U will allow the individual to learn and still retain his peoplehood! (p. 13, from the pamphlet “Why Deganawidah-Quetzalcoatl University? An Indian-Chicano University in 5082 A.C.”, D334, B. 63, F. D-Q University 1972-1978; see also Forbes 1973a).

Further, he maintained the doubtful critique that public imperial universities would relinquish enough control and freedom to develop in the direction Native and Chicano

Peoples sought to. His doubt was expressed clearly in a subsequent passage where he suggested that “experience has shown that no white-run, white-oriented college can adequately meet the needs of the Indian and Chicano peoples” (ibid). Part of his reasons which we can discern if any changes have occurred today is that there is no real commitment by the university to do any number of transformative changes including: “fully integrate its faculty, revise curriculum, do away with meaningless requirements, and share its governing authority” (ibid) Further, where are the programs that are adequately or equally funding these programs compared to English, Business or Medicine, nor are they openly supportive of the Nations and Communities where our students and faculty come from and seek to return to. Indeed, this is the core reason for attaining higher education at all, is that we have a home to return to, geographically, spiritually, socially, economically or otherwise. Forbes (1972) lamented after only a few years at UCD during the heyday development of D-QU that the main reasons for that schools creation was because:

Most significantly of all, few, if any, major universities and colleges are seriously engaged in the task of curricular reform. Virtually everywhere, conservative professors and administrators have blunted the onslaught of nonwhite and white radical students and, after implementing a few negligible reforms, they are “holding fast”. What little chance exists for meaningful change in white universities is off-set by the fact that the achievement of change requires such a massive output of energy that it seldom proves to be worth the effort. In any case, Indian and Chicano peoples cannot wait for such changes. They must move forward now (ibid, p. 14).

Indeed, this is the issue we are facing today. Many universities who once engaged in “sustainability” programs and efforts on and off campus are being cut everywhere unless they align with corporate energy interests and money-making economic models which don’t challenge the consumptive ideologies that will eat away the heart of our homelands and communities if given the chance, if they haven’t already. Forbes (1973b) original conceptions of the purpose and foundational philosophy of education bears reminding, which is “the survival and development of the people (the tribe or nation)” for he believed, “educational programs must contribute [to the] existence of the nation” whereas “an individual is “successful” in life in so far as he acquires the respect and esteem of his people” (p. 14). The Nation is paramount, for it is the group, for we can never talk about persons separate from peoples, or Natives separate from Nations, large or small. We are always part of groups, of families, of a people or nation beyond state citizenship, for the state does not create life but rather parasitically lives on it. Forbes (2000a) hope to reform the Englatino terms of society and community (nouns) by using the verbal or active terms “together-doing”, “together-living”, “together-making” bodies is emblematic of his engaged work to make our everyday actions verbal, influential and potent to the point where we are focused upon our intimate relationships as persons of peoples who are bound by relating, by living, by loving and making life beautiful together. Elizabeth Cook-Lynn (2007a) similarly concluded that her purpose as an Indigenous author and scholar was an “ethical core” of nation-building (p. 63). The focus upon nation-building is also viewed in contradistinction to that which is embodied in the language of the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007)

which draws blurry lines between Native Nations and their capturers, so-called “States”. Since the Treaty of Westphalia (1613), European nations have been empowered as “states”, considered the highest level of political authority and power, whereas Native Nations were effectively demoted, depressed and domesticated within their boundaries of power as “Indians” or “tribes” or worse, “merciless savages” and “hostile tribes”. This is inclusive of the Éireannach (Irish) who had to fight many wars until achieving some semblance of “statehood” through the advancement of at first the *Saorstát Éireann* “Irish Free State” (1922-1937) and then the *Poblacht na hÉireann* “Republic of Ireland” (since 1937). Although they have retained a degree of autonomy and power separate from the United Kingdom, today, with the advancement of a global imperialism sped up by the internet, cell phones, satellite communication, etc., the influence of their former enemy is perhaps even greater than before 1922 as now they are ever more influenced by other imperialists such as the U.S. and as members of the European Union connecting them to other imperial “states” who wage internal and external wars for control and power. Similarly, the Diné Nation which could advance itself as a “state” given that it has the bureaucracy and experience to do so, has attempted to promote a Diné education system replete with advanced education, immersion-style schools and the revitalization of their ancient systems of training and ceremony. Diné College for example promotes in its mission statement, a key strategic goal of nation-building, which includes “building congruent educational programs to meet the needs and aspirations of the Navajo Nation” to “assist Navajo Nation in becoming better positioned economically” and to “align programs with sustainable employment opportunities for graduates” (from the DC website). However, is this what it means to be a Diné person and people and does this



match the guiding principles of *Sa'ah Naaghái Bik'eh Hózhóón* or is this more in line with the manifestation of a Navajo State? Yet, confusingly, this is what is respected by UNDRIP, a state, not a nation. Article 5 clearly articulates that the “State” must be protected while Article 6 suggests that Native peoples have a “right to a nationality”, but do they have a right to their own “State”? In no place does it recognize the right of Indigenous Nations to be also States, or equal to their captors, let alone, for states to become demoted to their original status as guests upon Native homelands, territories and National boundaries. For example, Article 46 clearly protects imperial “States”:

Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, people, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act contrary to the Charter of the United Nations or construed as authorizing or encouraging any action which would dismember or impair, totally or in part, the territorial integrity or political unity of sovereign and independent States.

Thus, we have a conflicting paradigm concerned with our acts of nation-building and rebuilding, which is that States are empowered in ways through their own support of each other, much in the same vein as imperial states of the past who recognized each other's claims to the detriment of Native Nations. UNDRIP mentions nothing about nation-building and thus does not support the development of Native Nations into anything they themselves envision. This situation is akin to the “self-determination” pronouncements of Nixon which although were tethered to Native Nations and Nationals calls, they were distinctly separate and divested from these original, traditional and core notions which demanded equality and respect as Nations, not as individuals (Forbes 1981a). The Canadian attempt at Truth and Reconciliation since the 1969 White Paper, its separation

from the UK and the forming of a new constitution since 1982, and recently in the form of the 2006 led talks also do not mention any attempt at renegotiation, which can only be attempted through new treaties which are internationally valid agreements that make Native Nations equals to the Canadian State, and thus, with land-territory-waters as the key issue, boundaries and borders of protection and security must be a primary goal. It is no coincidence that the first abrogating acts of the U.S. and Canadian governments were the trade and intercourse acts, and the most punishing inroads of the original treaties involved the “free passage” clauses which allowed the rights of “white” citizens to pass through National territories, especially “troops” and “traders” but also missionaries, and allowing the construction of roads, railways and the concomitant infrastructure to allow the State to breach former boundaries and the sanctity of Native National territories (see Treaty with the Delaware 1778, a treaty of “peace and friendship). Treaty 2 of Canada for example protects “white subjects” from Native Nations ability to “interfere with or trouble any person passing or travelling through the said tract” (see also Treaty 1 & 2, a treaties of “peace and goodwill”). Such is the nature of the imperial State. Nation-building and state-building are not always distinct projects, however, the goals of each may be markedly different and it must be clear what the goals are in order for education to be of any great influence, for how can we produce people to work on such projects if on the one hand we may be preparing our students to defend the imperial state’s rights over our own Nations?

*Decolonization as a Path-Way*

Forbes (1978) brings us back to his conception of education as the finding of a path-way through life in his discussion of the process of decolonization, summarized this way:

This is a long process because once we proceed down the road, we find that it leads over many rises and down into many valleys before the end can be reached. Sometimes we're fooled and we think that we've reached our goal but soon we discover another hill ahead. It's a long trail to follow. European imperialism has brainwashed our people very thoroughly - so well in fact, until we're well along on our journey, we cannot conceive of the number of layers of indoctrination and mythology that have to be peeled off. And we always run the risk of falling prey to new European myths since we're constantly the target of each European sectarian movement. Thus, for example, some Indian people will be converted to Baptist or Methodist religion as a part of the colonial process but then they will turn from that to Mormonism. Other Native people are deluded by the half-truths of Marxist-Leninism. Some Chicanos reject Catholicism in favor of Jehovah's Witness and so on. So we always face a danger of shifting from one European system to another (p. 102).

Trudell (2008) wrote a beautiful poem called, "Good Thoughts" which embodies this message:

Thinking good makes for strong heart  
Nourishment for spirit and soul  
A good path a good way to give

Belief creates what we believe

Good words

Good thoughts

Good actions (p. 145).

Forbes (1998a) explains that part of the purpose of the development of Native Studies programs was about creating an environment, a movement, an intellectual decolonization discourse which would feed their struggle continuously. Forbes reflects on the early days in the 1960's and 70's what this meant for himself and others, saying:

When we begin to decolonize our minds, which is what sovereignty is all about, I think we can see that boundaries and colonial structures created by the European invaders are, first, transient and, second, barriers to our self-determination. If we were speaking about Native intellectual work in 1745 or 1783 or 1867, the colonial boundaries would be radically different. They may also be different in 2050! (p. 13).

In this way, we need to be wary of simply replicating or repeating both the mistakes and the prescriptions of the past upon today without seriously assessing and applying some kind of rigor to our present problems and relationships. Forbes et al (2002) describe that the original Native American Studies was that developed in our traditional Native Nations and

revolved largely around the search for knowledge and wisdom that could be used in the life of the people. The core of this knowledge was concerned with the elucidation of harmony and appropriate behavior, behavior that might lead to the proper functioning of the human-animal-plant-world relationship (p. 99).

By the time the first programs were developed and framed as such in the 1960's and 1970's, indeed, Native Nations had been through hell but had survived to fight another day and to live as Nations. What kind of work would they do now, given the imperial condition? John Mohawk's (2010) perception of this intellectual work was described this way:

My version of Native American Studies was that we would be the critics of Western culture. We would do what Western culture and anthropologists do to Indians: review it, point out what's wrong with it, explain where it went wrong, tell them it was wrong, and basically have a version and understanding of it. To do that meant that I had to take a close look at the origins and the philosophies around science and the origins and philosophies about philosophy: the whole question of where the culture tells us its coming from, where it says it is, and where it says it is going (p. 48).

Forbes and Mohawk linked many times over the years when Mohawk was an editor and main contributor of *Akwesasne Notes* (1967-1983) of which Forbes published articles consistently and had some of his speeches distributed via their catalog. Part of the struggle is finding persons and peoples who you resonate with, who have ideas of their own, who will challenge your ideas, but who ultimately maintain the highest respect for the individual, people, the land, all life and thereby understand and value the similarities and differences of each and everyone's struggle. Unity is difficult, but it is powerful. Forbes, of all people I have studied, worked for inclusion rather than exclusion every step of his way. He included Chicanos for instance when no one else would. He spoke out for Affirmative Action numerous times in his career when it may have cost him his job

(Forbes 1995d). Of Forbes critics, Robert Warrior's (1998) claims seem to be based upon a cursory reading of Forbes words and life, missing his mark by a long shot when he claimed Forbes "does not provide much in the way of constructive alternatives" (p. 9). Forbes provides so many alternatives one cannot list them all, including: Indian control of all social institutions, tribal colleges and universities (D-QU), local and national Indian organizations (CIEA, NARF), Native American Studies (UCD), new writing systems, legislation, and much more.

Forbes (1998a) even goes so far to say that Native American Studies would do well to develop its own science, what he suggested to be called, "Americology", akin to Egyptology:

Americology should cultivate a respect for Native American values and traditions and should refrain from popularizing half-baked theories that may have harmful effects on our peoples. Scholarship is, after all, a form of community development. Its results should help people. Even as we seek the truth, we should always remember that theories are not the same as truth and must be treated with caution if not skepticism.

We, as Native intellectuals, have both a right and an obligation to challenge the colonial dominance of our history, whether it be sociocultural, political, artistic, linguistic, or legal. But we in Native Studies have a specific obligation to expand our subject area to embrace course work focused on languages, archaeology, art history, musicology, and other fields from which a Native perspective has usually been excluded. Native Studies must evolve into a comprehensive discipline whose responsibility embraces all aspects of indigenous life, thought, and history (p. 19).

The problem as he sees it, is that outsiders and aliens, the privileged and powerful control too much of the original source material, have distorted and invented its own facts, have overrun our territories, massacred our members and knowledge keepers and cannot even see Native peoples in the light of being the original and surviving Americans who have 20-200,000 years of continuous intellectual and social development to draw from in this land. The purpose of such a project is cosmopolitan and international in scope and delivery. The hemispheric program at Davis considers the total relationships, experiences, peoples, and wisdom traditions of Turtle Island as a contiguous field of study rather than stopping at the borders of the current U.S. empire. This includes Chicanos. This includes Blacks, creole populations, Jamaicans, Cubans, Gaels of Nova Scotia, Zapotecs and Mapuches, mestizo's, mulattos, metis, whites, Indians, Nisei, and Mississippians, everyone. Native American Studies was one of Forbes earliest "inventions" which he submitted his first proposal for in 1960.

The promising youngsters who are sent off to white colleges, and who stay for four or more years, are generally so indoctrinated with an Anglo approach to life that they cannot serve as effective folk leaders upon returning (when they do return). Their facility in the native tongue often has diminished; they have lost contact with folk ways; and, more significantly, they often develop an aura of smug superiority toward their fellows. Even where the latter is not the case, and even when they feel a kind of loyalty to the tribal heritage, their values have often become so confused that they are ineffective as leaders (and often as persons). *It goes almost without saying that an effective leader must be "immersed" in the*

*mystique of the people whom he wishes to lead.* (p.17, Forbes 1978, emphasis original)

Two thematic findings present throughout a majority of Forbes texts focus upon his conceptions of peoples and persons, as well as his understanding of imperialism and colonialism. These foundational concepts are important because they represent the basic need today of communities to perform education, that is, train, develop and pass on valuable knowledge and ways of living in a hostile, aggressive social sphere of influence and relationships, namely, a colonial and imperial matrix of relations. Unique to the current era is that if youth and community are not trained in their own communities values, ways of living, language, knowledge, homeland, etc., it is most assured that they will be trained in an outsiders ways or if not an outsider, in the milieu of community that have generally accepted colonial and imperial forms of knowledge and living. Although, seemingly an antagonistic approach to framing education, the question remains, is this not the case? Is it not true that our children are siphoned into a system of education, a construct of community and nationality which if left on its own would make them workers, warriors and other kinds of servants of a system of relations, of values, knowledge and orientations which may actually destroy the peoples and places which birthed them? Extreme examples of this kind of project were readily apparent in the 19th and 20th century in the United Colonies, however, it is not so apparent to many today in the 21st. Critics of public schooling are demonized for not supporting a bygone “common education” era, whilst, alternative, charter and other kinds of schooling are deemed to be privileged forms which detract from the former. The invisibilized neocolonial matrix of relations, most clearly manifest as the United Colonies or CanAmerica (Maracle 1994)



and in local governments and corporate structures, continues to exert an unending influence on our youth and communities. Whilst many places in the world have undergone internal and external decolonization processes (with some success coupled with absolute failure), the United Colonies has maintained itself to be impervious to these efforts. The power movements of the 1960's for example at times directly challenged the United Colonies and developed an anti-colonial and anti-imperial politics replete with solutions and pragmatic efforts at community and national revitalization and rebuilding efforts. A majority of these efforts however have become disempowered at best, and instead, what has survived have become symbolic and benign, or worse, destroyed completely. While on the one hand we can perform community based, cultural and linguistic immersion education all we want but how do we protect ourselves from joining the ranks of the empire, from further land, water and resource exploitation and pollution, from the military coming in and building a new airbase, from terrorism perpetrated by foreign police and agents of the state or local colonies, from the infectious media industries which target our youth, and the list goes on? Forbes suggested, we need to do both: we need to prepare our community members to be culturally proficient while at the same, knowledgeable and savvy about the empire at our door and in our homes, and worse, haunting our dreams, retraumatizing our daughters, and stealing our sons for new wars. We can grow a beautiful child, but can we protect them, or teach them to resist from being consumed themselves, or to resist consuming others?

One of the primary purposes of this research was to highlight these struggles in contemporary contexts through the lens of education as advocated by leader and scholar Jack D. Forbes. As an incredible and influential educator and author, Forbes developed

his unique stances and approaches in relation to the above struggles throughout his lifetime of work. Two foundational ideas Forbes continuously developed and promoted revolved around Peoplehood and Nationhood, an internal conception of the community and “together-living” as he called it, while the other was a nuanced understanding of the direct and specific relationships to the imperial and colonial order as evidenced and constructed since 1492 and the invasions prompted by European monarchs, churches, corporations and peoples. Both of these ideas are foundational because they require a longitudinal frame of reference, knowledge and engagement. One cannot understand imperialism or community without history, and thus, one cannot hope to survive or fight with or against them without knowing their trajectories over time. This also brings up the discussion of whether “fighting back” is a necessary tactic or approach to survival or can communities of tradition hope to survive by simply raising good people and leave the destroyers to suffer their demise. Is community-based education enough or is knowledge of the imperial effort and our relations over time a worthwhile approach to survival? Forbes argued that both were needed.

Forbes was raised in the environs of Los Angeles, and his formative years generated a great deal of inspirational, epiphanic, and lifelong models and experiences he would draw and reflect upon throughout his life. He was always, as one poem relates in its title, looking for the wise. In it he describes his predicament in L.A. this way:

I used to comb this land  
looking for  
wise men,  
looking for

wise women  
Not finding any, bitter and  
disillusioned,  
I chanced upon an  
old Mexican  
Who pointed out that  
wise men and  
wise women  
Can only be recognized  
as such  
By one who is also wise

such being the nature of wisdom (Forbes 1981b, pps. 25-26).

Forbes was “reading the world” each day, to borrow from Freire (1983;1985), which allowed him to “read the word” with great precision, criticality, and tenacity. He surely was too much for his teachers to keep up with. Thus, he went on his own learning path, beyond school. He recalls in an unpublished poem called “Ya-Town: The Big El-Lay Classroom” how he “read book after book on my own and cut classes” and that he just “studied and studied” everything around him (D-046, B. 183, p. 3.). His poetry reveals his personal learning pathway which led him on a lifelong journey of decolonization, which he describes this way:

a world was out there, everywhere,  
beyond schools walls  
not enough time on the weekends

working all day Saturday from age 12

most everything closed on Sunday

cutting school only way to learn

(ibid., p. 4).

He concludes his memorializing of these youthful learning years which included hitchhiking and taking the electric trolleys, riding the street cars and walking all over the vast cosmopolitan metropolis of L.A., reflecting that “it was all learning” (ibid., p. 5). He gives thanks to the cable cars of many colors that drove him around the vast town, for he knew at an early age he wanted to study history, and he gives thanks because these were for him a “schoolhouse on wheels” which made his journey so memorable and active,

so that I could wage my struggle

as budding historian discovering old tracks

and grass-grown right of ways

disapproved by progress (ibid., p. 4).

By the time he graduated from Eagle Rock High School in 1951, the electric trolley and cable car system was being dismantled by the oil, car and rubber companies from which he regretfully sighs, “and I never got to ride them again!” (ibid., p. 5). Forbes conception of education, of knowledge and learning, was rooted in a person’s desired path and approach to knowing as he felt if given the chance, he would have done these things anyways but instead he had to cut class in order to really learn what he wanted to know. Forbes was an only child to working class parents who he always worked alongside, who worked his whole life in some capacity or another, and who was gifted loving grandparents, parents, aunties, and family who saw the gem in him and helped him shine.

A learning path is not a private endeavor, and includes work and sacrifice, love and relationships, but also it must have a clear direction, a clear route.

Forbes did not advocate the same kind of learning approaches and experiences, knowledge or ideas for everyone but rather respected the intuitive and gifted processes of learning which each person carries, and if allowed, will carry out and forth. Forbes was not obstructed by his parents for his zest for learning and instead was encouraged, while he often met oppositional ideas, persons and rules at school. The liberating tendency to take matters into your own hands is a precarious and dangerous expose for others because it demonstrates what one can do without the forces your confronted with who may suggest they know best. It is through loving, the love of self and other, that knowing becomes powerful. Because came to love all living things, he also was confronted with the power of his knowledge regularly. For example, he and his friends would hike up the canyons in Eagle Rock and drink, talk and smoke. They would share feelings, ideas, plot and plan. Yet, the hills above Eagle Rock were used for military purposes and also for the building a large waste dump. Forbes and his friends caught wind of this and decided to take matters into their own hands under cover of darkness by attempting to sabotage their efforts. This went on for years. He recalls this clearly in the poem, *Memorias de Eagle Rock* (1992b), in which he memorializes the home he left 30 years prior:

City of Eagle Rock  
conquered by Los Angeles  
but the orange groves  
were almost gone anyway  
urban sprawl creeping past

each barrier  
I tried to stop  
Auntie Bert's canyon  
up above Cedaredge and Hilltop  
from being destroyed  
sabotaging bulldozers  
but the L.A. Department  
of Water and Power won! (p. 29).

So very early, Forbes was exposed to the basic fact of knowledge and learning, which is given what you know about something, what do you do with that knowledge. Do you defend the places and sources of life and learning? Do you protect that which is sacred despite forces around you who treat it with absolute raw disrespect? Forbes made the choice to fight back, to resist, to protect sacred life and places, with his body, with his mind, with his whole self.

Education as Forbes perceived it was about bringing forth wise people and nations, not simply "smart" (biting/strong) men, or productive ("willing workers") and trained technicians who could be siphoned into the imperial workforce and global imperial matrix because they lacked an ethical and spiritual core. Resistance was not founded upon reaction, but upon the core's struggle to survive intact and healthily. Further, he was always weary that it was too easy to become psychotic, to become a consumer of life rather than a defender and steward, to become a common people-eater/wétiko. The focus upon wisdom is also key because it points towards the kind of knowledge and relationships which are good, beautiful, sustainable and lasting. Akin

figures to Forbes are found everywhere, and I am sure we all have our own models and elders which identify for us authentic ways of living and learning. Tomas Atencio (1974) suggested that the *oro del barrio* or good knowledge of the community lie fallow as “dormant wisdom”, in the soil, in the language, in the folklore, in the elders, everywhere (p. 9). The dilemma of Chicanos was framed as “la acequia o a la escuela?” [the Acequia/ditch or the School], in other words, traditional community based learning was done upon the land while taking care of each other instead of the classroom. Atencio’s formation of *La Academia de la Nueva Raza* in Dixon, NM in 1970 (originally *La Academia de Aztlan*, now the Rio Grande Institute) was precipitated on the belief that they were developing a “road to wisdom”, because in his words “education must mirror life” and further, “theory must reflect practice. And we must be our own philosophers, our own scientists, our own theologians. We must use what is ours by heritage *pa no comer misa y cagar diablos* [for not to eat mass and shit devils]” because as he explains that this “new process of education, ranging from content to styles of learning, must rise from the wellspring of our own experience” (p. 7). Forbes “greatness of the native mind” and Nation is an ongoing development, and not one which seeks to reproduce “knowledge” that can be bought and sold on the marketplace like Chia seeds as a “superfood”, like Curanderismo as “shamanism”, and Wisdom as “sustainability”. Cajete (1994) like Atencio notes that wisdom was defined largely by our elders, by people who had lived long enough to know what kinds of knowledge had real worth, in the long run, as they had reflected in their later years upon the roads and paths they had travelled, and upon the completion or incompleteness of their great tasks and visions in life. For as Forbes (2008a) notes, the world is an obviously creative world, one formed out of the “divine

wisdom” and “creative wisdom” of spiritual powers, mysterious power beyond our control or understanding (p. 1). Further, Forbes (1983) declares that for people, our wisdom must be assessed by not what we say, but what we do, for wisdom and any good knowledge is to “be derived not solely from verbal discourse but also, and most importantly through actions and deeds. New actions, including new observations, lead to new understandings” (p. 1). Cajete (1994) says that it manifests in people in this way:

Wisdom is a complex state of knowing founded on accumulated experience. In Tribal societies, wisdom is the realm of the elderly. By virtue of their longlife experience, they were deemed most capable of maintaining the essential structures of the spiritual life and well-being of the community. They maintain the Tribal memories of the stories, rituals, and social structures that ensured the “good life” of the community through the spirit. They are also, by virtue of their age, the members of the community closest to that revered state of “complete” men and women (p. 48).

Forbes (1994c) perceived that one of the missing links we have today is a respect for our elders as wisdom-keepers, and further, it is the respect for what he called “female wisdom”. In order for us to talk about “wisdom” we must remind ourselves that we survive because of the queens that birthed us, and often take care of the community in the prime, as primary caretakers, as the major “teachers” of the youth and of the elders, even today. Forbes (1983) speaks about a “cumulative wisdom” which “is the collective, cumulative wisdom of a continent. It is also typified by an apparent simplicity and an attention to practical problems of living. Indeed, the highest science from the Native perspective would seem to be the science of how to live in this life” and is absolutely not



based upon only “men’s” wisdom but must equally be “women’s wisdom” (p. 23). Further he says “it is also based upon a considerable degree of empirical observation, including the careful study of human and animal behavior, the behavior of nature, and the lessons to be learned through dreams, within-seeing (insight) and visions” all of which can be performed by any person or people, irrespective of gender or physicality (ibid). The wisdom of elders and women seem to have been completely jettisoned in this day and age, as well as the wisdom of the earth, of the land, of the entire creation and its myriads forms of life, its creatures that are solid like a rock or fluid like water, fast like the wind, hummingbirds and bees, or slow-moving like the sloth, snails, turtles or trees. If we are to develop our education systems we must carefully base them around wisdom traditions, wise elders, and the wisdom of the land and its magnificent teachers who in fact know how to live the good life with ease, without the internet, without all of these consumables and securities. Wisdom is the ultimate life insurance policy. Wisdom is the ultimate investment plan. Wisdom lives in a sustainable economy. And we need our youth, our elders, our queens, and all life to be invested into equally.

*Education as a Peaceful Vehicle Towards Decolonization*

“Colonialism only loosens its hold when the knife is at its throat” (Fanon 1961, p. 23)

“Respect is the cornerstone of democracy. Respect is what will build a world that is peaceful and democratic. Only respect.” (Forbes 1991, interview by Hogle).

How do we achieve a world without the machinations of oppression, and with death lurking at every corner not because we simply must die in order to sustain life, but because we have vigorously invited death through a consumptive-based social system, namely imperialism? The death dance, the corpse machine, the leviathan and wétiko, has become us now, and always was. Our stories of old were told because we could become monstrous, we could become evil, we could become killers, we could become selfish and greedy, we could become our own worst nightmares and destroy family and community, places and traditions. We must recognize that on the one hand, the ability to kill, to destroy, to exterminate has been with us since the beginning, since the first child was allowed to live rather than be strangled or drown by the first mothers of the world. They have always held the power of life in their hands, the power of death, that is, after Coyote gave us the first death, or was it *Aswut* the Eagle. We can be our worst enemies, however, as it seems, a monster has indeed been created that is greater than our *Ongwe'Ias* or the *Wiindigoo*. The new monster is perhaps White people, perhaps Imperialists, perhaps a shape-shifter or trickster like Coyote, like *ve'ho*. Whoever and whatever it is, it can be us too. This is the prime need for a serious reconsideration of education today. For how do we create good people with so many bad models and influences abound everywhere? How do we create peaceful, respectful, humble people with so many destructive, violent, killers out there, which may not even look like those on television, for they wear nice suits and ties, drive cars and ride bikes, who go to work every day and on the weekends? One of Forbes major predicaments was that the machinations of imperialism, the psychotic sickness was so easily transferable that it has indeed infected all of us to some degree or another, or at the very least, we are complicit and bound through relationships,

assumptions, and mere survival to a systematic and interwoven nexus of exploitation and destruction. Forbes (1983b) further describes wetikoism, or global imperialism as a “total system”, because it is a product of people who have developed themselves according to various tap-roots, especially hierarchal and authoritarian forms which demand obedience, sacrifice and exploitation rather than consensus, giving and reciprocity.

Forbes attempted to hammer this point home at the E.F. Schumacher Conference’s triennial conference May 6 and 7th of 1983 in a classic speech which demonstrates his unwavering attempt to reach the imperialized, inspire the open-minded, speak truth to power, and make relatives as the basis for action:

So the basis for Indian democracy really arises from the cosmology, from a conception of the world, from the conception of the way the creator wants us to be. It arises naturally out of that. It may also be said, of course, in the reverse. That undoubtedly authoritarian societies and greedy societies and so on arise out of a cosmology that is different from this one. It’s very important I think, when we think in terms of changing social structures and social conditions that we always keep in mind that underlying that, even though it may be unspoken and may even be denied, is a cosmology or a worldview which supports whatever kind of destructive order that is operating. It does not operate in a vacuum but has a full cultural system behind it. This is one of the reasons why it is so very difficult to change even one little piece of a total system. It is because it is a system. It’s in mesh with many other things. (D-046, B. 194, “Decentralization: A Native American Perspective”; See also D-046, B. 22, “Searching the Future” for a transcription).

Further, at the core of this nexus is a violent regime, rooted in militaries and police forces, vigilantes and armed citizenries instilling fear through terror while uprooting peoples opportunities to live autonomously on their lands.

Does the need for alternatives consist of simultaneous resistance to concomitant, ongoing encroachment, destruction, imperialism and servitude? Why can education be a vehicle for decolonial and anti-imperial efforts? “Father of Indian Education” in the 20th century David Risling Jr. once proclaimed at a speech to Indian parents and other audience members in Fresno in 1975 that the “school is the enemy” and had been the enemy as the first experiences he and others had with non-Indian people on a daily basis was in non-Indian run Christian, federal and public created and run schools (D-334, B. 101).

What is the purpose of education? To me it is not primarily the acquisition of specific skills or factual knowledge. Rather it is learning how to be a human being. That is, how to live life of the utmost spiritual quality. A person who has developed his character to its highest degree, and who is on that path, will also be able to master specific skills. But if they don't have that spiritual core, they will use those skills to hurt other people. They will use those skills in the interest of that which is bad, rather than that which is good. We see this all the time with people who have know-how, but use that know-how for their own good, like many of the mad scientists that we have in the world today who are willing to let their skills be available to any dictator or government who will pay their salary. In return for that, they will use their skills to produce modern instruments of torture, weapons, and drugs that will change people's behavior. They have the skills, but

they have no morals. They will do whatever they are paid to do. So knowledge without the spiritual core is a very dangerous thing. (Forbes 1979c, p. 11).

Forbes tells us that our core values are what keep us from ultimate destruction, and these core values enacted on a daily basis through ritual and ceremony, through relationships and community, we remain bound to enact and honor the world around us as a living system, as an ecology that thrives on harmony and balance rather than consumption and destruction. Further, as Forbes has pointed out, it thrives on Love, the “magic stuff of the universe”. Peace cannot be attained within an education system that doesn’t actively support the development of a multiplicity of loving relationships or ignores the current of unloving relationships people are engaged in numerous ways. Further, one that does not emphasize the healing powers, potentiality and needs of so many brutalized peoples and families, cannot possibly perform education whose outcomes are a healthy people, place and relationships.

Forbes (1998g) utilizes the concept of the young soldier in order to demonstrate the ways in which imperial society purposely brutalizes the youth who repeat and outdo their teachers:

The brutalization of soldiers is, of course, an old technique designed to enable young men to kill innocent people who look exactly like them, or who possess the same claims to humanity. But once such terror has been unleashed, then it will continue to poison both the ex-soldier and the victims until there is a spiritual healing (p. A17).

This extends inside the classroom as well. Students are traumatized at an early age, graded and prodded over before they have been given the chance to truly learn how to live in the world from responsible, wise and caring community.

One of Forbes' earliest poems, "The Search", which was written while a USC grad student and perhaps as a response to his meeting his first wife there expresses the conundrum of love within in education this way,

The professor lectures

His lecture

All lectures

Only a part of college

Only a part of life

Only a part of that which is taking place.

For a man and a woman

They might meet

In that classroom

Amid the lecture

They might meet

And what is a lecture compared to that? (Forbes 1992b, p. 18)

Thus, education and teaching for example are not separate spheres of influence or ways of learning, but rather must compliment the authentic pathways we must all take towards becoming real people, whole people, loving people. But what about teachers? What is their/our dilemma?

Forbes once wrote that the core dilemma of teachers today in an imperial society is “whether the teacher will be a pimp or an authentic person” (Forbes 1994h, p. 1). He defines a pimp as a selfish “go-between”, one who negotiates the boundaries of power for their own benefit. Not only do they pimp themselves out for money, but they are most often pimping others out for their own gain, insisting while they do this that they are indeed, power, and to be feared. They would deny that they are being pimped themselves, for they cling to the idea that they are in control, they are the master of their destiny, unlike those that are being pimped by them. The teacher is in a similar nexus of relationships. They have a choice. They can be a pimp for the textbook industry, or for consumer society on the eve of Black Friday deals and the Santa farce, or they can perpetuate the new colonizers right to “explore” the universe while ignoring the serious consequences this has had in history and will have in the future, such as the Red Scare and the pollution circling the Earth as it orbits the Sun or the mining and colonization of Mars. Teachers choose all the time whether to “pass” a student, whether to have a “movie day” and shirk on their work in the classroom, and to simply use captive students as a means to collect a check. We live in a highly exploitive society today, and pimping each other or hustling each other is in fact, the norm. Forbes defines the pimp teacher this way:

we often pimp for an admittedly exploitative, unethical, violent, abusive, ugly society - preparing our pupils for non-lives or battered lives or battering lives in a hypocritical and dehumanizing world. For example, as a home economics teacher we might pimp for the big-foods industry with its orientation towards refined products, white sugar-loaded foods, and packaged goods. A pimp teacher prepares

her pupils to be consumers of whatever the mass food industry wants them to consume (ibid).

Forbes goes on to argue for example, that in presenting the imperial vision of the world without question is “by far the most common type of pimping” and,

arises when teachers present their students with inaccurate, biased textbooks and curriculum materials, prepared by a publishing industry which is either unwilling to offend vested interests or regional prejudices or is, itself, part of the corporate, white, male Anglo-Saxon power structure (p. 2).

Thus, for Forbes, the predicament we are faced with as educators and the philosophies we entail, must be grounded in not necessarily oppositional framework, but one which he calls, authentic. Authenticity, revolves around one’s personal power, their authorship of their own teaching and learning and knowledge. And it is from this conception of authenticity that leads Forbes to conclude that,

*In order to escape from this situation teachers must possess the professional responsibility and institutional support for doing research, because it is the ability to do independent research which allows a teacher to assume responsibility for what he or she teaches (p. 3, emphasis original).*

This is the crux of his argument because when an educator, or parent or leader takes up any position they must do so in a reflexive environment where the “truth” does not stand except in agreement with others truths and their ability to exercise their own power as truth-seekers yet is validated by their own experiences, stories, traditions, and the wisdom of their elders. That is, they must express an authentic opinion based upon their own search for truth and their understanding of each truth’s relationship to the whole of their



knowledge. Truth, in essence, is simply a lie dressed up if it is not guaranteed in some way by the speaker, and even then, it must still be tested by the listeners for it must compete with other truths all the time. Hence, research, is about revision, or the ability to take another look at something and come to new visions and understandings, not necessarily new knowledge. Research, is a vision process of knowledge production and not necessarily an academic or textual quest for information, informants or sources (Forbes 1966d). Traditional communities have developed advanced forms of visioning by investing into ceremonial traditions and rituals which honor and promote dreaming and vision such as among the Rotinoshonni who have practiced a daily dreaming rite of remembrance and sharing for countless generations. Many communities maintain coming of age ceremonies for men and women which rely upon supporting vision-type experiences at home, in sacred places, in ceremony, or through inducement via special herbal plant decoctions such as *nuktamush* or *toloachatl*, *ayahuasca*, *hikuli* or *peyotl*, or by the opposite approach of fasting, performing purification rites, and limiting influences to those most desired and respected sources such as powerful spirits, ancestors, rooted, running, flying, slithering and swimming teachers, wisened elders, the fire, or water, a mountain or cave, and a person's own heart and inner-vision (Cajete 2000, pp. 64-66). Most teachers in the schools today come with a complete lack of visionary experiences, and cannot adequately guide students towards the tried and true, rich sources of knowledge that are distinct from this information age's focus upon textual, visual and material sources.

So, why do teachers, who are known or perhaps stereotyped for being low-wage professionals, and victims for the cause of education, why do they act as “go-betweens”

or pimps for a corrupt system of state, school board, textbook industry, and colonial relations of exploitation? Forbes (1994h) says that the rich and wealthy are aware of these factors and facts, so much that, he believes, “*the dilemma for the conservative elite is, then, how to have schools and colleges without having education. By and large, they have solved their dilemma, but at the expense of teacher integrity, professionalism, and authenticity*” such as through providing mediocre training, a lack of an ethos in social justice and change, a false sense of superiority over their students, families and communities, the idea that they live in a democracy which actually works for ALL peoples, etc. (p. 8, emphasis original). He argues, this is done by dumbing down and underfunding public schools, creating and replacing quality for quantity through vocational focused, technical, and other kinds of industry dependent institutions and corporations, as well as playing off the character of its citizens through enticing the greedy (with tax breaks, private institutions, etc.) and the fearful (those who are afraid of social change, loss of employment, no education whatsoever, etc.). Forbes maintains that this goes back to the classic divide and conquer schemes perfected over the last few thousand years by imperial elites. And more to the point, Forbes (1994h) harkens that most sides of the story, of the voters, are in fact “*products of public education; and they are products of schools which failed,*” that is, they have been miseducated and trained either to accept the status quo in order to reap the benefits that can come to them, or perhaps it’s the illusion of democratic change and the real way their government functions, or that change is impossible or even the fear of the consequences (p. 10). No matter what the reasons are, many teachers simply protect the interests of those with spiritual, political and economic power rather than training students to become free-

thinkers, fighters of justice and peace, building their spiritual and social character and values, and lastly become real social community democrats representing their own families and nations, homes and territories. For these reasons amongst many others Forbes (1994h) argues coherently that “*the teacher does not become authentic to be popular, he or she becomes “real” so as to live as an authentic human being and to do a good job. He then has a reason to fight. Her battle is then worth her time* (p. 11, emphasis original)”. Thus the main difference between the authentic teacher and the pimp teacher is that the authentic teacher doesn’t merely “take on the system”, they do it for intrinsic reasons as much as extrinsic purposes, for their own unfettered spirit, their own humanity, their own dignity and self-respect and the fulfillment of their vision and path in life. If we carry an ethos of interdependency, mutual love and respect, togetherness and balance, we as educators understand that being “real” or “authentic” is how we treat others as well, especially our students, their parents, their knowledge, and their time and energy.

So what does a good teacher, an authentic teacher look like? Forbes (1966d) once described his belief on the subject by saying that,

it is my conviction that excellence of teaching demands subject-matter competence in addition to such qualities as the ability to communicate, knowledge of testing procedures, and a genuine interest in human beings. But above all, effective teaching demands enthusiasm enriched by knowledge. I have come to the conclusion that enthusiasm without knowledge is dangerous, and knowledge without enthusiasm is boring. Above all else, the good instructor seeks to awaken

curiosity, to arouse interest, to stimulate the student to pursue knowledge and creative development enthusiastically (p. 8).

It is the last fact that I have to come actively pursue and demand of myself and my students. One does not teach a subject that students will put in the closet never to be seen again, but rather, to creatively integrate and adapt this knowledge to their own life and lifelong learning. Student's cannot simply embody these aspects though without seeing it live, demonstrated and modeled by the teacher. Teachers cannot simply be good bankers, to use the phrasing of Paulo Freire. Teachers must also go beyond dialogue and beyond demanding creative development and actually show their students what this looks like, either themselves, or by bringing them to the sources of this kind of magic at work in the community, among masters, elders, knowledge-keepers and tradition-bearers. One model group I left out of this selection is the youth. The youth can demonstrate how a free-thinking, creatively inclined, and integrated framework can utilize new knowledge. If I were to give my college level students a piece of paper and tell them to make a book out of it, they would often struggle at the task. Whereas, if I give youth the same blank paper, they would create numerous kinds of books in a much shorter period. Thus, an authentic teacher must also be youthful in their approach to learning, that is, they must invite and demonstrate, inspire and share with their students the gift of learning and creativity, simultaneously. What kind of person can move beyond bare-bones teaching? Forbes answer, is the researcher and specialist. Which in the traditional community setting is the visionary and the medicine person or ceremonial leader. Among Rotinonshonni this would be a clan mother, this would be an herbalist or midwife, this would be a faithkeeper who leads ceremony and guides youth, and this would be the elders of the

confederacy and national councils, this would be special uncles and aunties, leaders of the family and the nation. Last but not least, is that this would instill the virtue of world as teacher as this is the ground upon which all knowledge and wisdom comes from and flows from, as a living-breathing tradition.

The specialist and researcher have devoted extreme amounts of time to asking questions and solving problems while most everyday teachers are not respected as capable of this kind of thought and professional activity. This is a poor assessment of teachers, however, if we remember what Forbes (1966d) highlights previously, teachers are trained to teach students they perceive to be have a platitude or low ceiling for learning, and the same can be said of public-school teachers. Forbes argues that the specialist can go above, and,

beyond the textbook generalization, beyond the artificially simple concepts of secondary-level instruction. Only the specialist can stimulate intellectual curiosity by analyzing problems in his field which remain to be solved, by answering students' questions in depth, and by exposing them to the latest knowledge (p. 8).

While many schools are doing adequate work of requiring “professional development”, they rarely require teachers to become researchers and to continue their education by supporting them through graduate school, specialized courses, sabbaticals, research and travel stipends, or even work during the summer months or over breaks. Often professional development consists of everyone getting on the same page rather than improving their particular knowledge, approach, and delivery. Or worse, it's used as a way to force everyone to submit to some industrial standard, new textbook, testing model or policy change which may in only a few years be outdated, be voted out, or otherwise

become irrelevant to their teaching. Such has been the case with the numerous educational reform efforts since the transformation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act post 1966.

The teacher-researcher is one who is offered the means and support to keep the ball rolling, the plot moving, and their knowledge relevant and highly functional. The answers a researcher finds may not always be new, they may be the same as when they started, but at least now, after follow-up research, experimentation, focused study and time to integrate what they have learned, new understandings, new approaches, and better ways of educating the same subject may be generated. Yet, we find this is rarely the case in public schools, junior colleges, vocational or technical schools, and even at the state university level. We find that teachers are not also researchers. And then at the research institution, they are divided between research professors and teaching faculty, those that are continuing their education and those that are banking students and training workers. Forbes argues that research should form one of the foundations of professional competence. Yet we find, in Forbes (1966d) words,

if the faculty is expected to participate heavily in extracurricular activities, if emphasis is placed upon committee work to the exclusion of scholarship, and if administrators and other nonteachers [sic] are accorded undue respect while teachers are treated as persons of low status (and in the United States status is reflected in great party by salary schedules) (p. 9).

And where this is the case there will be little time for quality research and true professional development. Forbes concludes that “teaching and research are not incompatible. On the contrary, good teaching rests upon a foundation of general and

specific research” (p. 9). We see that at the junior or community college level, teachers are overloaded with heaving teaching schedules and many teach during the summer, in evening courses, or otherwise if they do research, are fitting the bill completely on their own. Forbes notes that these issues can be mitigated through creating a fund for research and travel (conference, field study, mentorship) purposes, merit-salary increases for subject-matter coursework while not giving increases for non-subject related degrees and courses, which includes also not encouraging good teachers to leave the classroom and become administrators with exceptions. Further, the public school is usually unranked which differs greatly from research and advanced educational institutions. Rank of course should be conferred through excellence in teaching and service rather than simply for hanging in there a certain number of years or merely having publishing outlets who agree with their views. Often, it is difficult for even university level teachers to attain full professor status because they cannot be published in conservative journals that are recognized by the academy, and who further look down upon those who publish book-length works which actually reach the general population and is in a language they can understand and utilize yet is also useable by the specialist.

### *The Teacher as Parent as Teacher*

Moll et al (1992) described how “funds of knowledge” carried by students, parents and community can and should be integrated into the curriculum, classroom, and school, if not forming the foundation of education. Forbes argued (2008a) that although we would like to pin the great injustices in education on teachers alone, we cannot escape the fact that our youth are “taught not primarily by underpaid public school teachers, of

“ivory tower” professors, by their parents, by movies, by television and the Internet, and in fact, by what they observe in society” (p. xix-xx). Many teachers think of themselves in terms of parents of their students, and treat them lovingly, calling them their “kids” (literally, baby goats) or “children” with affection and compassion. Yet at some period in the educational pipeline, this affection, this love and understanding, this respectful approach, is shed for an aggressive and rigid relationship rooted in power, authority, and punishment. This may be because we are not teaching our own community, neighbors, or people. This may be because we have succumbed to the view that at a certain age, children cannot be trusted or have become corrupted. Some teachers have actually called students and youth many derogatory labels and names such as “brats”, “snots”, or “wicked” or worse, which further casts them into a status being irredeemable. Further, many teachers are not good parents and would just as quickly beat or berate their students as they would their children, doling out punishments with impunity and relying on fear tactics for classroom discipline. The teacher must have adequate knowledge of the student’s cultural communities, and ideally, be an integrated part of their community. It’s not that outsiders cannot teach, but rather it’s a matter of integrating this knowledge, as well as developing a practice based on having core values of reciprocity, respect, culturally relevant knowledge and pedagogy, paired traditional approaches to learning and the healthy relationships that make the ultimate differences. Ideally, we are taught even in schools by extended members of our family and community. This extends to the curriculum which must reinforce what the community is and wants to be. Forbes (1973f) once said in the context of Native education, that,



a school, to be relevant to the Native pupil and his community, must have an atmosphere and a curriculum which is “American.” It must be consciously shorn of its alien European quality and must come to reflect the realities of this land’s past (p. 88).

He says this precisely because White’s, who dominate the teaching profession even in completely Black, Native, Mexican, Vietnamese, etc., communities are devoid of both cultural competency requirements as a parent would be held to, as well as the knowledge needed to live and survive in that place, that land. White teachers claim to be American when in fact they exhibit largely European ideas, relations, sentiments, culture and allegiances. By American he means, indigenous to the Americas, which were for the last 20,000 years or more, were stewarded and “owned” solely by Native Americans, and only in the last 1 percent of this history, has there been any great influence at all by “others” or outsiders who don’t see themselves as Americans or more shamefully, as the “real Americans”. Thus, the highly integrated ecological and place-based knowledge that Native Nations, their elders, parents and youth possess and are supposed to know are instead replaced by foreign information that is irrelevant or even damaging to their livelihoods and communities of place. In another presentation Forbes (1973b) elaborated, saying,

But it is not enough to say that little bits and pieces of Native American life and culture should be integrated into the curriculum. On the contrary, *we must be sure that the essence, the deepest meaning of Indian life-ways are dealt with* (p. 202, emphasis original).

This same approach must be applied to all peoples who have a stake in their child's education and seek to retain and continue to develop their own knowledge, language, ideas and economy in life and on the land. Otherwise, the kind of education we as parents-teachers are performing is an assimilationist approach, where we may not care how we teach to students because we consider the end product of conformity to be paramount to their self-worth, their sense of community, the sacredness of their family relations, etc.. If we were to look at our role as akin to parents in the classroom, we might reconsider our approach and relationship with students. We might reconsider the kinds of knowledge we have and what we are teaching, what kinds of knowledge the students, their families and community have and what they want to learn, and instead teach for them, not for the test from Texas. For most peoples, we live in environments, in places that are completely localized and are in fact niches from which we have adapted and learned to survive in. Thus, our knowledge is highly specialized and molded around living as a people of a particular place. This is not to say that we cannot survive elsewhere or our knowledge outside of this context is invaluable, for if it is based on critical thinking and creativity we can survive anywhere. Yet it is to say that our education in schools also must be just as highly specialized, and directly applied to our living environments and community relationships. You cannot teach weather patterns or concepts developed in Texas or Florida, New York, or California to interior Alaskan students, and vice versa. The same goes for a people's cultural knowledge. You cannot simply teach a general Diné-Navajo curriculum from To'hajiilee, New Mexico to those living near Navajo Mountain in Utah. A canned curriculum does not work for anybody excepting those who live in a small, isolated, close-knit community and territory. These

are the rare exceptions in a day which may be comprised of the world wide web, interconnected roads and global sourced food supplies. Yet this is exactly what is pushed on students, parents and communities today. Homeschooling has risen to become a viable option for many people who seriously have reconsidered the education they are receiving at public and private schools and which has followed a charter school model. Parents have the ultimate say over their child's learning yet we find this is predominantly an arena dominated by privileged whites rather than Native parents or people of color.

One of my students advocated consistently for “uncolonization” rather than decolonization for their approach to homeschooling their own children because they chose not to send their kids to a colonial institution altogether for fear of casual imperialization-socialization (Martinez 2018; Comunicación combativa 2018). Indigenous parents in Australia for example found that in their experiences at schools their children weren't enjoying it, and further they were “struggling with the fact that I was trying to introduce Aboriginal culture into the school and they weren't very receptive to that even though I was offering it to them for free and offering to organise it” (Gbogbo 2018). Now, they note the change the student has had afterwards to be profound as it was for the parents engagement, “I watched my intelligent child go from someone who had anxiety and was really struggling with a text-based system to someone who loved learning and couldn't get enough of it” (ibid). This might not be an option for many parents, but it brings forth the potential of people to make decisions on their own based on a new criterion: Indigenous knowledge and relationships. Indigenous parents have power and agency, and must ultimately make the decision to raise their children how they see fit. Given the predicaments we are engaged in daily and the kind of propaganda found

in schools which fuel imperial-colonial of our communities, is it any wonder that Risling Jr. like so many others claim that “school is the enemy”?

One of the ways to enact this role and relationship directly is by training parents, especially grandparents and wisened leaders to be teachers. Teacher assistants likewise should be parental figures. In traditional family settings, older siblings often fulfill this role and are the closest surrogates to their parents. The other direct way is of course for parents to be directly involved in the development of the mission, curriculum and structure of the educational program (Forbes 1973f, p.88). In this way, the parent-teacher is invested fully into the education of everyone because they also view other children akin to their own, they view other teachers as parental figures, and they recognize the limits of their teaching because they are in a unified family setting. Another aspect of direct parental involvement is that they are learning with their students, and the students are learning with their parents. This occurs most practically in the modeling of daily life practices and when youth are helping and supporting the family. It is recognized that youth need to play, to be creative, to have experiences and develop healthy and independent learning and living practices. Children in schools are often in an in-between position as they are corralled but also find ways to socialize with each other. They should not be workers and given the same responsibilities as adults, as was the case with boarding school practices where students literally did all the work. When the California Indian Education Association held their first statewide conference amongst concerned Indian leaders, teachers and parents, the focus group came up with a list of prioritized approaches which intimate the collective consensus on what quality parental involvement looks like, and includes:

1. parents should assume the responsibility of counseling and guiding their children at home;
2. parents should provide training in Indian language, history and culture at home, to supplement community and school efforts;
3. parents should participate actively in organizations such as Parent-Teachers Association and should visit the school frequently (not just when their child has a problem);
4. parents should help the Indian community develop educational and recreational programs for youth;
5. parents should attend classes in order to prepare themselves for helping their children, if the parents lack suitable background;
6. parents should be willing to serve as teachers in Headstart programs and as teacher aides and resource persons in regular classrooms, and;
7. parents should work to improve their self-image by setting better examples for their children within home and community (p. 10, Forbes 1967e).

As parents, it is ultimately our responsibility to provide the best learning, growing and nurturing environment for our children. Forbes (1967e) highlighted these points in his own keynote at the conference, saying:

Education is the key to development of self-sufficiency and improvement. But before education can be successful, the programs must meet the needs and desires of the local community. To bring this about, Indian people must become fully involved with their schools--as school board members, PTA members, teacher-aides, etc., and must be concerned with the education of their children (p. 49).

So while it's important to stress the responsibility of the parents to parent, and be the "first teachers" in following the example of our elders, of our mother earth, who are their "first teachers", we must also recognize that it's not easy to transform an entire education system, or even a single classroom because they are deeply connected and underwritten by powerful forces, corporations, policies and politicians who stand often above and beyond the parents and community. This is one of the main reasons parents must reconsider their roles in the system of exploitation, for if we do not take the active role as parent-teachers, we effectively give up this power and influence to perhaps, antithetical "others". Parents are often told they should join the PTA, but the PTA wasn't made for them and is often presided over by a conservative majority who it has long represented. Although parents may have some influence within the PTA, often what we find is that in large school districts and schools, Native parents do not have enough muscle, clout or numbers to alter the majority view. Or as is the case with most PTA's, they are predominantly monolingual English, White and privilege-oriented mechanisms that often support, at best, fundraising efforts, and most notably, by pawning much of these efforts upon their children as salespeople and beggars of more wealthy members. PTA's are imperial ancillaries in these cases. It is clear that working on the "outside" is not the answer, for what is "outside" of the empire now? Parents must work either on the inside directly as teachers or start their own school boards, PTA's, institutions and schools. Further, we must challenge those that have and continue to perpetuate a patriarchal, racist and imperial paternalism upon youth and community. Forbes (1967e) summary of the CIEA conference report included a perspective that is crucial to understanding the context of transforming the totality of the relationships involved, especially in the case of

a brutal armed conquest, psychological and spiritual trauma, abuse and terror, the pollution of land, traditions, and ideas, and related influences readily apparent in the case of California. He said, a total change must occur, and cannot simply be an educational approach:

It may well be that a conquered population can be truly liberated from the state of being conquered and powerless only through a process of self-liberation wherein the people in question acquire some significant measure of control over their own destiny. As a part of this process, a conquered people must acquire some control over the various mechanisms which serve to develop or to destroy that sense of personal inner security and pride which is essential for successful participation in sociopolitical affairs. All forms of education including that which derives from the home, the community and mass media are crucial in this connection (p. ii).

Forbes advocated that parents demonstrate to their children a positive self-image, to teach and train them in their own people's traditions, and to model education by actively taking upon learning themselves is important. The demand for teachers to be as parents would alter teacher-training programs. The demand for teachers to be as parents would alter curriculum so much that it would centralize family, kinship, clanship, community and nationhood. It is definitely part of a larger debate and discussion that needs to be sensitively addressed.

*Forbes Ultimate Goals for Decolonization and Deimperialization*

Interviewer: The importance of unity, well Jack Forbes was talking about unity. What would be your ultimate goal?

JDF: Well I don't know that I know my ultimate goal yet [T:[gasps] Yet?][Forbes: laughs] you know I have to wait after a thousand years for that, well in any case, we have to realize that all of us have been programmed by colonialism and classism, by other systems that have told us who we are and part of the process of growing up really is to find out you know a little more about who we really are and to shed these things that have been forced upon us. And unfortunately a lot of people who are persecuted who are oppressed who are economically poor and so on often don't have times in their lives to do a lot of that discovery. They know things are wrong, they know you know somethings haywire, but they don't have the tools, they don't have the time, they don't have the energy to do some of this unravelling. And that's where I think those of us who are scholars, who get a chance to become scholars have an extremely important role. Not that we have magical insights at all, but we have the time, the inclination and to some extent we have learn to master some certain kinds of skills that enable us to put ourselves at the service of people, to try to open up what I call development. Development is the opposite of envelopment. I use the word development differently from, than some people use it. It comes from a French word that means to open up, to liberate. And envelopment is the process of closing in. Most of us have been enveloped, we've been enveloped by various systems of colonialism and so on.

So one of my objectives is to help people to liberate themselves, to open things up. And to do that it's quite clear that you have to kind of start being skeptical about what has been given to us. And to me this is an extremely exciting task of



discovery then, of trying to set aside the dominant paradigms and see what the historical evidence really will give you if you just let it flow out onto the table in front of you. In other words instead of trying to organize it ahead of time, you let the evidence you know flow out and organize itself and you look at the picture and see what it's all about. (From a KPFA radio interview broadcast entitled "Decolonization, Africans and Native Americans" conducted May 28, 1994, JDF D-046, Box 193, Cassette 7).

Part of Forbes timely perspective was that as educators and scholars we are in a position to advocate for and empower students and communities towards autonomous or community development rather than envelopment into the lumpen proletariat and as a part of the castigated urban or suburban underclasses of the U.S.. Key to his perspective is that one needs a historical view, a view which is rooted in an ancient perspective of community development over time. Community stories of tradition and development form the basis from which a people see themselves unfolding and flowering culturally, socially, spiritually and in relation to others. Without these shared visions of historical development, students are apt to believe in the colonial and imperial messages of inferiority, in terms of cultural deficits, and historical backwardness where essentially Native Nations are starting from square one or worse with thousands of years of unlearning to go through. The opposite may in fact be the truth, that imperial and colonizing groups have to go through a resocialization and reeducation process which places them into right relations, establishes a new story of historical development or invigorates an ancient one which places them in a position of equality and respect among

Native Nations, and all life. Unfortunately, this is not a part of the story of the development of white people, whose only origin or creation stories are either absent in the ones they perpetuate from western science or Christian traditions, or are the fiery racist propagandistic versions you hear neo-Nazi's and openly white supremacist folks spewing are rooted in the belief of a righteous conquest, of righteous enslavement, of theft of Indigenous lands and lives, of ecocide (climate change doesn't exist), of righteous science (can do no wrong), and justified exploitation of all non-white peoples and places.

Development, if it is going to happen in any positive, sustainable and respectful way must again be rooted in ancient struggles of become The People, that is, humble, loving and mature creatures of specific places of creation imbued with the knowledge of how to live harmoniously with all their relations, over time. Education, or the bringing forth of these desirable traits in individuals who in turn are community members cannot be both exploitive or destructive (as modern development models suggest) and harmonious, respectful and with a practical maturity and wisdom that sustainability and traditional models of living require. ““Education” of the kind we know in the modern world has little to do with ethics or with bringing forth the individual potential of the learner. On the contrary, it is largely technical in nature (whether in natural science, social science, or whatever) and seldom (in and of itself) serves to alter the class and ethnic “interests” of the graduates” says Forbes (2008a), whose view obviously in not in sync with the many advocates today of teaching towards a so-called 21st century education (pp. xii). Usually, one means the continued exploitation of Indigenous lands and bodies, and the further incorporation of students into the globalization of exploitative

predator-prey capitalism where the skills needed are in fact, the ability to forego a sensitive conscience to sentient others while pursuing unlimited resource extraction, unbridled “growth” and greater production of foreign products to be consumed by those who offer very little in terms of cultural, spiritual, historical, linguistic or other kinds of social capital outside of belief and will to exploit without mercy (or with the superiority complex to believe that it’s all for our own good, or will be reprieved through a final solution either in a heavenly judgement, human race destroying disease or war (the we deserve it or we’re doomed logic), through scientific discovery of a “cure” such as colonization of mars, or some plastic pollution eating bacteria, etc..). Yet really we are losing precious time when the solutions have been amongst us the entire time, because our ancient and lived histories are the sources of our problems and answers. Thus Forbes demanded like such leaders as Crummel, Du Bois and Parker that an intelligentsia, an educated (at home and away) group of Native scholars and leaders was needed in order to actively promote deimperialization and decolonization.

*On Democracy and Real Red Power*

“To discover true democracy and real freedom one must turn to traditional Indo-Chicano societies, grounded in reverence for the Web of Life” (from “Why DQU”, D-046, B. 181, p. 9)

In 1965, Forbes (1978a) advocated “Indian Power”, one year before Clyde Warrior painted “Red Power” and “Custer Died for Your Sins” on his car in 1966 (p. 18; Shreve 2011, p. 169). Forbes was ahead of his time in many ways and his lengthy

experience as a democratic organizer, a leader working on behalf of all peoples and communities began when he was a teenager in Los Angeles, joining the South Pasadena Democratic Club at the tender age of 17. At Glendale College he was a student leader and campaigned for Adlai Stevenson in 1951 and 1952, a man whose politics would eventually open up the door for JFK to become president in 1960. Before Forbes took a position at the Center for Western North American Studies in 1965 at the University of Nevada Reno, he had worked as a field organizer for the Democratic Party of Ventura, which he helped found in 1955. He worked on the political campaign for John F. Kennedy during his year run for presidency from 1960-1961. In 1960 he formed the American Indian College Committee along with Carl and Mary Gorman, from which they developed many radical proposals for Native higher education. He formed and led the Native American Movement/Movimiento Nativo Americano from 1961-1963 along with leaders Antonio Del Buono and others. He was on the Board of Trustees for the Ventura County Community College District from 1962-1963 He formed an American Civil Liberties Union in Reno shortly after he arrived in 1965. He worked closely with Native Nevadan leaders throughout his time there and was in fact reprimanded for his authentic grass-roots work, especially after speaking supportively about the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada's charges of regaining their stolen territories that his administrators at the CWNAS told him he would be fired if he didn't watch what he did and said.

In 1967, he moved Berkeley to head the Far West Educational Research Laboratory where he was one of the few persons who worked with local Native and communities of color on an educational level. In this year, he also began to work with the fledgling California Indian Education Association which he helped co-found and whose

grassroots work eventually forced the hand of UC officials to okay a Native American Studies program at UC Davis that began in the fall of 1969. He helped form the United Native Americans in 1968 whose student body were major leaders at Alcatraz. During this time as well, Forbes was an active leader at UC Berkeley during the Third World Liberation Front strikes and activities and was so well received by the diverse ethnic studies student body leadership that he was nominated for the position of first director of Ethnic Studies, which he declined for UCD . He helped co-found California Indian Legal Services in 1967 as well, and whose legal team would later help D-QU win its fight for the application of the Army Telecommunications Center in Davis, which it eventually called home. Right as he began to lay the groundwork for UCD-NAS, he, the CIEA and other leaders founded D-Q University, just outside of Davis in 1970, and which opened its doors for classes in 1971. Forbes had worked for 10 unrelenting years from 1961-1971 to develop and build support for Native American Studies and an American Indian University, sometimes on his own, but mostly in collaboration with many other peoples. In 1970, he helped revitalize the Rappahannock Tribe and Powhatan Confederation, where he served as a leader and field organizer. Also this year he helped found the Coalition of Eastern Native Americans which sought to infuse the surviving Eastern Native Nations with a revolutionary democratic spirit that moved many to action and unity. His work never did end. He taught for free at D-Q University for many years while also being a leader at UC Davis Native American Studies for over 30 years. If Forbes was anything, he was a revolutionary educator and democrat, who fought for the return of Traditional Native Democratic Nations his whole life. Forbes democratic tradition grew out of his working class and humble Native experiences living and loving amongst the

people, plants and creatures of his beloved California which he called home nearly all his life. Forbes rejected the demagoguery of Europe who had failed to develop Democracy for thousands of years and instead always looked to local traditional leaders and community members for guidance and wisdom. In comparison, I feel small in the presence of his legacy, but his greatness makes me want to be great and strong too, not in political clout, power or prestige, but in love and community, in thought, words and action.

Forbes core democratic thinking was based on his firm belief that Native Nations represent, in the past and present, the greatest examples of democracy or “power to the people” in action. He however was scared that we have had too many undemocratic years that have brainwashed and burned us out. He said:

unless we can allow such communities to survive and develop *according to their own vision of life*, we shall find it impossible to preserve even the formal structure of democracy for mass societies. A people, in short, who become accustomed to the suppression of local democracy, who violate other people’s rights of self-determination, who turn to bureaucracy for solutions of all problems, and who value Gross National Product over Gross National Sanity cannot long avoid totalitarianism. We must look to tribal people, since small, healthy, balanced societies have much to teach us. We must not destroy them. We must provide them, not with solutions, but with the means for their finding their own solutions to their own problems (p. 19, Forbes 1978a).

In summary, he believed in “revolutionary democracy”, but in the actual sense of returning to traditional democratic community governance. Forbes (1978a) argued that in

this day and age “the only true revolutionary is one who seeks to create a genuine democratic society” (p. 11). For him, “democracy is indeed the only “revolutionary” viewpoint competing for man’s allegiance” (p. 11). The problem of course is we live in an imperialized world and as such, it has infected many of our own self-proclaimed revolutionaries who have no critique of imperialism, who carry an overt sense of superiority of their people, over queens and elders, of the land and waters, and in their own self-serving ideals. These people might on the one hand attack current imperial politics but at the same time work with them. Forbes argues this is because

totalitarian systems which allegedly seek to prepare mankind for democracy are in fact anti-democratic and, therefore, anti-revolutionary. The “pie in the sky” which they offer (democracy in the future) is nothing more than a carrot held in front of the masses, designed to prevent popular uprising and to attract utopianists. In fact, men such as Stalin betray in all of their actions as great a hostility to democracy as do men such as Hitler, Franco, Chiang Kai-Shek, and Genghis Khan (ibid, p. 11).

Forbes truly believed that a group cannot become democratic by being taught, because they must learn in the context of community how to work together. Forbes (1978a) says:

*democracy can only develop where it is put into practice, even as a oak can only grow where an acorn is planted. People must learn to be democrats, they cannot merely be taught. For this reason it is very dangerous to establish any powerful bureaucracy in a state ostensibly moving towards democracy, because such a bureaucracy will almost inevitably prevent democratic practices and will therefore prevent the learning of democracy. . . . A government that basically*

*distrusts the individual can never help that individual to become a democrat* (p. 11, emphasis original).

Forbes says this because nearly every single revolutionary, socialist, democratic project has resulted in a centralized bureaucracy, one which moves away from local, community and place-based consensus and autonomous survivance. Even Native Nations have succumbed in large part to bureaucracy rather than democracy, implementing “tribal councils” and “elections” while relying upon back-door deals, corporate, state and federal power, police and brute squads, and otherwise eliminating open councils, consensus-building, community-run (self-determined) programs, local financing, and family support structures. Cajete (1994) says “the understanding of a natural community led to the social organizational concept of “natural democracy”” which is a traditional Native community (p. 89). Further he explains:

within this context of natural democracy, there is the idea that plants, animals, and other entities in the natural world, have rights of their own and must be given respect, as would any member of a human tribe. Today, natural democracy may be considered a revolutionary concept, yet it was the foremost principle guiding the process of Indian people in their interaction with their physical environments. Conservation and preservation of natural communities were integrally reflected in the practices of Indian people. This basic environmental ethic was predicated on the perception that life should be preserved for life’s sake (ibid).

Forbes “revolutionary democracy” is very much akin to Cajete’s “natural democracy”. Forbes does offer some pragmatic approaches and structural inventions which he hopes might aid in both stopping the imperial monster from eating the earth and peoples



wholesale, as well as giving less numerical Native Nationals the best chance at influencing a transitioning society. “The establishment of true democracy is dependent upon *both* the creation of a representative political system and the setting up of safeguards against the abuse of power by the wealthy. A little bit of socialism is certainly a minimum prerequisite” (Forbes 1978a, p. 12). So while Forbes recognizes the socialist paradigm of social support systems, he does not hope to completely replace ancient models of governance or reduce them to mere symbols. Further he argues that “*a democratic society must be a pluralistic society*” and it must “*keep the wealthy in check and keep the state in check*” (p. 12, emphasis original). How do we keep “wealth in check”? He does not say. Traditionally, in Rotinonshonni communities this was performed first and foremost by making women the property owners and thereby creating a powerful group to check the rest, for they were the “wealthy” and arguably held the weight of responsibility upon their backs. Next, this was performed by giving women the final say on the choosing of male leaders to represent their clan-family, who they could also summarily depose. The “law” must be clear about how wealth is held, by whom, and provide means for distributing it so that the “wealthy” does not become a permanent class of materialist people but rather a regenerative harmonizing group dedicated to giving and nurturing life and the life of the community. This was the purpose for example of the Tlingit and other pacific northwest coast communities “potlatch” and for other feasts-ceremonies such as the “give-away” acts of Lakota, Anishinaabe and other peoples. Also, we must understand the “state” is not a separate entity *except* when it’s a bureaucracy, when it has become separate from the whole people and community and becomes the network of power-hoarding individuals who are in turn connected to other networks of

like-persons and groups. In other words, their allegiance has become “the state” or “the law” rather than the actual people or land. In “state” paradigms, the state owns the land or holds it in trust for “the people”. This is called collusion, which is essentially the liberal game of “let's make a deal”, meaning, anything and everything is available for purchase, for sale, and up for negotiation, such as our national forests, which are all Native homelands. Akin to Forbes (1978a) concept of a prerequisite “mass awakening” prior to any kind of revolutionary spirit, he maintains the same standard for “democracy”, saying, “no democratic society can be brought into existence by any means until the majority of people have acquired a democratic spirit. This cannot be accomplished except gradually by means of education and experience” (p. 13). He says this with the recognition that many peoples have lost the democratic spirit and have moved away from local, consensus making groups, namely, the democratic family of which the Nation is a mere extension. Many people cannot conceive of taking on the responsibilities their ancestors had, of being family, of being teachers, of being leaders, of being providers of all sorts, of caretaking the land, of protecting their relations, of creating their lives and everything in it, and of working with others who are equals to make shared decisions. This has all got to change, and fast.

Taking cues from Frantz Fanon and Huey P. Newton, Tecumseh and others, Forbes (1978a) was not shy to admit that a violent, oppressive, and deadly system must ultimately be overthrown if it cannot be undone by education and communication (p. 13). Yet at the same time, Forbes was emphatically for peaceful solutions as he was convinced in his rigorous research how numerous rebellions became power-struggles drenched in a violence-based nation-state or how revenge or blood-payments were

ineffective against a terror state built to exact revenge and punish “criminals”, “seditionists” and “witches”. He says what was needed was a “democratic revolutionary” who was “distinguished from the pseudo-revolutionary by his constant concern that all of his actions contribute towards the creation of democracy. He must avoid unnecessary violence, he must diminish hatred, he must avoid authoritarianism and bureaucratism” and finally as to what kind of actions that will successfully perpetuate real democracy (power to all people) is that “he will be typified by a love for people, all people, and will entertain no naive class hatreds” (p. 13). He saw that the U.S. “has not been, as some scholars allege, an “experiment in democracy.” . . . but rather it has a “great potential for massive good or massive evil” (p. 14). “Perhaps these projects can be achieved by democratizing the “Democratic Party.” On the other hand, it may be that the United states needs a nationwide “Freedom Democratic Party” to serve both as an educational device and as a pressure-group forcing the Democratic Party to move leftwards” (p. 14). Does the Green Party or any other party fit this description? Forbes on the other hand sought to develop what he called an Americanist Party, an international democratic and grassroots, Indigenous led movement. It never gained traction but not all good ideas do, the first time they are proposed.

How do these ideas fit into a decolonizing philosophy of education? Is Democracy the end result or is it Community, that is, not Power but People which survive and thrive as a unified Nation the ultimate result? The issue with a focus upon Power, as in Indian Power or Red Power, Black Power or Chicano Power, is that like Democracy, or Self-determination we may mean different things than what the imperialists and colonizers mean, especially if they have never experienced real Democracy, or real

people power. They don't know what it means to Rotinonshonni people who have been practicing it for thousands of years, have struggled through their own harrowing histories of becoming people-eaters and killers, and have learned from this struggle and still maintained the core of their values: *Skennen* (peace), *Ka'shatsténhshera* (strength) and *Kanikonriio* (Good Mindedness/Righteousness). As mentioned elsewhere though, Forbes believed that the many Indigenous confederations, traditional democracies and peaceful Nations represent the highest examples from which we should be basing our future societies upon. He did not consider any of the current nation-states to be so-called democracies, or if they were, then Native Nations were obviously something else, something better. For example, John Mohawk (2010) in speaking on power, says real power is the ability to “enact a true peace” and “is the product of a unified people on the path of righteousness” whereas reason, clear thinking and good mindedness “is the ability to enact the principles of peace through education, public opinion, political, and when necessary, military unity” (p. 185). And while in the Rotinonshonni confederacy as well as among the constituent's local National governments, there are condoled leaders who uphold the law and will of the people. The will and laws of the people are one, and they are not a state outside of them for this is a direct democracy rather than representation and implementation style republicanism who are loosed to do their own will as much as that of their constituents. Among the Rotinonshonni leaders are chosen by the Good Women, the *Gantowisas* who are the leading queens of each clan-family, and instead of having absolute power, they are merely speakers, workers, diplomats, interpreters and agents rather than having the power to make decisions on their own (Mann 2000). Often today, our people have been brainwashed to believe that they must give up their power to

their elected leaders, who in turn make decisions and work on their behalf without their consent. Mohawk points out for example that diabetes, which has ravaged so many captive peoples, has a cure, and that cure like so many others is rooted in the ancient land-based survival models of traditional foods, land stewardship, and communal land owning and caretaking. Thus democracy is not separate from economic self-sufficiency. Culture is inseparable from language. Education is inseparable from family and community. As argued throughout, we are interacting always within a matrix of relations. How many of these relations practice democracy? Does the supermarket or monocropping corporate farm? Does the school, board of trustees or council, the state or federal policy makers? What about the hospitals and health-care system? How can we practice democracy, let alone teach it, if every other relation is a paid representative that reports to an external bureaucracy or hierarchical structure that exists because of its profit margins?

How does this translate it into “democratic education”? There can be no such thing as “democratic education” if it is not rooted in a democratic community which exemplifies and models how democracy works which can then be contrasted to the majority institutions and states which are non-democratic. Otherwise we do not have living examples to draw from, and instead, we are telling are children the greatest farce in the world and greasing the wrong wheels. This comes difficult to many educators who have been deluded to think that the U.S. was anything other than an empire out of control, something other than an angry infant that ran away from its parents (UK) and built a police state (fort) in someone else’s (Native Nations) backyard. Yet many educators have not studied their own communities traditions of democracy (consensus,

autonomy, equality, diversity, unity) nor have they critiqued the majority non-democracies outside of labeling non-republican states socialist or communist. In order to practice democracy we must have our own economic self-sufficiency, which provides the base for socio-cultural development. Yet, as John Mohawk (2010) reminds us, “culture and economy are inseparable” (p. 94). Further, he explains the nexus this way with regards to its total connection and relationship to education:

A lot of people today have come to accept the BIA definition of *culture* as referring to music, dress, and language. But cultures are inconceivable without an economic base. Even spiritual life revolves around to a considerable extent around the ways that people see their lives supported. Indeed, it is arguable that people’s personal relationships, and their relationships to their environment, are molded by the ways in which they meet their needs, and the manifestation of those ways is what we call culture. In the absence of culture, there can be no economy. In the absence of economy, there can be no culture. All that remains is the memory of culture.

A great part of what is taught today in schools is the “memory of democracy”, or the “memory of culture”, the “memory of traditions”, etc.. Or, they are being taught how to participate in the global exploitation economic empire, where everything is K/Capital including their labor, including their culture, including the water, including their own souls. Democracy, or people power, is a farce with the total matrix of community, without democratic relations, without economy, language, history, kinship, etc.. Thus, while the Matrix of Peoplehood is valuable as a major area of discussing nationhood, it must centralize these other aspects, otherwise it is merely an essential list for teaching the

“memory of culture” rather than understanding the way Nations have been impacted by imperial invasions of all kinds, and how they actually survive today. Capital for example, is a signifier for its original roots, meaning *kaput* or “head, first, primary” and which came to denote power embodied in the “head” of a people, the leadership, or the “head” of household, or property-stock owner. Capital is not anything outside of its origins, which in this instance is identified as racism (whiteness) and patriarchy (male rulership), and thus capitalism is merely the creation of new systems of exploitation based on this fusion and its advancement and development beyond its original boundaries of Europe. This is why bell hooks critical use of the term “Imperialist White-Supremacist Capitalist Patriarchy” is to acknowledge always how they are bound together. If racism and patriarchy are endemic to capitalism, they are all endemic to imperialism and colonialism. We cannot separate them, they are one. Democracy cannot be continued within this context because they have turned many of us against the “democratic spirit” of “the people’s power” through mutuality, negotiation, consensus, equality and autonomy. We cannot force ourselves on anyone, all we can do is show them another way.

### *Education, Socialization and “Public” Schooling*

One of the gravest needs we have today is an education which matches the communities vision for itself. A majority of Native, Chicano, Black, Asian and students of color attends education institutions beginning at the age of 3 or 4 and do not graduate from them with a degree of value until the age of 20 or later, if they ever do. What are they doing during these 14 or more years of education which helps them become competent family members, masters of their language and literacies, bearers and

members of living communities of tradition, and ready to take on the massive issues all peoples share in and are unique to their own struggles? For the most part, most students are attending institutions which are dominated by English-only, White and European cultural values, traditions, history, knowledge and ideas, are structured, taught, graded and formed to match the interests of global capitalism, representative democratic republicanism, and continue the work of the imperialist and colonialist empires it draws from in the past and present as founts of knowledge and wisdom. The teaching field is still primarily comprised of women, a whopping 77%, which is up from its last survey that reported 76% (NCES 2012; NCES 2017). These same surveys revealed that the teaching population was 80% white in 2016, down from 82% in 2012. Basically, our youth lack a culturally and community-relevant education and lack any kind of critical engagement with the base issues, struggles, ideas and dilemmas which their peoples and lands face, one's which we must face and deal with directly. Lehman "Lee" Brightman (1971) was a co-founder of United Native Americans in 1968, and taught at D-Q University for many years among other places. He gave testimony before a Senate Subcommittee session on Indian Education in 1969 and summarized the educational context then, which is not too far off from what it is today, saying:

Let us look at the present school system as it stands today. The schools are controlled by white men. You don't find Indians on the school boards. You don't find any Indian teachers, very few if any. The schools are named after white men. The pictures they hang on the walls in our schools are not of Indians, they are white men, famous white men, not famous Indians, but white men. Then you get into the school teachers. About 99 percent of them are white. They teach a white



curriculum that was established by the dominant white middle-class society. A good indication of why this is not working with our Indian kids, it was established as I said, by the dominant middle-class white society for non-Indians in urban areas and it is not working in urban areas (p. 38).

Thus, what we need is a dramatic revolution in education, a complete and enduring overhaul, if not a total dismantlement and reconstruction. Let's look at some of the main tethering reasons why things have not changed, and why schools have not been a great influence themselves in this transformational process.

First, and I believe foremost, we must go back to the original point of Bryan McKinley Brayboy (2006), which is that imperialism/colonialism and racism are endemic to the United Colonial Empire. Further, we must seriously understand what this means in terms of political and public transformation by taking heed of the lessons and wisdom of James Baldwin (1979) who argued that white imperialist men will not give an inch without their interests converging with the imperialized, the colonized, the oppressed, the poor, the non-white, etc.. No meaningful change is allowed and this is because as the work of Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) have shown in the case of federally controlled Indian education efforts such as at boarding schools and day schools, there is an assumed zone of safe and dangerous issues, ideas, elements of peoplehood, topics of political discussion, activities of experience and learning, characteristics of teachers and administration, of curriculum and pedagogy and more which are resistant to change because they would upset and overthrow the imperial regime of learning or mis-education. The oldest Native language and culture-based immersion programs in the U.S. are approaching 40 years and were started then, primarily, without any support

whatsoever from the U.S. or Canadian governments or their affinity states. These regimes will not generally support education which is the opposite of their intended goals of conformity, making willing workers, passive consumers, and culturally bankrupt students who have no choice but to enter the global imperial workforce as free-range wage-slaves. Their communities, languages, traditions, lands, education systems and people have not been invested into but instead remain the most exploited communities on the map, suffering from the highest levels of water toxicity, the highest levels of teenage suicide, the highest levels of poverty, and the list goes on and on. This is not the dream and vision their ancestors had for their people, but it is the one that the U.S. Empire and its corporate leeches recreate daily as the basis of “American exceptionalism”, “democracy” and “freedom”. It’s ideals are crushing us. It’s foundational values and structures are devastating. It’s core is rotten. It’s vision is a nightmare of ecocidal and genocidal proportions.

Where do we begin? What kind of vision is needed and what kind of work must be done? We must start at the root of the problem, namely Imperialism and its matrix of relations, along with its gatekeeper, Racism, which is the old defense system of those in power. Imperialism thrives on enemies, within and beyond the empire. Thus, educationally, we must appear as friends or we will become enemies of the state or local vigilantes. Yet at the same time, there is always a trade-off, a sacrifice when you wear a mask or put on a front, part of it becomes real, and worse, the mask isn’t temporary and doesn’t come off. In this way, we must always be wary of impersonating the imperialist and racist, and those who we use as spies may be playing both sides. This leaves us with the dilemma of assimilation or segregation, as often the only way to be

different on a permanent level is to remain as separate and distinct entities as much as possible. On a local level, we must either take over the school boards and schools, or start our own, or take our children out of schools until our needs are met. If we are not receiving the kind of education we need and deserve, we are receiving the opposite kind. Education is about socialization, into a people, a place, into a way of life, a belief system, a historical journey, a language and its way of communicating and thinking, everything which makes up a People, a Nation. Therefore we need to start with the vision or the mission and its tangible goals of school, district, and system as a whole. The goal of the school or educational institution should be first and foremost, to raise good Onkwehonwe, Chicanos, or Kanien'kehá:ka or your kind of People, and devout, loving members of a Nation. Is your school trying to raise good Christians? Is your school trying to raise U.S. citizens? Is your school trying to raise workers for the global or local economy? Is your school trying to raise your children to become something other than one of the people? This is the most basic and important stage and move that must be done. You cannot expect a single classroom or teacher to do the work of re-educating an entire nation. It cannot be done. Thus, this is the reason why Forbes advocated like Huey Newton and Bobby Seale that one must go about bringing forth a mass awakening, *conscientization*, of the people *before*, such efforts take place, unless of course, a community is ready for this kind of education already. If that is the case, they are ready for the next step or stage, which is building or rebuilding.

One of the issues that plagued D-QU was that although it developed a critical mass and had a great original vision, it took over an old Army Telecommunications Center and instead of bulldozing its barrack-like structures, its bureaucratic central

headquarters, and cleaning up its poisoned wells and soil, its pillaged fields and acreage, for it attempted to live within the decommissioned and deteriorating structures and habitat, structures that were similar in many ways to the ones that the U.S. government left behind at Alcatraz Island from which the Indians of All Tribes had proposed to develop a University within and which Forbes had criticized (Forbes 1983, pps. 24-25). Without the funds to ever fix up the old ones, D-QU remained a dilapidated institution, as Forbes notes, it was consistently denied basic funds by DOE and other sources in order to do this (Lutz 1980, p. 39; Forbes 1985a). In 1977 for instance, an internal FBI memo clearly describes the terse and tense relationships it had with the federal government who characterized the school this way:

For information of the Bureau and recipient offices, since its inception DQU has been sustained through grants from the federal government, justified by their claim of establishing and operating a legitimate university dedicated toward teaching Indian culture. The fact is, however, that DQU has not operated effectively with the student body rarely in excess of 20 and supported by administrators and other staff with substantial salaries. It has consistently been regarded and reported to be a haven and sanctuary for transients and militants, both Chicano and Indian, and the Sacramento Office is presently in the midst of a Fraud Against the Government investigation concerning DQU (pps. 73-74, as quoted in Berger 1994).

This was a fact of life for the institution. It could not simply focus upon raising healthy peoples in a loving supportive environment. The early efforts of D-QU including a Migrant Education Project from 1972-1974 suffered from an incredible lack of

experience, structural instability, and relationships with the federal contractors. Part of this was because the federal government was initially hostile to D-QU from the beginning and as Forbes suspects, was riddled with hostile external interference and sabotage (Forbes 1980b; Forbes 1985; Lutz 1980). Deloria's pronouncement of D-QU's successes is not completely unfounded, as more than a few efforts, such as the Native American Language Education projects in Zuni and O'Odham communities were espoused positively but failed to develop regenerative concerted activities (Forbes and Adams 1976; Lutz 1980). Attempts to maintain D-QU's agricultural potential was consistently checked after 1977 by many federal entities after early successes. Part of this was the federal reading of the terms of the deed which disallowed farming or profits from its production by the school, negating one of the schools prime missions Forbes felt was assured through the federal counterparties acknowledgement of the original evidence for its articles of incorporation (Forbes 1985; Forbes 1980b). A number of permaculture, small plots and experiments have occurred at the site over time and even post-2005, whereas today in a strange perversion of sustainable education, D-QU is leasing the majority of the land to a local farmer who sells his products from the land to market and they've recently donated 12 acres *back* to the federal government in the building of a drug rehabilitation clinic through Indian Health Services in a sadistic and ironic twist of fate. Old-time instructor Lehman Brightman attested to the overall struggle to found and maintain itself for 35 years saying in 2010 after teaching for twenty years "practically donating my time and all" making \$200 a week for most of the 1970's and 1980's, it'd be a crime to give it back, to the government. They took all of our [land], we signed 389 treaties and they stole 1 billion acres of land, and left us with a couple hundred thousand

acres, and there's no sense in us giving it back to them." More importantly he reflected on the history of the struggle when he proclaimed that "we should not give land back to white people" and "we need to hang on to every inch of it". Thus if we are to learn anything about tactfully and sustainably promoting higher education in a hostile environment, we must maintain our focus upon the core relationships of community and territory in the prime, from which the vision, mission and goals can be sustained internally. Forbes role in D-QU clearly was huge from the beginning yet cooled off as he was not in a leadership position after 1974 excepting as an external representative or as an ambassador instructor. He until its closure however fought to keep it a people's institution devoted to its core vision and missions. Brightman influenced many people at D-QU, while Forbes did the same at UC Davis from the 1970's into the 1990's. D-QU narrowly survives while NAS at UC Davis continues to thrive, however, it is distinctly situated within a larger public land grant institution. The great visionary institution was never allowed to shine, yet in many ways, it shined greater than many other educational centers in nuanced ways where people got together and prayed, danced, and commingled, it was a humble place. Humbled by the lightning strikes of the imperial storm and humbled by the family and community who called it their learning home, its old hide, dried and tanned tells the story of its rise and fall.

### *Colleges, Universities and "Higher" or "Advanced" Education*

Forbes truly believed in the power of advanced training, the value of intelligent research, and the capacity of leaders trained by and for community development. One of the primary purposes of higher education and the university, is that a person can study

what their heart truly desires, tackle pressing problems and questions, and learn from wizened others. Further, one is technically placed into a category among Masters. But why do we have to wait until we have performed more than 20 years of education outside of our homes, families and communities? Doesn't this separation eventually lead a person away from the land and their people? And then, are the graduates truly prepared to lead their people? Are they truly prepared to tackle the pressing problems of today? These are the same questions we should be applying also to every kind of educational institution, practice and movement. If we are to train the youth of today to become the leaders of tomorrow, we must begin before they are even born and after they have passed on. Education must be an intergenerational experience. We must be thinking about how do we integrate our familial, communal and traditional forms of education with some of these ways that have been forced upon us, such as schools and church, but without depressing and changing the original core of our values, our community, our way of life. How do we do this? What does it look like? Forbes says, "we need to have new visions". Cajete (2014) says we need to focus on "coming back to our power". Battiste (1998) says that the university and "institutions of higher learning should not impose standards that are not inclusive of Indigenous communities who want and should control their own knowledge" as many of them continue to pursue questionable or destructive research, continue to move forward without meaningful or engaged relationships with Indigenous community, and while the war rages on all around them at schools, on the land, in government, and throughout the empire, universities and institutions of higher education as a whole have yet to make any great impacts for Native Nations (p. 26).

Part of the reason for the development of Native American, Chicano, African/Black and Asian American Studies was to secure a place in these institutions which directly focused upon the communities in question, while making changes within these historically white, Christian and imperializing fortresses of knowledge of power. When Forbes entered UC Davis in 1969 he found that the University like most was focused completely upon U.S. and European languages, history, knowledge, arts and discourse such that German Studies for example offered hundreds of credit hours in the subject, which despite the various Ethnic Studies there today, it still offers hundreds of credit hours in German Studies and other European emphasis. This is criminal. This is a complete lack of respect, solidarity, or care for traditional peoples, people of color, and essentially non-European and non-White persons and ideas. The university still emphasizes a European root and heritage, it practices, as Battiste and Henderson (2000) cognitive imperialism and base Eurocentrism which also detracts from a focus upon the peoples of the Americas, the issues relevant to Native Nations, and the development of the leaders, teachers, doctors and change-makers that is so desperately needed. Forbes (1974c) perceived that all peoples suffer from mis-education, poor influences, bad models, widespread corruption of all social institutions, polluted and desecrated territories. He says honestly that we need a two-pronged attack:

Native American Studies and traditional American elders in their own homelands must certainly devote a great deal of attention to “un-learning” as well as “learning”, that is, “un-learning” how to be a corrupt tribal official (cacique), how to be a brutal policeman beating up one's own people how to be an alcoholic, and how to be selfish, sly, and cruel. The teaching of Americanism, the spiritual-



ethical core of the native heritage is, therefore, important, but it is not enough. Native People must also learn how to liberate themselves from alien-imposed ideas, which reflect values opposed to Americanism.

Of course, he is speaking of the divergent path imperialism as a whole has misled our people into a false sense of security and “progress”. Many of our leaders in fact demonstrate acquiescence and comfortability with the onslaught while in their positions of power. Thus, his focus on a rebirth, on a renaissance, on the revitalization of traditional forms of education and institutions while at the same time doing the difficult work of “moving away” and removing the imperial ideas and structures is equally as important as learning new-old concepts.

The case of the Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute, founded in 1971 and located in Albuquerque, NM provides a unique view as to how the BIA, now BIE does Indian education, its way. SIPI was not originally part of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium which was founded by the original U.S. TCU’s in 1975, which included D-Q University because it was not considered a “tribal college”, but rather, as Khachadorian (2010) calls it, is a “government installation” not unlike its five other post-secondary institutions which are all service academies for the U.S. military. A tribal college was advocated for by the local All Indian Pueblo Council as early as 1960 but in the end, the school was not created with them in mind and they do not have any say its educational structure, curriculum or administration. SIPI has a “governing board” made up of tribal members, however, they do not govern any more than SIPI parents do, as they merely work in an advisory capacity and are consulted but not consoled. SIPI employees are first and foremost, federal employees and in true military fashion, the

“chain of command” is strictly followed and everyone must pledge allegiance to the U.S. rather than one’s Native Nation. When I worked at SIPI through the University of New Mexico as an adjunct, I was consistently exposed for not having followed this command structure and was reprimanded. In order to do anything, you must request permission, and this goes up a long line of superiors before you are able to move forward on anything and must go through the proper channels. So, something as simple as watching a film outside of the classroom time, would require pre-approval for the room, for the film, for any number of things. One cannot simply schedule a room to use on their own to show a film for educational purposes. And what’s curious, is that there were so few films one could show because the only ones “pre-approved” were in the library, which was seriously lacking and not from the lack of efforts of the librarians. SIPI is historically underfunded, and it shows eerily in its mostly decrepit buildings and bleak landscaping despite being located off of an acequia ditch and near the Rio Grande. When I worked there, I interviewed numerous students at UNM and elsewhere who chose not to go to SIPI and one of the most basic reasons was it looked like a run-down boarding school. The resemblance between SIPI and Sherman Indian High School, another BIE run school is striking, as one cannot shy away from the fact that they resemble old forts adorned with barbed wire separating the students from the local neighborhoods.

Khachadorian (2010) performed a study of SIPI student narratives, to learn essentially how students thought and talked about SIPI. She found that many compared it to a prison, which when I shared this my students when I taught there, many concurred, that is, except the ex-prisoners in the classroom (p. 120). Yet, the similarities were often striking such as the strict curfew, dorm policies and gender divisions, the no-tolerance

policy for “paraphernalia”, drugs and alcohol, its isolation and depravity, its punishments and policies, its security and hierarchy all demonstrated to students this was an institution not created by their communities but rather by white authorities at some point in the 1970’s. The ex-prisoners however would remind students of the key differences between metaphors and reality, and also, that there is some truth to that comparison as well. SIPI, like D-QU lost its accreditation in 2010 and then was subject to loss of funding and since 2014 has “initial accreditation” but not full accreditation. SIPI students had to canvas the town and southwest with “Save Our School” signs and shirts, a feat they were in fact repeating as it had been threatened with closure multiple times in its history. I was hired amongst others to give this school some credibility, as it had been hiring many adjuncts who were not qualified to teach the general education subjects and it was mainly a school of long-term substitutes, subject to the whim of the deans, administration and BIE funding as adjunct made up more than half the teaching squad. This was not a dynamic place of learning. The atmosphere was like that of a continuation school, and many students of SIPI were in continuing education classes to receive high school diplomas or to fulfill prerequisites of which many did not actually take college level classes. This was not a place where the 100 plus Native Nations in attendance were sharing and developing themselves as members of tradition-bearing communities. There was not “an Indian school of thought” directing the institution. This was not a place where one could openly and honestly discuss the problems endemic to Albuquerque, the southwest, their Nations, families and their communities. Imperialism and racism were only talked about critically in the few Native American Studies, literature and other courses myself and colleagues taught. Sometimes I would receive threats or challenges from other instructors and staff

when these subjects were openly discussed as they often listened in to our conversations at a time when there were no doors on the classrooms, which is most of its existence. On the whole, this was a school dedicated to creating willing workers for Albuquerque and to locate the rare and coveted BIA jobs in their home communities. Granted some students transferred to UNM and elsewhere, they were the surprising survivors and tokens. The differences and similarities between D-QU and SIPI are pronounced and minute. These will be discussed as a way to describe the nature of Indigenous higher education while influenced by the imperial system of education and control.

As mentioned previously, D-QU was founded in 1970 and then governed by Native and Chicano leaders, 32 of them, 16 of each group, when it opened for classes in the fall of 1971. SIPI was governed by the BIA and its highest administrator was the Vice President of the U.S. and the Secretary of the Interior. D-QU did not answer to anyone beyond its own board of trustees and the admins they hired. Admins at SIPI are hired by the BIE. D-QU imagined from the start to provide education to anyone who wanted to attend, including non-Natives and non-Chicanos, which it did. SIPI only accepted federally recognized and enrolled U.S. Indians. This was its strong point, except that it did not apply this stringent criteria to its teaching faculty, to its administration, or most importantly to the thickly filled bureaucratic BIE governing structure. D-QU although did not have such a stringent criteria, it attracted and employed primarily Native and Chicano leaders, educators and community members. D-QU's articles of incorporation (1970) read:

- (a) To develop, publish, sponsor, and disseminate educational materials and programs relative to American Indians, Mexican Americans, and other groups.

- (b) To carry out research and sponsor studies relating to the history, culture, and affairs of American Indians, Mexican Americans and other groups.
- (c) To develop, publish, and disseminate materials designed to enhance the self-image and organizational abilities of American Indians, Mexican Americans, and other groups.
- (d) To make grants to organizations, agencies or individuals in furtherance of the above purposes.
- (e) To provide scholarships for American Indian, Mexican American and other students.
- (f) To develop, sponsor and operate a University-level program of higher education and instruction, and to award appropriate certificates and degrees to students who benefit from said instruction (Forbes 1985, pps. 71-72).

Early on, the university bore the heavy influence of Forbes, who was both a primary progenitor of the idea of Chicano-Indian education, which the later school shied away from, as well as making the place a Ph.D. granting institution which trained teachers, leaders, developed community, and performed relevant research. For example, its early philosophy was guided by these core ideas and approaches to higher education:

. . . the rationale for the existence of this University is to serve the Indian and Chicano people. For an educational institution service may take many forms aside from formal classroom or laboratory instruction. Education means “to bring forth”, that is, to bring into being new “knowledge” not only in the sense of new discoveries but also in the sense of presenting the already-discovered to those who are unaware of its existence. “Bringing forth” also refers to the awakening of the

full potential of an individual. This university regards the development of new knowledge, the dissemination of knowledge, and the full development of individuals as fundamental aspects of its educational program. The areas of theoretical research, applied research, and community service (emphasizing dissemination of knowledge and skills) will, therefore, not be neglected but rather will be sought after. As resources allow, the university should make the entire hemisphere its campus (Forbes 1985, pps. 98-99).

Forbes was an applied historian-anthropologist and a strong, and indignant advocate for grassroots community work. Education without community must surely be education for corporations, or for the rich, or for any number of other powerful groups. Forbes had not expressed an educative approach or praxis until 1960 and 1961 with the forming of the American Indian College Committee with Carl and Mary Gorman, and his early experiences with the Native American Movement all in southern California, and trusteeship with Ventura Community College District 1961-1963. Prior to this period he was simply an Indian historian and researcher of the Southwest although he had expressed interest in Indian issues and readily engaged democratic politics. In combining these two paradigms, Forbes felt that one could continuously develop as a student-teacher, while working in and for the community because knowledge and wisdom is only as valuable as it can be practiced, and it must be practical, pragmatic and rooted in a total way of life. How do we put our ideas into practice?

Forbes imagined D-QU as an incomplete project until it fulfilled this role as research center and service-learning outlet, saying clearly:

The creation of this university will not be complete until an “Indian Extension Service” and a “Chicano Extension Service” reach out from the campus to the entire Native American-Chicano people. The vital knowledge and skill needed to survive in this world, and to live as a fully-developed man in harmony with Life, cannot remain accessible only to the few. By and large, existing “extension”-type programs do not reach the Chicano and Indian people, however, we propose to erase that deficiency. Similarly, the long suppression of Indian-Chicano history and culture and the neglect of Indian religion, herbology, and ecological science must be overcome. Fundamental research must be carried out to reconstruct the past and to better live [in] the present. Research, both survey and applied, must also be carried out relative to the objective needs of contemporary Indian-Chicano people, emphasizing such areas as nutrition, infant mortality, alcoholism, poverty, employment, mental health, suicide, economic development, preventive medicine, etc. Research and service will be emphasized at Deganawidah-Quetzalcoatl University for still other reasons. First, because students need to become involved in research and field training as a part of their formal education. Secondly, because teaching in most fields cannot long be successful unless the teacher is periodically, or preferably continuously, a learner as well as a teacher. Research and field service are activities in which the professor becomes a learner or is brought into contact with the communities he is ultimately responsible to. Finally, research is essential for the successful development of Native American and Chicano Studies (Forbes 1985, pps. 98-99).

Thus from the beginning it was imagined as a place where all aspects of the community were to be served and developed, and further, it performed service and research within the community as a basic part of a students and the schools knowledge path plan and degree program. Research was fundamental because it is the generation of new insights and ideas, as well as the rediscovery and in-depth study of ancient wisdom and knowledge which perpetuate a living, breathing community of intellectual-leaders able to tackle old and new problems, together. Forbes understood the power of the University as did Du Bois for creating new leaders and performing research relevant to community. They knew that technical, industrial and community college style schools did not produce an intelligentsia that worked on more levels than simply physical labor. And while physical laborers are needed for any endeavor, sometimes, less is more. The wise elders know how to do the most with the least, know when to work and when to play, and know what knowledge and labor is lasting, truly beneficial, and valuable. The goal of any institution of higher education should be to put its students and community on this path of wisdom. Forbes (1972) recognizes that a wisdom path of knowledge was developed by all of the ancient and contemporary American Nations, and only because of the infectious consuming imperialisms that this ongoing development and refinement of education has wavered. Unlike modern universities however, D-QU would support the spiritual, socio-cultural and ecological niches of its primarily Indigenous student bodies. Whereas the European university served as the answer to ecclesiastical and theological institutions, D-QU was considered the total tap-roots of a people must be focused upon, and likewise the fount of any people, the familial and communal relationships in place which ultimately decide what elements are necessary for their survival together. When it opened its first



classes in 1971 the school had big plans to open four colleges, including a medical school, agricultural institute, and the two cultural wings of Chicano and Native American Studies which represented the northern and southern halves of the American island.

The purpose of D-Q U is to develop scholars who will go into the Native American and Chicano communities and begin to systematically bring about changes to improve the quality of life of the inhabitants of those communities in keeping with the cultural, social and political values of the people. It is envisioned that these scholars will be social change agents in all aspects of their work within the community. They will teach the traditional values to those who need increased self-identity and confidence. . . . This school will afford an opportunity for the individual student to attain his/her highest academic potential. This means developing an academic program which is noted for its excellence, but taught in a way that will meet the present lifestyle of the student, with modification of behavior based on the cultural values of the ethnic groups represented here (“D-QU Catalog 1972”, D-334, B. 63).

D-QU’s (1980) mission for example was extremely distinct compared to SIPI. It’s opening statement had changed from its original 1971 and 1972 catalog due to its transformation as a Native and Chicano controlled institution to an Indian controlled institution after the passage of the TCCA in 1978 which required them to have an all federally recognized and enrolled U.S. Indian board of trustees in order to receive funds from this act. Its five core objectives in 1980 consisted of:

1. To create a program of superior education and academic training for Native Peoples within their own culture as a frame of reference.

2. To create a practicum for Native students in contemporary technical and professional skills to meet the urgent needs of Indigenous communities.
3. To preserve and develop the Native cultural heritage as valid academic areas of inquiry and scholarship.
4. To serve as a learning center for Native communities.
5. To serve Native communities through field courses at specifically selected sites. (pps. 6-7, D-334, B. 63, F. “DQU 1978-80”).

Compare this to SIPI’s mission which says it “prepares our culturally diverse Native American students as lifelong learners through partnerships with tribes and other organizations. We establish a strong educational foundation for student success”. The overall vision “aspires to be an intellectual asset to Indian country that is highly effective and puts students’ success first”, these are vague programs as success is defined largely by what the goals of the school are rather than communities, such as the granting of a degree, or employability, etc.. The school gets specific in its “strategic goals” which include, 1. “improve student success, guided by an institutional culture of evidence”, 2. “expand its role in tribal nation-building by better understanding and responding to the educational and workforce needs of tribes, and to better support the sustainability of tribes’ fundamental needs”, 3. “modernize its facilities and technologies to better support student learning”, 4. “improve its college operations to achieve greater effectiveness and efficiency” that, 5. “will position itself within the community of tribal colleges, and among all community colleges, nationally”

(<https://www.sipi.edu/apps/pages/mission/vision>). The third goal is more an admission that its facilities are run-down and in poor condition than a goal per-se. While the fourth

goal contends also by admission that its college operations were not up to par in the past. But how will it do this if tribal communities have no meaningful control or influence over the institution in any way? The Board of Regents is admittedly an advisory board that “works with the administration in determining goals and activities for long-range development” but is not on campus, and does not meet directly with the purpose of influencing, let alone, controlling the schools operations as it is still a BIE owned and operated entity. It is curious also that this institution survives while D-QU is relatively obsolete, primarily because of its federal support. SIPI for example employs known and filed against sex offenders such as Eric Christensen who is still the VP of College Operations despite having numerous complaints and charges brought against him (Demarco 2018). I’ve seen many such “cat-calls” from higher ups, and have had conversations with numerous students who were threatened sexually by staff, faculty and other students who had reported their instances creating a culture of sexual predation. In 2006, there was a brutal rape by one student upon another just off campus in the field we all walk through on our way from the bus and local businesses (Khachadorian 2010, pps. 97-98). I witnessed a number of student protests on campus for various reasons. In my experience as a teacher, I attended expulsion hearings more than a few times for students who broke the “drug and alcohol free” campus policy despite only having a drink off campus with friends and family as adults. My students would say, “I thought I left the rez [and were able to drink freely]”. This occurs primarily because students, like Native Nations, are treated with a kind of paternalism of which they are policed for normal behaviors that the rest of society can perform daily. While alcohol is not a positive attribute of leaving one’s community, many students considered the policy too

invasive without the concomitant relationships needed to support other behaviors such as having sports or other outlets such as a sweat-lodge. Also, teachers, staff and administration can readily drink without any consequence at all. Students at any other college in the city can do this and do locally at UNM, which has recently opened an alcohol serving place in the student union, probably to keep students away from the more private faculty lounge which has always served alcohol. And it's not that I condone drinking, but a double standard is not a good teaching lesson, especially amongst adults. Another example is that the dorms at SIPI are same-sex only which makes it difficult to carry on a healthy relationship with your future spouse, while same-sex couples were frequently harassed for displaying any kind of affection. Yet all the students no matter their gender or love interests, are 18 years of age, and are fully developed adults many years prior.

The constant reference to Native Nations as tribes reminds us that this is a U.S. federal government installation. Further, while the strategic goals mention "nation-building", it's in the same breath as "workforce needs", which is code for a working class or proletariat, the same is found in Diné Colleges mission statement. And while the focus is on community and upon "educational foundations", these are hardly relevant if a student's goal is to merely become a worker in global capitalism. Most reservation jobs are with the BIA or with a multinational corporation, and while some are with local Native government projects or efforts, many are federally funded, or supported by corporate or local energy exploiters, and whose funds may just disappear one day. At SIPI, this school does not produce business owners. This school does not create critical minds and leaders. This school does not create language speakers as at best it has a single

Navajo language class, and two Spanish language classes, and the rest is an English language medium for its sometimes up to 100 Nations may be represented on campus. This was also a fault of D-QU as it rarely had more than a single language class at any given time. Native language learning, maintenance and development is a need of all Native Nations, yet very few institutions of higher education, let alone k-12 are doing this work and are truly a Native peoples institution. Tribal colleges are of the few places one can go anywhere to receive adult education in a Native language outside sparse university settings and language offerings. Yet one can find hundreds of credit hours in nearly every European language family, or even multiple forms of a language, such as ancient and modern Greek, and now also token or exotic ones such Swahili, or business related (money-making) ones like Mandarin or Arabic and a plethora of others. This is a complete disservice to peoples from the Southwest for example who weren't even apart of the U.S. until after 1848, and in New Mexico, California and Alaska, after 1912 as citizens, or for all Native Nationals, after 1924. At the University of New Mexico, hundreds, perhaps thousands of credit hours are offered each term in Arabic, Greek, French, German, Italian, Latin, Navajo, Russian, Spanish and Swahili, while the rest of the languages of the Americas, outside an occasional Quechua, K'iche Maya or Nahuatl course are absent. These latter courses are also frequently taught by second-language academic speakers and to primarily Linguistics students. For example, the NAS major, as is normal among most major degree programs in the U.S., does not require a language component. My own program at UCLA equally did not have a specific requirement yet I was fortunate to make languages my own requirement and studied Cham'teela, Kanien'keha, and Gaeilge. This made the difference in my studies and community work

where I could speak not from a place of knowledge and power from what I knew, but from a place of humility and respect, for what I didn't know, because I was aware of what I wasn't aware of. Within the UC Davis NAS doctoral program, a language component is a requirement, and thus each student must put in the work of becoming proficient in the language-medium of their people, or the most relevant language for their work. So while UCD might have this requirement, often students are not prepared for this because their previous degrees did not have this emphasis.

This goes back to the original critique of D-QU which is that most students were not prepared to enter D-QU and learn from elders or critical scholars or learn their languages. This is why community immersion programs are so important because they provide this foundation, yet we must also provide our youth with a place to go after we have given them a strong foundation, a place which prizes their educational pathway and giftedness. This is the reason for the wraparound efforts of the Maori and Hawaiian medium education programs which can be followed from pre-k to Ph.D.. This is the future of indigenous education. Imagine the kind of universities we should be developing to harness the power of k-12 immersion students?

We must of course even go beyond this and reenvision education as multigenerational and intergenerational, as a more-than-human or amongst all the peoples-creatures-life worlds we inhabit and survive upon kind of education. Education begins before we are born. Education bears fruit often after we have passed away. For example, Socratic style learning is more widespread than ever. Freire's legacy is taking on new dimensions every day. Montessori, Emilio Reggio, Vygotsky, Mann, Dewey and many others work is heavily applied. The work of Forbes and others provides another

stepping stone to our greatness, the greatness of the Native mind-spirit, the greatness of the Native People-Nation, and the greatness of our combined power as people of Anowarakowa. As the late Corbin Harney (1995) used to say, “we, the people, are going to have to put our thoughts together, to save our planet here. We’ve only got one water, one air, one Mother Earth” (p. iv). Forbes (1974b) demanded that educationally, we all became good Turtle-Islanders, or as he said it, proud native Americans whose people embodied the places they were from. No longer should we trouble ourselves with Europe or European ideas. He had one clear message to Euro-Americans, to White folks, to temporary immigrants. Forbes hope was summarized as a process of becoming Americanized, becoming a people of America whose tap-roots finally represented their authentic education into indigenous life:

So when I speak about the Americanization of education I am speaking about a profound process which demands that you who are of European thinking finally and at long last have an American spiritual and cultural revolution. Break the umbilical cords that bind you to Europe! Stop regarding this land as a temporary way-station on your migrations from England to Australia or wherever you are going next. Make this land your home, existentially as well as physically! *Love this land, and the living creatures on it, as if you were going to stay here forever* (pp. 16, emphasis original)!

Now is not the time to jump ship, to fly to Mars, to fly to Marx, to escape to the city, to escape to the metropolitan museum. If we are going to work towards real decolonization, here and now, we must make everything education. We must transform the way we think about schooling so that we do not continue to allow these institutions to be holding tanks

for a future soldier-worker, dutifully willing to die for something that has already and continues to incorporate their lands and communities into the imperial matrix of exploitation. Forbes never gave up, never gave in. His method of fighting wasn't with high-tech weaponry, it was with words and action, with people. Everything he did, he never did it alone. And honorably acknowledged his absolute dependence upon the smallest and largest creatures, upon the waters and soils, upon the winds which rooted him to the sky. All of his messaging and advocacy points to the "real problem in education", which is the colonial relationship, the way we are influenced by and for a racist, patriarchal, imperial and exploitive network of relations. He felt we had the power to change, to transform or destiny, our destination, by walking a good path towards it. Sometimes we must walk alone, but if it's a good path, others will find it, others will find each other.

To summarize, Forbes decolonial dreams and deimperial actions with regards to education focused upon a total reform, a real revolution which started with community creation and control of their own education. Education was only conceived as an extension of Native family and community, based on fulfilling their needs, goals and visions for their people. In order to do this however, one must grapple with a few basic facts. First, Native Nationals and Nations come from greatness, come from Anowarakowa, come with the wisdom, experience and memory that can save themselves and perhaps many others. However, after more than 500 years of concentrated imperialism and colonialism, we still live within and with the devouring, diseased and destructive products of these efforts. Education has been a core avenue for teaching the "wétiko psychosis" and has become the predominant means to infiltrate familial and



national traditional practices directly. The tap-roots might be infected and the soil or water poisoned. The neighboring plants are all infected already minus a few resilient families. All of this has limited the use of ancient democratic thought, organization and communication among even the strongest communities. Forbes conceived that only through a mass awakening could any real progress be made towards unequivocal decolonization and deimperialization, eradicating racism and systemic privilege, coupled with the rebirth of Native Nationalisms. Education was perceived as a peaceful means to achieve these ends, as well as a basic socio-cultural need of family and community in order to raise good people and perpetuate themselves together.

Forbes efforts at D-QU and NAS at UC Davis were on the scale of grand visions. He hoped that they could influence the imperial system of higher education through creating a Native nest on campus whose mission was to serve Nation-building and rebuilding by giving Native students, researchers and community a place to develop themselves into scholar warriors. D-QU was unique in that it hoped to be fully controlled by Native and Chicano persons, and was the first time a pan-Indian education project would become fully realized which looked South and North for its influence and constituency. Both efforts purposely took a hemispheric approach to learning, or rather, an American approach which treated all of America as its field of study with local Nations centralized. Unique to these efforts was a critical stance against ongoing imperialism, albeit one that made D-QU a central target of the FBI and other conservative forces. D-QU inspired many subsequent actions and had at its early creation been a leading force in Indigenous higher education, attracting scholars such as Heydar Reghaby, Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz, Inés Hernández-Avila, and many others. Although the

original vision was thwarted in many ways, it had survived many rounds of persecution by 1977 when the Western Association of Schools and College gave them full accreditation as a junior college, from which Risling gave a celebratory speech, saying “the spirit is here, the philosophy is here. We may not have the buildings here, but when it comes to philosophy, we will stand up to Harvard or Yale” (quoted in Thomas 1977, p. 3). Forbes and Risling felt strongly that they had implemented to the best of their abilities an educational institution fully grounded in the communities it served and whose wellspring of wisdom and experience was unrivaled elsewhere. Unique also was that Native American Studies at UC Davis was akin to D-QU, especially in the early years when Forbes, Risling and Hutchison frequently split their time between both places. Together, the two efforts served many students and community who would otherwise have never tried, especially at D-QU where anyone could begin their learning journey without having prerequisites, test scores, a quality high school degree, and otherwise with limited resources to support them. So while Forbes approach to developing an indigenous intelligentsia might seem to emphasize “special”, or “gifted” students, D-QU was a completely open university to any and every kind of student, young or old, with or without citizenship, for nearly any and all classes, workshops or programs offered.

## Ch. 8: Concluding Thoughts and Future Research

In order to clearly articulate the synthesis of Forbes decolonizing philosophy of education, I will reify the previous chapters and make room for discussing their potentiality, their effects, and other issues. The core ideas of Forbes socio-cultural and educational perspectives are delineated as such, in no particular ranking order: Peoplehood and Nationhood, Education, Imperialism and Deimperialization-Decolonization. Within these core areas are some salient and important ideas, namely relevant to Peoplehood and Nationhood is a conception of the indigenous-Indian in the specific, as particular peoples, and as Anowarakowa:ron “turtle islanders” or Onkwehonwe “real/original people”, Forbes Anishinaabe. Forbes hoped we would resist further Indianization according to federal, Christian, scientific, imperial and white standards and instead promoted native Americanization, his own version of Pan-Indian identities that he thought would, unlike *indigenismo* and *Indianismo* in Mexico promote a diverse and differentiated kind of self-determination and self-development unguided by state policy. By 1940, state policy was to “Mexicanize the Indian” (Pineda 1918), while in the U.S. in the 1940’s as described by John Collier (1942) it was that “the hope of those in charge of Indian administration that they could provide for an orderly adjustment of the ancient social forms and archaic culture of primitive Indian groups to the demands being made upon them by modern society”, or Modernize the Indian (p. 32). Forbes would settle for no less than the unequivocal promotion of indigeneity in all its forms and locations, ancient and contemporary renditions. Forbes recognition that family, kinship-clanship and the concept of relations within an interrelated creation demands that everything we do must centralize the actual relationships, or lack thereof in all our work.

Education must be as specific as the people it is for, and who must be the driving force in every aspect of education.

For Forbes, the case of Indigenous California democratic traditions (egalitarian, consensus-based, non-coercion, open-free participation) was a dramatic extreme to white imperialism and consumption, corporate capitalism and the amazing bureaucracies called democracies which abuse people power at every turn. Traditional kinship and socio-political relations in California provided ancient models as did the many confederacies of peace which supported autonomy and exchange, revealing to him that the *wétiko* was the aberration, that imperialism and white supremacy, male terrorism and Christian persecution were at the root of our problems. Forbes provides a counter view to the imperial farce that there is an “Indian problem”, rather, there is a white problem, there is a male problem, there is a missionary problem, there is an imperial-colonial problem. Education as the process and relationship with family who seek to raise good, complete, healthy persons-peoples carries the responsibilities originating with parents and community. Education must not simply represent these original relations, it must be a specific response by the community itself, completely within its realm of power and manipulation. Education must be like a family itself. Once education leaves the realm of kinship, it becomes externally supplied with ideas and influence out of immediate, direct control by clan and kin. While various “state” governments, city governments and the federal government attempt to support education, they too often seek to control and influence it beyond anything the actual community desires. Forbes answer to this situation was for community to organize, that is, to get together and talk about their needs, issues and reinvigorate their responsibilities to each other through relationship-

building, or nation-building. When he speaks of a rebirth, “mass awakening” and renaissance, his humble approach is not to join a political faction but to begin with community. On a larger scale than a specific family-kin-clan group or community, Forbes suggested a general alignment approach which would aid in groups becoming acclimated away from white imperialism and towards a local view of themselves as people of place, native Americanism. The curriculum, the course of study, the teachers, leaders and students would centralize becoming people of specific places, of which most Native Nations possess ancient and definite sciences-knowledge traditions and ways which offer more than blueprints to raising good peoples. Why can’t native Americans realize this opportunity? Why do whites and other key groups resist at every turn their own Americanization/Indigenization, preferring strict control over every aspect of education so as to reproduce their destructive way of life in themselves and others?

Forbes view of indigeneity-native Americanism is unique and provides the backdrop for his approach to education. He proposed that just because a person moved into the city, wears a suit and tie, or even married a white person, did not subtract from their original authenticity and groupness. If a whole family or village or Nation relocates do they uproot all of their tap-roots and become automatically something else: a refugee, a mestizo, a worker, a citizen? If we are to believe this farce, we might accept that once the British or Spanish touched the Americas, they became something else on contact, and similarly, America instantly became something else or someone’s else. Thus, Onkwehonwe and Anishinaabe, Kanien’kehá:ka and Carib’s instantly became Indians and Anowarakowa became the *Indias/las yndias*. Forbes objected to any definition of America/ns-Indianness which was outside of the community itself, which although

interesting, were not indigenous conceptions. His own version of peoplehood insisted that self-definition, meaning group-identity rather than individual identity was the most important factor. Whatever the people decided, who they were, their history, their means of communication, their homelands, etc., were all equal factors or tap-roots identified by the people themselves, not by an external study. Anglo-Saxons came in as British, Scottish, Germanic and other kinds of peoples, but at some point replaced their original ideas about themselves with an imperial conception predicated upon the servitude of the land and peoples of America and Africa rather than their own local endogenous development which they consistently corrected if it did not reproduce an imperial and unequal relationship, one which came with privileges and exclusionary behaviors embedded in a new conception of people: whiteness and wetikoism (euro-white imperialism). Tradition is what is handed-over to the next generations, but this does not equate to a straight across transmission process, as it is always up to individuals and groups to decide who and what they will be. With this in mind, Forbes considered Chicanos and Mexicanos equally Indian despite not having any special status in Mexico or the U.S. as such. He found beyond being people of color, they carried many customs, ideas and traditions which compared favorably to many U.S. Indians as did Africans, and often, found many such persons and groups had maintained themselves with a greater differentiation or uniqueness than many U.S. Indians had despite being card-carrying members. This was the impetus behind many of his efforts because he saw the potential of unifying as many Indian people as possible, especially under the banner of anti-imperialism and decolonization, a fact all peoples faced collectively and individually. Is Indianness, Indianismo, Indigenismo, or even a pan-Indian view possible in a world of

diverse, distinct and independent communities? Forbes thought a lack of unity was a major flaw of all revolutions, rebellions, independence movements, and revitalization struggles since 1492 and it was about time Native Nations and Nationals recognized they were all being target as “Indians” whether they were the same, similar or complete opposites. Further, Chicanos and Africans especially were equally indigenous as they had never become alienated in the way whites purposely separate themselves from non-whites, and whose conception of themselves carries affinitive anti-black, anti-Indian characteristics. Forbes says this is one of the downfalls of many contemporary Indian groups who attempt to differentiate themselves from Chicanos, Mexicanos and Blacks but not Whites. His sympathetic view was that “if we have African blood we should be proud of it. It is good, honest, tribal ancestry” (Forbes 1975, p. 4 “Attan-Akamik” v. 1, no. 4). Blacks and Chicanos are not the problem. White imperialism, male terrorism, exploitative and consumptive economic and political systems were all greater threats in the past and the present (Forbes 2008a; Forbes 1978a; Forbes 1975b).

Forbes considered the aggressive plague of imperialism, which he named a “wétiko psychosis” or sickness, to be the grossest problem with the world today because it was a sickness of the mind-spirit which knew no bounds and had the most incredible lifespan after being birthed in Forbes and Mohawk’s mind somewhere in the middle east a few thousand years ago. Part of this is because it is insidious and often disguised in other frocks and masks, akin to how whiteness is a shape-shifting identity meant to survive socio-cultural changes by maintaining the imperial relationship to political and economic power, which is a total interconnected nexus or matrix of exploitation and reproduction. One cannot possibly untangle racism and patriarchy let alone capitalism,

communism or globalization without undergirding their analysis with a critique of imperialism and colonialism in historical perspective. Colonialism was differentiated from imperialism in that colonialism was the actual process of “planting” settlers into areas where Native peoples had been subdued, removed or had their lands confiscated, however, as Deloria Jr. and Carpio point out, it can be an indigenous tool of repopulation as well. Imperialism on the other hand is the entire ideology, infrastructure, history, experience and actions related to empire-building which must be built internally, into the people’s traditions and beliefs as well as upon their territory, traditions and institutions. What distinguished imperialism also in Forbes mind as the real threat was that it could be taught to anyone because as a broad commanding system of control and power, it attempted as its ultimate goal, bringing diverse peoples, lands and traditions under one rule: that is, unity. A unified empire can easily destroy a disunified and smaller Nation. While schooling as a form of education originally developed among imperial and religious elites, it soon was brought to the frontlines of the imperial war on subjugated others much as churches had fulfilled this role in the past. Religious sects established praying towns on the east coast and missions throughout the Americas who all serviced a diverse Indian population. The “wétiko psychosis” in Forbes mind, was rooted in an invasive European imperialism and was most recognizable as a consuming, and consumption training epidemic which dismissed any special or intrinsic value upon Native Nations, their lands, and especially women and other “lesser creatures”. Imperialism is the most sophisticated kind of evil he could behold.

Racism is precisely the practice of degrading another being below an assumed superior being, and easily is relatable to patriarchy and speciesism, as well as other



ideologies which expressly reinforce a clear hierarchy or caste system. Forbes considered caste-racism to be at foundation of imperial ideologies, and while genocide, removal and destructive practices worked in some instances, he felt that empires were more willing and even positive about its ability to assimilate, transform and consume those who resisted and turn them into citizens, tributaries and workers. Indeed, General Pratt said as much in his approach to establishing Indian boarding schools who he assumed were integrative institutions rather than segregationist and that their greatest quality was in their bringing Indian students away from their families homes and into those of white persons. For Forbes, white people were the epitome of the new imperialism and wétiko psychosis because they developed themselves into a new people, one which became the antithesis to free black and Indian peoples and who were their captors, parents, commanders and executioners if need be. This new white identity was fatally flawed because it was based upon all of the sinister qualities of European imperialists and colonists, and although they attempted to invent a sophisticated arbitration system in the form of the U.S. Constitution and U.S.A., they instead infected the project and subsequent ones with its imperial foundations. Schools are the new teachers of this now old imperialism which is shape-shifting and manipulated constantly in order to continue with its perpetual growth cycle of consumption, and while profits are nice, it survives on losses as well. In this desacralized world of the wétiko, nothing is safe from the empire's clutches.

This is where Forbes specifically develops his own approach to education, one which re-envision schools as socialization institutions which can either do the work of serving specific communities and individuals, or it can serve the masters of imperialism.

Education in his mind was the practice of developing good people, complete people, hearty and intelligent, family and community oriented, trained and raised by elders and tradition-bearers, tested and challenged to become their potential, to have new visions for the people, and to keep the circle of relations in balance and with beauty. Education did not necessarily involve schools, although he felt because they were so well-known, funded and pre-furnished, why not use them. Forbes recognized that all peoples have performed education or the intergenerational process of raising good, complete people trained ultimately to become one of “the people”. To each people, their own kind of education. The issue at heart comes forth in the imperial siege and destroy efforts which have capsized many people’s original pathways, territories and traditions. Traditional education forms embedded in families and their beliefs, their structures and practices have been disrupted so much that 99% of Native students, in the Americas attend some form of compulsory public schooling administered locally, by extra-local agencies, organizations or corporations, and at the highest level of imperial and state governments. By the end of the 19th century, a majority of people in the Americas had begun to receive some kind of schooling beyond home and by the 21st century, nearly 87% of youth in Mexico for example complete mandatory, free, primary schooling demonstrating the “third world” mirrors the “first world” educationally in many ways (Welti 2002, p. 292). We are not talking about a benign or passive system of brainwashing and manipulation. Every institution beyond the direct control of family and community represents a shift away from the original power centers of Native Nations and real American lifeways. While progress has been made on many fronts including the creation of immersion programs replete with legal acts of federal funding, Native American Studies programs,

Tribal Colleges and Universities, somehow, this is not enough and the majority of students are not being reached hence the need for a “mass awakening” or rebirth. Forbes does not advertise “revolution” because he believes that it has become watered-down by socialist and communist conceptions who do not represent a “return” to ancient practices but rather for a pre-industrial utopia which lacks a comprehensive critique and distance from imperial racism, patriarchy and capitalism which developed precisely during this time period in the 16th-18th centuries (Forbes 1978a; Mohawk 2004).

A study of empire necessarily breaches the normal bounds of philosophy, for it is a truly eccentric abomination to uncover. In order to understand the nature of the imperial sickness we must consider the total body which make up its historical tributaries and ancient roots. Forbes rallied through the various roots of peoplehood-nationhood to conclude that imperialism infects every one of them: including language, ceremony, territorial relations, history, governance, kinship, art-science-media, and other respective elements. Outside of families and close community, schools represent the next sphere of influence which teaches all of the above subjects as part of an integrated whole, a curriculum or course of study which reflects the views of those writing it. Predominantly constructed in all its facilities from white men, who are the most highly volatile of the imperialists today, they are the central figures of all the stories and lessons found in a majority of texts and teacher training curriculum. The wétiko goes unnamed because there is not a single stringed conversation or narrative which cuts through the times and describes the consummate imperialist from beginning to end. Similarly, the patriarch, the monarch, the president, land baron, people-owner, the missionary, etc., go unconnected from their imperial and racist origins which continues to hold the land, the peoples, the

queens, the creatures in its claws. And where does the corporation fit into this, and how does it epitomize the alienated and consuming imperial creature which now has more rights and power than many people? Native Nations have always stood in the way of the European vampires. We have known full well that our stories prepared us to deal with a grotesque and sadistic killer in our mists, our entire education originally prepared us to deal nearly anything we would ever imagine coming across in life. Today, the education system itself is the greatest synthetic imperialist we have ever known. Artificial classrooms constantly reinforce the same model of consumption as the end goal, as the centripetal force churning out the rest of the curriculum. Native Nations will never find themselves as they want to be seen within the imperialists vision of the world. When they do, they will be watching it through their own eyes, making it with their own hands, building it with their own bodies and dances, and weaving it from the fibers of our mother earths hair. Education is something people do all the time, however, many of us have been so impacted by either the direct imperial inferno or indirectly through all our relations that we reinforce a miseducation system that replaces healthy, community and land-based experiences and lifeways with weakened, alienated and destructive consumptives who have been trained for war alone.

Forbes most important approach begins with dreaming our dreams. D-QU and NAS/AIS were his original great visions, ones that he had while asleep and awake, and in the spaces between. He considered education to be the prime duty of parents, family and community, one which has been largely wrested from the laboring castes via an intricate system of exploitation and consumption coupled with violence and terror while wealthy persons can easily procure the best teachers and tutors, institutions and programming. He

thought either a mass awakening, a rebirth, and renaissance of some kind could help move us all together in a direction away from the imperial and colonial nexus, which is truly global in its reach today. The 1960's seemed like this time for him but by the 1970's and the total backlash which had come from the largest of wétiko's upon his efforts namely the federal government and its bureaucratic divisions of power, he surely felt that something more drastic must be done (Forbes 1981a). First and foremost, to analyze the conditions of anything, one must study their whole self in relation to others, in particular, their psycho-social relationships within a spiritually-rich universe of relations. He would say, focus on the mind, it is our pathway and scourge unfurled. We ourselves create the greatest mistakes over and over again, with and without encouragement, with and without fear or the lash, because we have been taught otherwise, and because every step of the way we are not corrected. When speaking a language, you either sit back and listen and watch and learn, or you speak up and take your lumps while making mistakes. In the U.S. most students leave school monolingual English and most likely are raising their children speaking English only and while the language itself may not be winning at the indigenous Olympics, it's the most spoken language by Indian people in the U.S. next to Spanish. This is in the face of language loss through multi-generational trauma and cultural separation at boarding and public schools. The issue for Forbes was not anyone one area of peoplehood can make a difference but at the same time, every area is a battleground. Education is the prime battleground which all children today face, which we faced as youth, and which parental and grandparent generations also share in, especially in the U.S. today. A total transformation was required in order to affect real change. Who can help make this change? Who will be the new leaders?

Forbes answer to this dilemma, like Du Bois, Crummell and in some ways Parker, he believed to be in the creation of an indigenous intelligentsia who developed what he called the greatness of the Indian or native American mind-spirit. Unlike Parker's "race leaders" concept and Du Bois "talented tenth", Forbes knew that the total community must be involved, and likewise, the intelligentsia came from all of its members rather than a class or caste of economically, educationally or biologically ranked persons. Given that an ethnocentric education was a foundational premise for peoplehood-nationhood and community reproduction, Forbes advocated educational initiatives which centered community relationships and contexts, community knowledge systems or native American sciences (Cajete's "ethnoscience" or Native Science), and traditional learning modalities such as apprenticeship and mentorship, observation, experimentation-experience and participation, critical study and research, ancient approaches such as vision-production, creativity-art, ceremony and economic activities as formulated by specific people for specific people and individuals could engage the core of community via relationships and responsibilities, or democracy. Forbes argued that education was no good if people could not live in their own communities. An intelligentsia was only as good as its engagement with community as living members. European models of foundation and higher education were only valuable if they could produce people of community, people of specific Nations and Peoples as imperial education concerted effort is the opposite, which is to produce its own patriot-citizens, willing workers, tributaries and taxpayers, warriors and police, politicians and governors, teachers and leaders. Within this system of education, nearly every person becomes a missionary for its own cause, which as he names it is exploitation and consumption. An intelligentsia, although

equally woven into the web of imperialism and colonialism was at the very least conscious of this fact, and through its training as community leaders could at least fathom and engage the power-struggles head on among its people.

The collective decolonized or deimperialized mind-spirits would naturally find each other as allies and compatriots because at their core, was the development of values and ethics which represented the highest thought and vision of their people, imbued with the ancient and time-tempered wisdom, and surrounded by a world of relations which provided mirrors for how to live a good life and in right relations. D-QU was imagined to be a place where one could pursue their individual pathways which were to be rutted in the tracks of their communities relationships and vision of itself. All groups have suffered over the last few hundreds of years so much that each groups particular vision has become withered or sick or even missing if they have survived. Yet are they as sick as the vision whites have had for “others”? D-QU was imagined as a place where the basic acts of healing and rebirth, of decolonization could take place in a supportive environment where one could be free to be themselves, to be authentic, to learn in their own way but also a place that confronted its students with their peoples realities which they were supported in engaging directly through intimate learning approaches. The humblest of these for example, and one which served in many ways as a midwife or rebirthing praxis is also one to have survived the school’s shutdown, the sweat-lodge. Forbes and Risling’s emphasis upon the core profusion of a spiritual, ceremonial and American pathway of learning can be traced to the visits, inspiration and support by leading elders, scholars and practitioners across Anowarakowa. Forbes understood that beneath the imperial map lay 20-200,000 years of tried and true wisdom which not only survived in many places,

peoples and mediums, it especially resided in the faithkeepers, visionaries, healers, warriors, and many other kinds of people, but especially the elders. Forbes early contacts and work with Antonio Del Buono, Carl Gorman Sr., Thomas Banyacya, Su-Wohrom (David Risling Sr.) and David Risling Jr., who all were influencers early in his career outside of academia were raised in original communities of power and wisdom traditions, whose spiritual base was sound, if not the sounding alarm for their worldly works. Also, these persons were present in Forbes life before D-QU and before Native American Studies, as he had known Del Buono from probably junior college circa 1951 at the earliest date, Gorman from 1960, Banyacya around 1961, and the Rislings by 1967. Numerous other influential persons also convinced him that for any people, let alone decolonial-deimperial and resurgent community-based movements to succeed, it must have a spiritual base. This point was made clearly by Forbes (1985b) and Champagne (2007) in relation to resistance and revitalization efforts across Anowarakowa into the 20th century. Education must focus upon a person's specific relationships: spiritual, kinship-national-political, economic-territorial, historical-communicative, creative (art-science-tools), etc.. The blessing of D-QU by Benjamin Black Elk in 1970 was significant for Forbes, as was the presence of Phillip Deere and Darrell Standing Elk since 1975 and soon after Dennis Banks that same year because they brought the "spiritual core" to D-QU. This was coupled with the original anti-religious acquaintance in Howard Adams whose aggressive approach likely pushed Forbes in the opposite direction. Forbes mid-life rebirth occurred around this point, in which he re-dedicated himself as a spiritual spawn of the Great Creative Power, was remarried to a Yuchi (Muscogee Creek) from Oklahoma, Carolyn Forbes, and began to build a richer



community in Yololandia-Davis on 7 acres, down the road from the 640 acres at D-QU and the newly expanding Tecumseh Center of Native American Studies at UC Davis' thousands of acres, the now largest UC in the state as of 2007 and in the top 10 in the whole U.S. (Forbes 1975c; Forbes 1978a; Forbes 1991).

Forbes original vision consisted of transforming the shapes and contours of education completely, inviting and demanding every possible opportunity to perform community-based education from which D-QU and NAS were imagined as vital avenues for growing leaders, teachers, doctors and scholar warriors. Triumphant support won the original site because of the incredible outpour of support from at first, UC Davis Native American students as Forbes declared, who then were supported by local Chicano students, a wave of Alcatraz and other influenced persons, local and international community. Among the first cadre of educators included Grace Thorpe, Sun Bear, Adam Nordwall, while a separate support group, Friends of D-QU included Morgan Otis, Reies Lopez Tijerina, Robert Robertson, then commissioner of Indian Affairs Louis Bruce, LaDonna Harris, numerous representatives and senators, and even, Vine Deloria Jr.. The original vision entailed an experimental daycare and elementary school on site, and had developed a Ph.D. program, D-QU's Center for Advanced Studies by the end of 1974, yet by 1975, many of these efforts were shunted and depressed. A key lesson is revealed which I believe most persons will have witnessed in their lifetimes before, and that is the springing forth of new life, new growth, such as in a new organization or project, a new school, a new garden. But what happens after its initial growth is very important: it must meet its vital needs or suffer stunted growth, suffer from malnutrition or lack of opportunity and resources, must survive pests and predations, must survive an ongoing

war to eliminate “subversives and terrorists”, must survive a leviathan, a big wétiko, white male imperialism and religious persecution, corporate farming and your average conservative, racist and patriarchal white person among so many other factors. While funding is important, internal unity and relationships must be solid at the core of any effort. By 1974, Forbes was not a leader on campus. By 1975 they were accredited instead as a junior college by WASC after suffering wave after wave of attacks by external, and internal conflicts. By 1978 Chicanos were not on the board of trustees, by 1980 most farming operations of any large scale were halted, and in 1983, D-QU had been sued by the DOE and federal government, narrowly surviving. No medical school, teacher training program, no Ph.D. program or research center, no experimental school or farm as these are all jettisoned to become accredited, funded, and in the end, limited by the precepts of a junior college. For Forbes, a spiritually-responsive environment was paramount to any educational endeavor because he believed that it grounded people to the most important relationships and sources of life, and provided the spoke from the great wheel of community could live off of. He learned this important fact from Su-Wohrom, whose depiction to his son David Risling Jr. as he left to college in the 1940’s after serving in the war, was a wheel full of spokes (tap-roots of peoplehood), from which the central hub was the community while the outside tread was white society (Risling 1993; Forbes 2001). Spirituality is in the end, nothing without a ceremonial tradition of responsible actions by community, who is interacting in an ensouled universe which provides the basic fruits of creation growing from the snow mountains from which flow our fertile and riparian existence. Forbes vision was that Native Nations would feel compelled to use schools as a tool for enhancing traditional education, governance,

ceremonial, and all of their tap-roots to keep the people together, to train them to survive in the imperialized world, and offer them a place to be free to be Indian wherever they went. One of the issues that might staunch these efforts was our specific engagement with a colonial-imperial present we did not understand and in turn, could not fathom how to survive it.

This study was not a biography, but in talking about someone's thoughts and actions, scholarship and legacy, it inevitably hoped to pronounce important moments and ideas of Dr. Jack Douglas Forbes. I had hoped to learn more about the man by leafing through his incredibly rich published and unpublished letters, his audio and video records, and old stomping grounds in order to understand him and provide a new synthesis of his philosophy of education for others to draw from. Yet invariably, it always seemed never enough to grasp the man behind the texts. I have talked to many of his family and friends throughout the years, and while they provided the deepest insights about his life, experience, humor and humble disposition, this is not what my ultimate mission was, and so I have refrained from adding these insights. This is perhaps the next point of departure in my scholarly work, from which I will dedicate myself to preserving and enriching the lives of others, by illuminating this already bright star, a son, an eagle, who should continue to be remembered. The archival record is indeed rich and vast. The appendix to this study carefully details all of the archival records I have thus located in order to provide my readers with a sense of the numerous sources, their extreme dispersion, and the central locales where they may be found. I believe that if one wants to study deeply what another has thought and done, they must diligently and honestly study everything. I have done this, but I always feared it would never be enough, and still do

so, because I have justice in my heart which awakens me to the fact that I am not without flaw and indifference. Thus, there are many avenues and areas from which a Forbesian life or biography would greatly enhance readers understanding of the man and the myth. I pray I have been faithful to the man thus far, and I hope, a diligent scholar.

There are many key areas of study which I think still reveal his thought but perhaps more importantly the communities and movements from which he dedicated his life to, and have informed this study. For example, the mysterious events surrounding the fire that burned down the San Francisco Indian Center in October of 1969, a month before the occupation of Alcatraz is a significant event and unsolved mystery. This event alone might have provided the necessary impetus or kick-off to what transpired afterwards. Reporter Tim Findlay says he interviewed everyone he could immediately after the fire but because of Alcatraz a month later, his investigation ended prematurely. Another mystery lives within the 50-year history of D-QU as there is only one doctoral study on the school (Berger 1994), and another major work which focuses on the California Indian Education Association (Casper-Denman 2009), which was NAS-UCD and D-QU's most staunch supporter throughout the years. Another example is that there is a total of five studies which focus on D-QU for more than a chapter, with two of them performed after 1978, and none after 1985 except in a synthetic or corroborative fashion such as the one by Marquez (2010) and another recently by Goodwin (2017). Thus there is a missing chapter in the universities history which has not been told in total. Further, Chicano involvement and influence has not been studied except by Marquez (2017) and was totally left out by Lutz (1980), Berger (1994) and Caspar-Denman (2012). Another key arena for study is United Native Americans and its involvement both with the Third

World Liberation Front, the Alcatraz occupation, the founding of D-QU and Native/American Indian Studies. It's most prestigious and long-standing leader Lehman "Lee" Brightman passed into the spirit world in 2017 and he took a lifetime of knowledge and experience with him. This work and many future works hope to celebrate and honor this man, for I fear his legacy will never be remembered appropriately or promptly. An upcoming work by LaNada (Means) Boyer, who worked heavily during the bay area prior to and after Alcatraz and was involved in all of the organizations and events mentioned above is forthcoming. Also, the connection and influence of Dennis Banks and AIM upon D-QU and California Indian politics in general has not been well examined. My research into collective FBI evidence on many of this studies subjects has turned up quite a few records, with more incoming, and reports of past requests fulfilled to have contained hundreds if not thousands of FBI documents. Who wants to put themselves out there and talk to the FBI about their collusion, infiltration and spying activities? Further, the magnanimous figure, David Risling Jr., has not been studied at all. His lifetime achievements are too many to name, and his influence upon Forbes cannot be understated. He truly was Forbes "elder brother" (Forbes 2002a). The same can be said for Carl N. Gorman, who Forbes suggested was the true progenitor of D-QU. A current study inclusive of Gorman is being performed by his daughter Zonnie as I write this, and I look forward to the due diligence I am sure she has given to the subject. Likewise, mention must also be made of Sarah F. Hutchison who was a key leader and teacher at UCD-NAS and D-QU for many years. Forbes recognized her qualities early and made sure she was employed even when the university could not or did not care about how important it was to have a Cherokee nurse in the academy. Also, there are so many

queens that are left out of this story, and this is not without some sense of remorse and hurt. We all should know deep in our hearts that they form the backbone of any man, of any nation, and of all life itself. Forbes praised his mother and grandmother, aunts, wife, daughter and women friends for teaching him how to be a man, how to be humble, how to be a good person, how to be selfless and live up to your core values, and of course, how to always do your best, and do the right thing. Too many lessons and missing in action queens remind me of this of fact.

On another note, I have shared what I can in the time I have had working with Forbes materials dutifully. There is nothing in here which cannot be found if one cares to search for it. Yet, this project is a study of research and revision, that is, I personally took another look at his life and philosophy of education, and my own as well, which no one else has done. Thus, many of the insights and ideas I have generated from my own life and work and cannot be replicated, for they are mine alone. However, I have limited my own views and advocacy on purpose so as to paint a picture of Forbes with his own words, as much as possible. Future research upon some of these core ideas would involve a great expediency of energy and conversations with relevant others, from which new insights might be generated. The history of D-QU is still lingering around, into the present, as it still holds the title to the site and meets regularly to maintain its status and the keys to the buildings. There may be some hope left in its revitalization, and it may be a triumphant story to tell. Forbes left a lifetime of work to follow, trace, track down and learn from. As a performer Forbes was action-oriented. He used the power of the word to get his message and feelings across, to challenge the imperial canons, and to build a new world on the ashes of a diseased one.

## References

### *Archival Collections*

- Forbes, J.D. and Escamilla Harris (2001). "Get the Word Out!" #54. Davis Media Access. Davis Community Television, Davis, CA.
- Forbes (Jack D.) Collection 1800-2000 (D-046). Special Collections Dept., Shields Library, University of California, Davis.
- Forbes, J.D. (1986). *The Native-American Experience: New Insights into Native-American History* [VHS]. Hayward, CA, Cal-State University, Hayward, Instructional Media Center TV.
- Forbes, J.D. (1991). Lecturer and panelist on "Native American Ecological Wisdom" at the Ethnicity, Equity and Environment Centennial Symposium, Stanford University, April 12, 1991. Stanford, CA: Stanford Alumni Association.
- Hutchison (Sarah V.) Papers 1960-1984 (D-240). Special Collections Dept., Shields Library, University of California, Davis.
- Kay Cole Papers (MSS 556 BC). Center for Southwest Research, Zimmerman Library, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.
- Risling (David) Papers 1969-1991 (D-334). Special Collections Dept., Shields Library, University of California, Davis.
- University Explorer (1971). "Images and Indians", June 13, 1971. Box 4, Folder "June 1971". University Extension. University of California Radio Service. Texts of Radio Broadcasts (University Archives Record Series 12). UCLA Library Special Collections, University Archives.

## *YouTube*

AkwesasneTV (2016). Ohero:kon “Under the Husk”. Retrieved March 15, 2019, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m9ktnN8VwPg>.

Cinema Politica Concordia (2018). *Q&A with Katsitsionni Fox - Ohero:kon - Under the Husk*. Retrieved March 15, 2019, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aAkva8sD80Q>.

Eyeteyleye (2010). Prof. Lehman Brightman Speaks on D-QU 11.09.10 - YouTube. Retrieved May 28, 2018, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZYDxIHAZ0ic>.

Forbes, J. D., Escamilla, C. (Host), & Meade, M. (Director). (2001, Oct.). Get the word out #54. Davis, CA: Davis Media Access.

Forbes, J.D. & Middleton, L. (1990 & 1992). “Native Americans and African Americans” and “Who was Columbus? The Conquest told by a Native American” in *For the People*. Columbia, SC: South Carolina Educational Television (SC ETV). Retrieved 04/01/2018 from: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nq2WY\\_MD3Dk](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nq2WY_MD3Dk).

Interview (audio only) with Jack Forbes (Feb. 7, 1998). “Native African Interactions”, Southwest Museum of Los Angeles. Retrieved 05/01/2019 from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xhal9WgkAGg&t=2819s>.

Revisiting Aztecas Del Norte with Spirit (Feb. 10, 2017). Mama Adalberta Cobb, Roberto Cintli Rodriguez, Melissa Johnson, & Susy Zepeda. Retrieved 02/31/2017 from



[https://video.ucdavis.edu/media/Revisiting+Aztecas+del+Norte+with+Spirit+-+February+10,+2017/0\\_s9sax604/25823292](https://video.ucdavis.edu/media/Revisiting+Aztecas+del+Norte+with+Spirit+-+February+10,+2017/0_s9sax604/25823292).

### *Newspaper Articles*

Argus (1977, June 16-22). David Risling, Native American. *Argus: Davis' Free Community Newspaper*, II(21), [no page numbers, 1-2, 7, 12].

Hyman, H. (1961, Feb. 21). Forbes tries to preserve Santa Susana Indian sites. *Valley State Sundial*, 3.

Indian Country Today (2017, June 20). Coming of age in Akwesasne: The beauty is under the husk. *Indian Country Today*. Retrieved from <https://newsmaven.io/indiancountrytoday/archive/coming-of-age-in-akwesasne-the-beauty-is-under-the-husk-Aiy6pXI7N0mKIzHdLys3bA/>.

Sun Telegram. (1971, Oct. 30). Indian educator says Anglos still imposing their culture. *Sun Telegram*, B-4.

Ventura County Star-Free Press (1964, Mar. 27). Trustee kept goals in sight. *Ventura County Star-Free Press*. Sec. B12, Vol. 89, No. 121.

### *Books and Articles*

Acosta, F. de J. (2007). *The history of Barrios Unidos: Healing community violence*. Arte Publico Press.

Acuña, R. (2007). *Occupied America: a history of Chicanos*. New York: Pearson Longman.

- Adams, D. W. (1997). *Education for extinction: American Indians and the boarding school experience, 1875-1928*. Lawrence, Kan: University Press of Kansas.
- Adams, H. (1966). *The Role of Church and State in Canadian Education, 1800-1867*. (Ph.D.). University of California, Berkeley, United States -- California. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/pqdtglobal/docview/302168759/69562D7EDD52418CPQ/1>.
- Adams, H. (1975). *Prison of grass: Canada from a native point of view*. Toronto: New Press.
- Adams, H. (1989). *Prison of grass: Canada from a native point of view* (2nd ed.). Saskatoon, Sask: Fifth House Publishers.
- Adams, H. (1995). *A tortured people: The politics of colonization* (1st ed.). Penticton, B.C.: Theytus Books.
- Adams, H. (1999). *A Tortured People: The Politics of Colonization* (2nd ed.). Penticton, B.C.: Theytus Books.
- Ah, N.-B. M. K. P., & Cooper, J. E. (2000). *Indigenous educational models for contemporary practice: In our mother's voice*. Mahwah, N.J: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Akers, D. (2004). Decolonizing the master narrative. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 29(1), 58-76.

- Alarcón, D. C. (1990). The Aztec palimpsest: toward a new understanding of Aztlán, cultural identity and history. *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies*, 19(2), 33-68.
- Alarcón, D. C. (1997). *The Aztec Palimpsest: Mexico in the Modern Imagination*. University of Arizona Press.
- Alfred, G. T. & Corntassel, J. (2005). Being Indigenous: Resurgences against contemporary colonialism. *Government and Opposition*, 9, 597-614.
- Alfred, G. T. (2005). *Wasáse : indigenous pathways of action and freedom*. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press.
- Alfred, G. T. (2014, Jan. 14). Shape-shifting colonialism. *Sunday Morning Herald*. Retrieved 05/06/2018 from <http://www.smh.com.au/national/education/voice/shapeshifting-colonialism-20140107-30f6n.html>.
- Alfred, G. T. (2016, Sept. 20). *Reconciliation as recolonization*. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/TAlfred20sept2016>.
- Allen, T. (1994). *The invention of the white race* (2 vols.). London; New York: Verso.
- Allen, R. T. (2001). The globalization of white supremacy: Toward a critical discourse on the racialization of the world. *Educational Leadership*, 51(4), 467-485.
- Almaguer, T. (1971). Toward the Study of Chicano colonialism. *Aztlán*, 2, 7–21.
- Almaguer, T. (1975). *Class, race and Chicano oppression*. Somerville, MA: New England Free Press.

- Almaguer, T. (1994). *Racial fault lines: The Historical Origins of White Supremacy in California*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Alridge, D. P. (2008). *The educational thought of W.E.B. Du Bois: An intellectual history*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Anaya, R., Lomelí, F. A., & Lamadrid, E. R. (2017). *Aztlán: Essays on the Chicano Homeland*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Antone, R. A., Miller, D. L., & Myers, B. A. (1986). *The power within people: A community organizing perspective*. Deseronto, Ont.: Peace Tree Technologies Inc..
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands: La frontera* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1999). *Borderlands: La frontera* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.
- Archuleta, M., Child, B. J., Lomawaima, K. T., & Heard Museum. (2000). *Away from home: American Indian boarding school experiences, 1879-2000*. Phoenix, AZ: Heard Museum.
- Apess, W. (1992). *On our own ground: The complete writings of William Apess, a Pequot*. Boston, MA: Univ of Massachusetts Press.
- Appell-Warren, L. P. (1988). *The social construction of personhood among the Rungus of Sabah, Malaysia*. Qualifying paper--Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Appell-Warren, L. P. (2014). *Personhood: An Examination of the History and Use of an Anthropological Concept*. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press.

- Arencibia Rodriguez, L. (2017). The Imperial College of Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco : The First school of translators and interpreters in sixteenth-century Spanish America. In P. F. Bandia & G. L. Bastin (Eds.), *Charting the Future of Translation History* (pp. 263–275). Ottawa: Les Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa | University of Ottawa Press. Retrieved from <http://books.openedition.org/uop/336>.
- Aristotle. (2010). *The Politics*. University of Chicago Press.
- Aronilth, W. (1992). *Foundation of Navajo culture*. Tsailé, AZ: Navajo Community College.
- Aronilth, W. (1994). *Diné bi bee óhooáah bá silá = An introduction to Navajo philosophy*. Tsailé, AZ: Center for Dine Studies, Navajo Community College.
- Aronowitz, S. (2012). Paulo Freire's Radical Democratic Humanism: The Fetish of Method. *Counterpoints*, 422, 257–274.
- Atencio, T. (1974). Journey to learning: La 'cequia? O a la escuela? In J. Reichert & M. Trujillo (Eds.), *Perspectives on contemporary Native American and Chicano educational thought*, (pp. 1-16). Davis, CA: DQU Press.
- Atencio, T. (1988). *Resolana: A Chicano pathway to knowledge*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Chicano Research, Stanford University. Retrieved 04/16/2018 from, <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/bdf4/75ab20b5afa7c2eae2f0a72e73922ec28553.pdf>.

- Atencio, T. (1991). *Cultural philosophy: A common sense perspective*.  
Albuquerque, N.M.: Rio Grande Institute.
- Atwood, P. L. (2010). *War and empire: The American way of life*. London: Pluto Press.
- Bad Brains (1982). Fearless vampire killers. *Bad Brains*. New York: ROIR.  
Retrieved from <https://genius.com/Bad-brains-fearless-vampire-killers-lyrics>.
- Baer, S. E. , (2004). Colonias: California's Forgotten Communities? *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association, Marriott Hotel, Portland, Oregon Online*. Retrieved 05/26/2019 from [http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p88203\\_index.html](http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p88203_index.html).
- Baldwin, J. (1979, July 29). If Black English isn't a language . . . then tell me, what is? *New York Times*. Retrieved 04/04/2018 from [https://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/books/98/03/29/specials/baldwin-english.html?\\_r=1&oref=slogin](https://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/books/98/03/29/specials/baldwin-english.html?_r=1&oref=slogin).
- Bailey, L. R. (1966). *Indian slave trade in the Southwest: A study of slave-taking and the traffic in Indian captives*. Los Angeles: Westernlore Press.
- Bailey, P. (2011). UC Davis Native American scholar Jack Forbes dies. Retrieved March 7, 2017, from: <http://www.dailydemocrat.com/article/ZZ/20110226/NEWS/110227146>.
- Baldwin, J. (1979, July 29). If Black English isn't a language, then tell me, what is? *New York Times*. Retrieved from

[https://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/books/98/03/29/specials/baldwin-english.html?\\_r=1&oref=slogin](https://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/books/98/03/29/specials/baldwin-english.html?_r=1&oref=slogin).

- Bancroft, H. H. (1884). *History of California*. San Francisco, Calif: A.L. Bancroft.
- Banks, D., & Erdoes, R. (2005). *Ojibwa warrior: Dennis Banks and the rise of the American Indian Movement*. University of Oklahoma Press.
- Barker, J. (2011). *Native acts: Law, recognition, and cultural authenticity*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Barker, J. (2015). The corporation and the tribe. *The American Indian Quarterly*, 39(3), 243–270. Retrieved 05/14/17, from <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/583850>.
- Barnhardt, R., & Kawagley, A. O. (1999). Education Indigenous to place: Western science meets Indigenous reality. In G. Smith & D. Williams (Eds). *Ecological Education in Action* (pp. 117-140). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Barnouw, V. (1979). *Wisconsin Chippewa myths and tales: And their relation to Chippewa life*. Univ of Wisconsin Press.
- Barrett, S. A. (1919). *The Genetic Relationship of the North American Indian Languages*. University of California Press.
- Battiste, M., & Henderson, J. Y. (2000). *Protecting Indigenous knowledge and heritage: A global challenge*. Saskatoon, SK: Purich Publishing.

- Battiste, M. (1998). Enabling the autumn seed: Toward a decolonized approach to aboriginal knowledge, language, and education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 22(1), 16–27.
- Battiste, M. (2013a). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit*. Saskatoon, SK: Purich Publishing Limited.
- Battiste, M. (2013b). You can't be the doctor if you're the disease: Eurocentrism and indigenous renaissance (CAUT Distinguished Academic Lecture, April 26, 2013). Retrieved 05/13/2018 from <https://www.caut.ca/sites/default/files/you-cant-be-the-doctor-if-youre-the-disease-eurocentrism-and-indigenous-renaissance.pdf>.
- Beauchamp, W. M. (1926). The principal founders of the Iroquois league and its probable date. *The Quarterly Journal of the New York State Historical Association*, 7(1), 27–36. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43566084>.
- Bell, D. A. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the Interest-Convergence Dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 93(3), 518-533.
- Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. NY: Basic Books.
- Bell, D. A. (2009). On celebrating an election as racial progress. *Human Rights*, 36(4), 2-5.
- Berger, M. J. (1994). *D-Q university: A history and case study* (Order No. 9514353). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304134863). Retrieved from



<http://libproxy.unm.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/304134863?accountid=14613>.

Berkhofer, R. F. (1979). *The white man's Indian: Images of the American Indian, from Columbus to the present*. New York: Vintage Books.

Berlin, I. (1998). *Many thousands gone: The first two centuries of slavery in North America*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Berman, M. (1981). *The reenchantment of the world*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Bernard, H. R. & Ryan, G. W. (1994). Techniques to identify themes in qualitative data. Retrieved from:

<http://www.analytictech.com/mb870/readings/ryan-bernard-techniques-to-identify-themes-in.htm>

Bernard, H. R. & Ryan, G. W. (2003). Techniques to identify themes. *Field Methods*, 15(1), 85–109. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X02239569>.

Berry, T. (1988). *The dream of the earth*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.

Bierhorst, J. (1985). *The mythology of North America*. New York: Morrow.

Bierhorst, J. (1995). *Mythology of the Lenape: Guide and texts*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Billingsley, L. (2006, Mar. 10). The Lesson of DQU. *Front Page Magazine*.

*Retrieved from*

<http://archive.frontpagemag.com/Printable.aspx?ArtId=5260>.

- Bird, L., & Gray, S. E. (2007). *The spirit lives in the mind: Omushkego stories, lives and dreams*. Montreal, QBC.: McGill-Queen's University Press.  
Retrieved from <http://www.deslibris.ca/ID/433001>.
- Bishop, C. (1975). Northern Algonkian cannibalism and windigo psychosis. In T. R. Williams (Ed.), *Psychological Anthropology* (pp. 237-248). The Hague: Mouton.
- Black, C. (2013). *Schooling the world: The white man's last burden*. Malibu, CA: Last People Films.
- Black, Elk, N. & Brown, J. E. (1953). *The sacred pipe: Black Elk's account of the seven rites of the Oglala Sioux*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Black Elk, F. (1983). Observations on Marxism and Lakota tradition. In W. Churchill (Ed), *Marxism and native Americans* (137-158). Boston, Mass: South End Press.
- Blackhawk, N. (2006). *Violence over the land: Indians and empires in the early American west*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Blaeser, K. M. (2012). A nexus of connections: Acts of recovery, acts of resistance in native palimpsest. In S. Gingell & W. Roy (Eds.), *Listening Up, Writing Down, and Looking Beyond : Interfaces of the Oral, Written, and Visual* (pp. 210-227). Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press. Retrieved from <https://search-ebSCOhost-com.libproxy.unm.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=1066740&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.

- Blauner, R. (1969). Internal colonialism and ghetto revolt. *Social Problems*, 16(4), 393-408.
- Blea, I. I. (1988). *Toward a Chicano social science*. New York: Praeger.
- Blea, I. I. (1995). *Researching Chicano communities: Social-historical, physical, psychological, and spiritual space*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Bloomfield, L. (1934). *Plains Cree texts*. New York: G.E. Stechert & Co.
- Bonilla-Silva, E., Goar, C., & Embrick, D. G. (2006). When whites flock together: The social psychology of white habitus. *Critical Sociology*, 32(2-3), 229-253. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156916306777835268>.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2010). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2004). From bi-racial to tri-racial: Towards a new system of racial stratification in the USA. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 27(6), 931-950.
- Bonvillain, N. (1989). Body, mind, and idea: Semantics of noun incorporation in Akwesasne Mohawk. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 55(3), 341-358. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1265074>.
- Boscana, G. (1846). *Chinigchinich: A historical account of the origin, customs, and traditions of the Indians at the missionary establishment of St. Juan Capistrano, Alta California; called the Acagchemem nation*. New York: Wiley & Putnam.

- Boscana, G., & Harrington, J. P. (1934). *A new original version of Boscana's historical account of the San Juan Capistrano Indians of Southern California*. Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.
- Brayboy, B.M. (2005). Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. *Urban Review, 37*(5), 425-446.
- Brightman, L. (1971). The pictures on the wall all are of white men. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 9*(3), 37-42.
- Brightman, L. (2010). Lehman Brightman speaking at the AIM 40th Anniversary Celebration, San Francisco. Nov. 09, 2010. Retrieved from, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LnmVIX0uQR0>.
- Brightman, R. A., Meyer, D., & Marano, L. (1983). On Windigo psychosis. *Current Anthropology, 24*(1), 120-125.
- Brightman, R. A. (1988). The windigo in the material world. *Ethnohistory, 35*(4), 337-379.
- Brightman, R. A. (2007). *Traditional narratives of the Rock Cree Indians*. University of Regina Press.
- Brinton, D. G. (Daniel G. (1890). *Rig Veda americanus. Sacred songs of the ancient Mexicans, with a gloss in Nahuatl*. Philadelphia, D. G. Brinton. Retrieved from [http://archive.org/details/rigvedaamericanu00brin\\_0](http://archive.org/details/rigvedaamericanu00brin_0).
- Brock, S. I. & Tupper, F. B.(1845). *The Life and Correspondence of Major-General Sir Isaac Brock*. London: Simpkin & Marshall.

- Brooks, L. (2014). Digging at the roots: Locating an ethical, native criticism. In Womack, C. S., Justice, D. H., & Teuton, C. B. (Eds.). *Reasoning Together: The Native Critics Collective* (pp. 234-264). Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Brown, J. S. & Brightman, R. (1988). *The Orders of the Dreamed: George Nelson on Cree and Northern Ojibwa Religion and Myth, 1823*. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Historical Society Press.
- Brown, J. (1971). The cure and feeding of windigos: A critique. *American Anthropologist*, 73(1), 20-22.
- Broyles-González, Y. (2002). Indianizing Catholicism: Chicana/India/Mexicana Indigenous spiritual practices in our image. In Cantú, N. & O. Nájera-Ramírez (Eds.), *Chicana traditions: Continuity and change* (117-132). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Burns, A. (2017). *American imperialism: The territorial expansion of the United States, 1783-2013*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Byrd, J. A. (2011). *The transit of empire: Indigenous critiques of colonialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cahnmann, M. (2003). The craft, practice, and possibility of poetry in educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 32(3), 29-36.
- Cajete, G. A. (1994). *Look to the mountain: An ecology of indigenous education*. Durango, Colo: Kivakí Press.
- Cajete, G. A. (1999). *Igniting the sparkle: An indigenous science education model*. Skyland, NC: Kivaki Press.

- Cajete, G. A. (2000). *Native science: Natural laws of interdependence*. Santa Fe, N.M: Clear Light Publishers.
- Cajete, G. A. (2005). American Indian epistemologies. *New Directions for Student Services*, 109, 69-78.
- Cajete, G. A. (2012). Decolonizing indigenous education in a twenty-first century world. In Waziyatawin and M. Yellow Bird (Eds.), *For indigenous minds only: A decolonization handbook*, (pp. 145-156). Santa Fe: SAR Press.
- Cajete, G. A. (2015). *Indigenous community: Rekindling the teachings of the seventh fire*. St. Paul, MN: Living Justice Press.
- Campbell, M. (1973). *Halfbreed*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Carlson, N. D. (2009). Reviving witiko (windigo): An ethnohistory of “cannibal monsters” in the Athabasca district of northern Alberta, 1878-1910. *Ethnohistory*, 56(3), 355-394. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.unm.edu/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=43366354&site=eds-live&scope=site>.
- Casper-Denman, K. (2013). *California Indian Education Association (CIEA): Working towards educational sovereignty*. Davis: University of California. Doctoral Dissertation, Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1513598283?accountid=14505>.
- Castro, R. (2000). *Dictionary of Chicano folklore*. Santa Barbara, Calif.: ABC-CLIO.
- Catapano, A. J. (2007). *The rising of the Ongwehònwe: Sovereignty, identity, and representation on the Six Nations reserve* (Doctoral dissertation). Stony

Brook University. Retrieved from

<https://dspace.sunyconnect.suny.edu/bitstream/handle/1951/44779/000000159.sbu.pdf;jsessionid=CA9B01C8D328FA6615BA85956F0FF3DE?sequence=3>.

Cervantes, J. M. (2010, Dec.). Mestizo spirituality: Toward an integrated approach to psychotherapy for Latina/os. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice*, 47(4), 527-539.

Cevasco, C. (2016). This is my body: Communion and cannibalism in colonial New England and New France. *The New England Quarterly*, 89(4), 556-586.

Chabot, C. (2016). *Cannibal wihtiko: Finding native-newcomer common ground (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*. Ottawa: Université d'Ottawa / University of Ottawa. Retrieved from <https://ruor.uottawa.ca/handle/10393/33452>.

Chafe, W. (2015). *Seneca dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://senecalanguage.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/SENECA-DICTIONARY-FINAL.pdf>.

Chamberlain, A. F. (1899, Jan-Mar.). American Indian names of white men and women. *The Journal of American Folklore*, 12(4), 24-31.

Chambliss, J. J. (1996). *Philosophy of education: An encyclopedia*. New York: Garland Pub.

Champagne, D., Johnson, T., & J. Nagel (1996). *American Indian activism: Alcatraz to the longest walk*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

- Champagne, D., & Stauss, J. H. (2002). Defining Indian studies through stories and nation building. In Champagne, D. & Stauss, J. H., (Eds.), *Native American studies in higher education: models for collaboration between universities and indigenous nations* (pp. 1-15). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Champagne, D. (1992). *Social order and political change: Constitutional governments among the Cherokee, the Choctaw, the Chickasaw, and the Creek*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Champagne, D. (2003, Dec.). Education for nation-building. Retrieved May 28, 2018, from <https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/education-nation-building>.
- Champagne, D. (2007). *Social change and cultural continuity among Native Nations*. Lanham: Altamira Press.
- Champagne, D. (2013). UNDRIP (United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples): Human, civil, and Indigenous rights. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 28(1), 9–22. Retrieved from <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/506184>.
- Chavers, D. (1980). The future of Indian Studies. *Char-Koosta*, 10 (10): 10. Retrieved May 2, 2018 from: <http://montananewspapers.org/lccn/sn79007540/1980-09-15/ed-1/seq-10/>.
- Chavez, C. (1984). Commonwealth club address delivered November 9th, 1984. Farmworker Documentation Project. Retrieved May 14, 2018 from, <https://libraries.ucsd.edu/farmworkermovement/essays/essays/CESAR%20CHAVEZ%20COMMONWEALTH%20SPEECH.pdf>.



- Chávez, J. R. (1984). *The lost land: The Chicano image of the southwest*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Chávez, J. R. (2011). Aliens in their native lands: The persistence of internal colonial theory. *Journal of World History*, 22(4), 785-809.
- Child, B. J. (1998). *Boarding School Seasons: American Indian Families, 1900-1940*. Omaha, NE: U of Nebraska Press.
- Christie, L. J. (1997). *Californian native american college students' experience: An ethnographic study* (Order No. 1388182). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304415560). Retrieved from <http://libproxy.unm.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/304415560?accountid=14613>.
- Clark, K. B. (1965). *Dark Ghetto*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Coe, M. D. (1984). *Mexico*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Coleman, A. L. (2013). *That the blood stay pure: African Americans, Native Americans, and the predicament of race and identity in Virginia*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Coleman, A. L. (2014). The red and the black: Remembering the legacy of Jack D. Forbes. *Indian Country Media Network*. February 23, 2017. Retrieved March 7, 2017, from <https://indiancountrymedianetwork.com/news/native-news/the-red-and-the-black-remembering-the-legacy-of-jack-d-forbes/>.
- Coleman, M. C. (2007). *American Indians, the Irish, and government schooling: A comparative study*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

- Collier, J. (1942). The Indian in a wartime nation. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 223, 29–35. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1023781>.
- Comunicación combativa. (2018). Uncolonized - Documentary Film Trailer 2018. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5Q2UuwNhAvg>.
- Contreras, S. M. (2009). *Blood lines: Myth, Indigenism, and Chicana/o literature*. University of Texas Press.
- Cook, S. F. (1976). *The population of the California Indians, 1769-1970*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cook-Lynn, E. (2007a). *New Indians, old wars*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Cook-Lynn, E. (2007b). *Notebooks of Elizabeth Cook-Lynn*. University of Arizona Press.
- Cooper, J. M. (1933). The Cree witiko psychosis. *Primitive Man*, 6(1), 20–24.
- Cordova, V. F. (2007). *How it is: The Native American philosophy of V.F. Cordova* (Edited by Kathleen Moore). Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Corntassel, J. (2003). Being and becoming indigenous: ‘Peoplehood’ and ethnonationalist approaches to articulation indigenous identity. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 9(1), 75-100.
- Cortés, H. (2004). *Cartas y documentos*. México: Porrúa.

- Corti, L. & P. Thompson (2004). Secondary analysis of archived data. In C. Seale, G. Gobo, J.F. Gubrium, & D. Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative Research Practice* (pp. 297-313). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Costo, R., & Costo, J. H. (1987). *The missions of California: A legacy of genocide*. San Francisco: Indian Historian Press, American Indian Historical Society.
- Coulthard, G. S. (2007). Subjects of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and the 'Politics of Recognition' in Canada. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 6(4), 437–460.
- Coulthard, G. S. (2014). *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Crosby, A. W. (2004). *Ecological imperialism: The biological expansion of Europe, 900-1900*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Crum, S. J. (1989). The idea of an Indian college or university in twentieth century America. *Tribal College*, 1(1), 20-23.
- Crum, S.J. (2007). Indian activism, the great society, Indian self-determination, and the drive for an Indian college or university, 1964-71. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 31(1), 1-20.
- Crummell, A. (1992). *Destiny and race: Selected writings, 1840-1898*. Amherst: Univ of Massachusetts Press.

- Curley, A. (2017, June 28). The Navajo Nation's coal economy was built to be exploited. *High Country News*. Retrieved February 3, 2019, from <https://www.hcn.org/articles/analysis-tribal-affairs-cleaning-up-coal-on-navajo-nation>.
- Curtin, J., & Hewitt, J. N. B. (1918). *Seneca fiction, legends, and myths*. Washington: G.P.O..
- Cunliffe, B. (2006). The roots of warfare. In Jones, M., & A. C. Fabian (Eds.), *Conflict* (pp. 63-81). Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <http://public.eblib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=244406>.
- Cushing, F. H. (1901). *Zuñi folk tales*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Danckaerts, J., Sluyter, P., & Murphy, H. C. (1867). *Journal of a voyage to New York: And a tour in several of the American colonies in 1679-80*. Brooklyn: Long Island Historical Society. Retrieved 04/12/2017, from <http://hdl.handle.net/10111/UIUCBB:dancja0001jorvoy>.
- Darder, A. (2011). Teaching as an act of love: Reflections on Paulo Freire and his contributions to our lives and our work. *Counterpoints*, 418, 179–194. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42981647>.
- Davenport, F. G. (1917). *European Treaties Bearing on the History of the United States and Its Dependencies to 1648*. Carnegie Institution of Washington.
- Davis, A. Y. (2003). *Are prisons obsolete?*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- DeJong, D. H. (1993). *Promises of the past: A history of Indian education in the United States*. Golden, Colo: North American Press.

- Dei, G. J. S., Karumanchery, L. L., & Karumanchery-Luik, N. (2004).  
CHAPTER FOUR: White Power, White Privilege. *Counterpoints*, 244,  
81–99. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42979560>.
- Dei, G. J. S. (2010). Rereading Fanon for his pedagogy and implications for  
schooling and education. *Counterpoints*, 368, 1–27. Retrieved from  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/42980664>.
- Deloria, P. J. (1998). *Playing Indian*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Deloria, V. & C. M. Lytle (1984). *The Nations Within: The Past and Future of  
American Indian Sovereignty*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Deloria Jr., V. & Wildcat, D. R. (2001). *Power and place: Indian education in  
America*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing.
- Deloria, V. (1969). *Custer died for your sins: An Indian manifesto*. NY.:  
Macmillan Company.
- Deloria, V. (1970, Feb. 23). This country was a lot better off when the Indians  
were running it. *The New York Times*. Retrieved 03/07/2017 from  
[https://www.nytimes.com/1970/03/08/archives/this-country-was-a-lot-  
better-off-when-the-indians-were-running-it.html](https://www.nytimes.com/1970/03/08/archives/this-country-was-a-lot-better-off-when-the-indians-were-running-it.html).
- Deloria, V. (1974). *Indian education confronts the seventies. Five volumes;  
Volume I: History and background of Indian education*. Tsale, AZ:  
Navajo Community College. Retrieved from  
<https://eric.ed.gov/?q=indian+education+deloria&id=ED113064>.
- Deloria, V. (1981). Education and Imperialism. *Equity & Excellence in  
Education*, 19(1-2), 58–63.

- Deloria, V. (1991a). *Indian education in America: 8 essays*. Boulder, CO: American Indian Science & Engineering Society.
- Deloria, V. (1991b). Research, Redskins, and reality. *American Indian Quarterly*, 15 (4), 457-468.
- Deloria, V. (1994). Foreword. In G. Cajete, *Look to the mountain: An ecology of Indigenous education* (pp. 11-14). Durango, CO: Kivaki Press.
- Deloria V. (1997). *We talk, you listen: New tribes, new turf*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Deloria, V. (2013). The spiritual universe. In. M. Moore and T. A. Demeyer (Eds.), *Unraveling the spreading cloth of time: Indigenous thoughts concerning the universe* (239-254). Candler, NC: rENEGADE pLANETS pUBLISHING.
- Demarco, M. (2018). VP at SIPI accused of assault and harassment. Retrieved May 28, 2018, from <https://www.kunm.org/post/vp-sipi-accused-assault-and-harassment-0>.
- DeMuth, S. (2005). Colonization is always war. In Waziyatawin & M. Yellow Bird (Eds.), *For Indigenous eyes only* (pp. 99-102). Santa Fe, NM: School for Advanced Research.
- Denetdale, J. (2007). *Reclaiming Diné history: The legacies of Navajo Chief Manuelito and Juanita*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Denzin, N. K. (2003). *Performance ethnography: Critical pedagogy and the politics of culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Denzin, N. K. (2014). *Interpretive autoethnography*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DeSanti, B. (2015). The cannibal talking head: The portrayal of the windigo “monster” in popular culture and Ojibwe Traditions. *The Journal of Religion and Popular Culture*, 27(3), 186-201.
- Dorsey, G. A., & Kroeber, A. L. (1903). *Traditions of the Arapaho*. Chicago: Field Columbian Museum. Retrieved from <http://archive.org/details/traditionsofarap05dors>.
- Dorsey, J. O. (1890). *The Cegiha Language*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Doxtater, M. G. (2005). Indigenous knowledge in the decolonial era. *American Indian Quarterly*, 28, 618-633.
- DuBois, C. G. (1908). *The religion of the Luiseño Indians of southern California*. Berkeley: The University Press.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). The talented tenth. In B. Washington (Ed.), *The negro problem* (pp. 31-75). New York: James Pott & Co.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1935//1962). *Black reconstruction in America*. Athenaeum//New York: Russell & Russell.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1945//1975). *Color and democracy: Colonies and peace*. Millwood, NY: Kraus-Thompson Organization.
- Du Bois W. E. B. (1968a). *The autobiography of W.E.B. DuBois: A soliloquy on viewing my life from the last decade of its first century*. New York: International Publishers.

- Du Bois W. E. B. (1968b). *Dusk of dawn: An essay toward an autobiography of a race concept*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Du Bois, W. E. B., & Aptheker, H. (1985). *Against racism: Unpublished essays, papers, addresses, 1887-1961*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1996). "The talented tenth" and "the talented tenth memorial address." In H. L. Gates & C. West (Eds.), *The future of the race* (pp. 133-179). New York: Knopf.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (2007). *In battle for peace: The story of my 83rd birthday*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Duarte, E. M. (1999). Concientización y comunidad: A dialectical description of education as the struggle for freedom. *Studies in Philosophy and Education: An International Journal*, 18(6), 389-403.
- Dunbar-Ortiz, R. (2005). "Howard Adams at UC Davis and DQU". In Lutz, H. (Ed.) *Howard Adams: Otapawy!* (pp. 255-56). Saskatoon, SK: The Gabriel Dumont Institute.
- Dunbar-Ortiz, R. (2014). *An Indigenous people's history of the United States*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Dunbar-Ortiz, R. (2016). *Blood on the Border: A Memoir of the Contra War*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Duran, E. (2006). *Healing the soul wound: Counseling with American Indians and other native people*. New York: Teachers College Press.



- Eagleton, T. (2010). *On Evil*. Yale University Press. ProQuest Ebook Central,  
<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/unm/detail.action?docID=3421198>.
- Eichorn, K. (2008). Archival genres: Gathering texts and reading spaces. *InVisible Culture: An electronic journal for visible culture*, 12. Retrieved from  
[https://www.rochester.edu/in\\_visible\\_culture/Issue\\_12/eichhorn/eichhorn.pdf](https://www.rochester.edu/in_visible_culture/Issue_12/eichhorn/eichhorn.pdf)
- Eisner, E. W. (1997 ). The promise and perils of alternative forms of data representation. *Educational Researcher*, 26(6 ), 4-10.
- Elizabeth, A. S. P. (1997). Circling the text: Nomadic writing practices. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 3(4), 403-417.
- Ellis, C. D. (1995). *Âtalôhkâna nêsta tipâcimôwina = Cree legends and narratives from the west coast of James Bay*. Winnipeg, Man.: University of Manitoba Press. Retrieved from <http://www.deslibris.ca/ID/412943>.
- Emerson, G. (2004). Foreword. In R. Benes (Ed.), *Native American picture books of change: The art of historic children's editions* (pp. ix-xiv). Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press.
- Emerson, L. (2014). Diné culture, decolonization, and the politics of hózhó. In L. L. Lee (Ed.), *Diné perspectives: Revitalizing and reclaiming Navajo thought* (pp. 49-67). Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Erdoes, R., & Ortiz, A. (1984). *American Indian myths and legends*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Erdoes, R., & Ortiz, A. (1998). *American Indian trickster tales*. New York: Viking Books.

- Espinosa, G., & García, M. T. (2008). *Mexican American religions: spirituality, activism, and culture*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Fadden, R. T. (1972). *Wampum belts*. Onchiota, N.Y.: Six Nations Indian Museum.
- Fadden, R. T. (2000). *Roots of the Iroquois*. Summertown, TN: Native Voices.
- Fanon, F. (1952). *Peau noire, masques blancs*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- Fanon, F. (1959). *L'An cinq, de la révolution Algérienne*. Paris: François Maspero.
- Fanon, F. (1961). *Les damnés de la terre*. Paris: François Maspero.
- Fenton, W. N. (1991). *The false faces of the Iroquois*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Fenton, W. N. (2002). *The Little Water Medicine Society of the Senecas*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Ferguson, N. (2004). *Empire: The rise and demise of the British world order and the lessons for global power*. New York: Basic Books. Retrieved from <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/unm/detail.action?docID=679868>.
- Ferguson, N. (2005). *Colossus: The rise and fall of the American empire*. New York: Penguin.
- Fernandez, R. E., & Gonzalez, G. G. (2012). *A Century of Chicano History: Empire, Nations and Migration*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis. Retrieved from [http://www.123library.org/book\\_details/?id=86597](http://www.123library.org/book_details/?id=86597).
- Fiddler, T., & Stevens, J. R. (1985). *Killing the Shamen*. Moonbeam, ONT: Penumbra Press.

- Figueroa, A. A. (2002). *Ancient footprints of the Colorado River: La Cuna de Aztlán*. National City, Calif.: Aztec Printing, Co.
- Filipina, R. (2008, May 22). Author, professor emeritus Jack Forbes explores a new view of Native Americans. *California Aggie*. Retrieved 09/17/2017 from, <https://wayback.archive-it.org/5785/20161209045540/https://theaggie.org/2008/05/22/author-professor-emeritus-jack-forbes-explores-a-new-view-of-native-americans/>.
- Fiske, W. (2004). The black-and-white world of Walter Ashby Plecker. *The Virginian-Pilot*, 18. Retrieved from: <https://www.nps.gov/jame/learn/historyculture/upload/The-Black-and-White-World-of-Walter-Plecker.pdf>.
- Flannery, R., Chambers, M. E., & Jehle, P. A. (1981). Witiko accounts from the James Bay Cree. *Arctic Anthropology*, 18(1), 57-77.
- Fleming, B. E. (2017, Spring). Nanaboozhoo and the wiindigo: An Ojibwe history from colonization to the present. *Tribal College Journal*, 28(3), Retrieved from <https://tribalcollegejournal.org/nanaboozhoo-wiindigo-ojibwe-history-colonization-present/>.
- Forbes, J. D. (1957). "Anglo-Powhatan Relations to 1676," *The Masterkey*, 30(6) Nov.-Dec. 1956, 179-183 and 31(1) Jan.-Feb. 1957, 4-8.
- Forbes, J. D. (1959, Jan.). "Racial Bias in Gold Rush History," *The Masterkey*, 33(1), 13-21.
- Forbes, J. D. (1960). *Apache, Navaho, and Spaniard*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

- Forbes, J.D. (1961). "Proposal to create an American Indian university," *The Navajo Times*, May 24, 1961; partially reprinted in *San Manuel Miner*, June 9, 1961, p. 2.
- Forbes, J. D. (1963, April). The historian and the Indian: Racial bias in American history. *The Americas*, XIX(4), 349-362.
- Forbes, J.D. (1964a, August 8). Uncle Tony: A legend in his own time. *Conejo News*, July 23, 1964, p. 3.
- Forbes, J. D. (1964b). *The Indian in America's past* (Ed.). Englewood Cliffs; Prentice-Hall.
- Forbes, J. D. (1964c, Aug. 8). Uncle Tony's success formula: Helping others. *Ventura County Star-Free Press*, p. 4.
- Forbes, J. D. (1965, Summer). A comprehensive program for tribal development in the United States. *Human Organization*, 24(2), 159-161.
- Forbes, J. D. (1966a, Aug.-Sept.). The Indian: Looking glass into the souls of White Americans. *Liberator* 6(8), 6-9; 6(9), 14-17.
- Forbes, J. D. (1966b, Oct.). Stranger in the land: Black nationalism. *Frontier*, 17(12), 6-8.
- Forbes, J. D. (1966c, Jan.). An American Indian university: A proposal for survival. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 5(2) 1-7.
- Forbes, J. D. (1966d, Dec.-Jan. 1967). Research and teaching excellence. *Junior College Journal*, 37(4), 7-9.

- Forbes, J. D. (1967a). *Afro-Americans in the Far West: A handbook for educators*. Berkeley, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.
- Forbes, J. D. (1967b). *Mexican-Americans: A handbook for educators*. Berkeley: Far West Research and Education Laboratory.
- Forbes, J. D. (1967c). *The education of the culturally different: A multi-cultural approach*. Berkeley, Calif: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.
- Forbes, J.D. (1967d/1975). Indian education: The effects of conquest [audio cassette]. Rooseveltown, N.Y.: Akwesasne Notes.
- Forbes, J.D. (1967e). *California Indian Education: Report Of The First All-Indian Statewide Conference On California Indian Education*. Modesto: Ad Hoc Committee on California Indian Education.
- Forbes, J. D. (1967f, March-April). Education for democracy. *The Humanist*, 27(2), 52-53.
- Forbes, J. D. (1967g). The borderlands. In J. Dunner (Ed.), *Handbook for World History: Concepts and Issues*, (pp. 126-8). New York: Philosophical Library.
- Forbes, J. D. (1967h, Fall). Who speaks for the Indian?. *The Humanist*, 27(5-6), 174-176.
- Forbes, J. D. (1968a). *Native Americans of California and Nevada: A handbook*. Berkeley, Calif.: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

- Forbes, J. D. (1968b). Mexican-Americans and the problem of race and color. *Journal of Human Relations*, 16(1), 55-68.
- Forbes, J. D. (1968c). Colonialist BIA exposed. *Warpath*, I(2): 9.
- Forbes, J. D. (1969). *Native Americans of California and Nevada: A handbook*. Healdsburg, Calif: Naturegraph.
- Forbes, J. D. (1969b, May). A case for multicultural schools. *California Elementary Administrator*, 32(4), 39-41.
- Forbes, J. D. (1969c, Sept.). Integration and segregation: The multi-ethnic and uni-ethnic School. *Phylon: The Atlanta University Review of Race and Culture*, VXXX(1), 34-41.
- Forbes, J. D. (1969d). Tribes and masses: The self-development of folk societies. *Journal of Human Relations*, 17(4), 516-525.
- Forbes, J. D. (1969e, Summer). Indian rebirth. *Warpath*, I(3), 1, 4.
- Forbes, J. D. (1970a). Powhatan religion and community development. Unpublished draft in author's possession.
- Forbes, J. D. (1970b). Do tribes have rights? The question of self-determination for small nations. *Journal of Human Relations*, 18(1), 670-679.
- Forbes, J. D. (1970c). "1570-1970: 400 Years of Powhatan Struggle," *Tsen-Akamak*, I(1), 1.
- Forbes, J. D. (1971a). Analco: Birthplace of the Chicano. *El Grito del Norte*, 4(11-12), 17.

- Forbes, J. D. (1971b). The mandate from innovative educational response to cultural diversity. In J.C. Stone & D. DeNevi (Eds.), *Teaching Multi-Cultural Populations* (pp. 5-18). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Forbes, J. D. (1971c). Our plural heritage. In G. E. Frakes and C. B. Solberg (Eds.), *Minorities in California History* (pp. 159-162). New York: Random House.
- Forbes, J. D. (1971d, Sept.). The Native American experience in California history. *California Historical Quarterly*, *L*(3), 235-8.
- Forbes, J. D. (1971e). Daganawidah-Quetzalcoatl University-DQU. *El Grito del Norte*, *IV*(3), 8-9.
- Forbes, J. D. (1971f). Powhatan Confederation Reorganizes. *Attan-Akamik* *1*(3), 1, 8.
- Forbes, J. D. (1972). Powhatan religion. *Attan-Akamik*, *1*(5), pp. 1-4.
- Forbes, J. D. (1973a). *Aztecas del norte: Los Chicanos de Aztlán*. NY: Fawcett.
- Forbes, J.D. (1973b). Teaching Native American values and cultures. In J. Banks (Ed.), *Teaching ethnic studies: Concepts and strategies* (pp. 200-219). Washington: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Forbes, J. D. (1973c). Indian language and culture. In G. Cooper et al (Eds.), *California Indian Education Association, Report on Fifth Annual State Conference* (San Diego, California, October 8-10, 1971) (113-117). Modesto, CA: California Indian Education Association. Retrieved 04/1/2017, from

<https://eric.ed.gov/?q=california+indian+education+association&id=ED087597>.

Forbes, J. D. (1973d). The needs of Native American students. In R. T. Thomas (Ed.), *Developing opportunities for minorities in graduate education : proceedings of the Conference on Minority Graduate Education at University of California, Berkeley, California, May 11, 12, 1973* (pp. 20-24). Berkeley, CA: Univ. of CA, Berkeley.

Forbes, J. D. (1973e). The truth about eastern Anishinabeg (Native Americans). *Attan-Akamik*, 1(6), 3.

Forbes, J. D. (1973f). Powhatan education. *Attan-Akamik*, 1(6), 1, 5.

Forbes, J. D. (1973f). Native Americans, curriculum revision, and desegregation. In S.F. Overlan (Ed.), *Papers Presented at the National Equal Education Institute, St. Louis, Missouri, March 1973* (pp. 85-91). Washington: ERIC. Retrieved from ERIC (no. ED078116)  
<http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED078116.pdf>.

Forbes, J. D. (1974a, Spring). The Americanization of education in the United States. *The Indian Historian*, 7(2), 15-21.

Forbes, J. D. (1974b). Self-determination and captive nations. In H. Reghaby (Ed.), *Philosophy of the Third World* (25-41). Davis: D-Q University Press.

Forbes, J. D. (1974c). Americanism in the university. *University Of Manitoba Anthropology Papers*, 8(2), and presented at the XLI International Congress Of Americanists, Mexico City, Sept.2-7, 1974.



- Forbes, J. D. (1974d). Colonialism and American education. In J. Reichert and M. Trujillo, Eds.), *Perspectives on Contemporary Native American and Chicano Educational Thought*, (17-38). Davis: D-Q University Press
- Forbes, J. D. (1975a). Native American science. In H. Reghaby (Ed.), *Blossoms of Life Science* (131-140). Davis: D-Q University Press.
- Forbes, J.D. (1975b). "Machiavellianism" the most contagious disease known to man. *Akwesasne Notes*, 7(4), Early Autumn, 30 Sep 1975: 40-45.
- Forbes, J. D. (1976a). *Captive nations* [audio cassette]. Rooseveltown, NY: Akwesasne Notes.
- Forbes, J. D. (1976b). *The Wapanakamikok languages: A comparative study of Powhatan, Natick, Lenape, Nanticoke, and Ojibwe*. Davis: University of California, Tecumseh Center.
- Forbes, J. D. (1976c, Mid-winter). Who are the Americans? *Akwesasne Notes*, 8(5), 37-38.
- Forbes, J. D. (1977a). *Religious freedom and the protection of sacred places*. Davis: University of California, Tecumseh Center.
- Forbes, J. D. (1977b). *Racism, scholarship and cultural pluralism*. Davis: University of California, Tecumseh Center.
- Forbes, J. D. (1978). *Tribes and masses: Explorations in red, white, and black*. Davis, Calif: D-Q University Press.
- Forbes, J. D. (1979a). *A world ruled by cannibals: The wétiko disease of aggression, violence, and imperialism*. Davis, Calif: D-Q University Press.

- Forbes, J. D. (1979b). *Tribes and masses: Explorations in red, white, and black*.  
Davis, Calif: D-Q University Press.
- Forbes, J. D. (1979c). Traditional Native American philosophy and multicultural education. In *Multicultural education and the American Indian* (pp. 3-14).  
Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles.
- Forbes, J. D. (1979d). Native American languages: Preservation and self-development. Davis: University of California, Tecumseh Center.
- Forbes, J. D. (1979e). Native American Science. In H. Reghaby (Ed.), *Blossoms of Life Science* (pp. 131-140). Davis: D-Q University Press.
- Forbes, J. D. (1979f). *Attan-Akamik: Powhatan-Renape Nation Guide to the Greater Washington D.C. Region*. Native American Studies, UC Davis.
- Forbes, J. D. (1980a). The good path. *City Miner*, No. 15, pp. 6-7.
- Forbes, J. D. (1980b). The development of a Native American intelligentsia and the creation of D-Q University. In H. Lutz (Ed.). *D-QU: Native American self-determination in higher education* (75-88). Davis: Tecumseh Center.
- Forbes, J. D. (1981a). *Native Americans and Nixon: Presidential politics and minority self-determination, 1969-1972*. Los Angeles: American Indian Studies Center, UCLA.
- Forbes, J.D. (1981b). Looking for the wise. In H. Pellissier & M. Bennett (Eds.), *Poo-Tah-Toi Davis Literary Anthology* (pp. 42-47). Davis: Davis Arts Commission. Reprinted in Forbes (1992) *El-Lay Riots* (pp. 22-26). Davis: Kahonkok Press.

- Forbes, J. D. (1981c). The survival of Native American languages. *Bilingual Resources*, 4(2-3), 14-27.
- Forbes, J. D. (1982a). *Native Americans of California and Nevada* (Rev. ed.). Happy Camp, Calif: Naturegraph Publishers.
- Forbes, J. D. (1982b). *Native Americans and Nixon: Presidential Policy and Minority Self-Determination*. Los Angeles: UCLA American Indian Studies Center.
- Forbes, J. D. (1982c). Fascism: A brief review of its history in the Americas. *Explorations in Ethnic Studies*, 5(1), 3-25.
- Forbes, J. D. (1983). Native American philosophy: Social and political implications. *Medelingen van het Juridisch Instituut No. 22, Juridische Faculteit*. Rotterdam: Erasmus Universiteit.
- Forbes, J. D. (1984a, Spring). South of hope. *Rikka*, 9(1), 38-40.
- Forbes, J. D. (1984b, Summer). Mulattoes and people of color in Anglo-North America: Implications for Black-Indian Relations. *Journal of Ethnic Studies*, 12(2), 17-61.
- Forbes, J. D. (1985a). *Native American higher education: The struggle for the creation of D-Q university, 1960-1971*. Davis, Calif: D-Q University Press.
- Forbes, J. D. (1985b). Native American resistance: 1890-1960. *Wampum*, 2(1), 15-44.
- Forbes, J. D. (1986). *Middle continent people*. *Blue Cloud Quarterly*, 32(4), 20pp.

- Forbes, J. D. (1986b, Spring). The Renape people: A brief survey of relationships and migrations. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 2(1), 14-20.
- Forbes, J. D. (1987). Shouting back at the geese. In Swann, B., & Krupat, A. (Eds.) *I tell you now: Autobiographical essays by Native American writers*, (pp. 111-126). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Forbes, J. D. (1988). Black Africans and Native Americans: Color, race, and caste in the evolution of red-black peoples. New York, NY, USA : Blackwell.
- Forbes, J. D. (1989a). The humanities without humanity; or Native American literature and humanistic education. In L. Cortelli (Ed.), *Native American Literatures* (pp. 113-121). Pisa: Universita di Pisa, Forum I.
- Forbes, J. D. (1989b, Fall). Teaching Native American values and culture. *News from Native California*, 4(1), 35-36, 38-39.
- Forbes, J. D. (1990a, Winter). The manipulation of race, caste, and identity: Classifying Afroamericans, Native Americans, and Red-Black People. *The Journal of Ethnic Studies*, 17(4), 1-50.
- Forbes, J. D. (1990b, Feb.). Undercounting Native Americans: The 1980 census and the manipulation of racial identity in the United States. *Storia Nordamericana*, 5(1), 5-47. Reprinted (1990, Spring). *Wicazo Sa Review*, VI(1), 2-26.
- Forbes, J. D. (1991, Winter). Envelopment, proletarianization and inferiorization: Some aspects of colonialism's impact upon Native Americans and other people of color in Eastern North America. *Journal of Ethnic Studies*, 18(4), 95-122.

- Forbes, J. D. (1992a). *Columbus and other cannibals: The wétiko disease of exploitation, imperialism and terrorism*. Brooklyn, N.Y., USA: Autonomedia.
- Forbes, J. D. (1992b). *El-Lay Riots: Memorias de Ya-town and Home Boy Poems*. Davis, CA: Kahonkok Press.
- Forbes, J. D. (1992c, May/June). Finding a good path. *Creation Spirituality*, 8(3), 38-41.
- Forbes, J. D. (1992d). *Naming our land, reclaiming our land*. Davis: Kahonkok Press.
- Forbes, J. D. (1992e, Fall). The Hispanic spin: Party politics and governmental manipulation of ethnic identity. *Latin American Perspectives*, 19(4), 59-78.
- Forbes, J. D. (1993a). *Africans and Native Americans: The Language of Race and the Evolution of Red-Black People*. Champaign-Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Forbes, J. D. (1993b, Dec.). Eurocentric concepts harm native people. *The Circle* 14(12), 6.
- Forbes, J. D. (1994a, Fall). Mama God. *Gatherings*, V, 24-25.
- Forbes, J. D. (1994b, Fall). Honor song for mothers of courage. *Gatherings*, V, 113-118.
- Forbes, J. D. (1994c, Sept. 30). Indigenous women and traditional leadership. *The Circle: News from an American Indian Perspective*, 15(9): 4. Retrieved

from <http://libproxy.unm.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.unm.edu/docview/196580060?accountid=14613>.

Forbes, J. D. (1994d). Empowering ethnic groups can prevent ethnic conflict. In C. P. Cozic (Ed.), *Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict* (pp. 259-263). San Diego: Greenhaven Press.

Forbes, J. D. (1994e). The Native struggle for liberation: Alcatraz. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 18(4): 123-130.

Forbes, J. D. (1994f, August). Intellectual property rights of Indigenous peoples. *The Native*, XXX(8), 12.

Forbes, J. D. (1994g). America and Americans. Unpublished text retrieved 05/13/2018 from [http://wayback.archive-it.org/5778/20111207064542/http://nas.ucdavis.edu/Forbes/America\\_&\\_Americans.html](http://wayback.archive-it.org/5778/20111207064542/http://nas.ucdavis.edu/Forbes/America_&_Americans.html).

Forbes, J. D. (1994h, May). The state of New Columbia and our colonized minds. *The Native*, XXX(5), 13.

Forbes, J. D. (1994h). The teacher as pimp and the teacher as authentic. Unpublished text in author's possession.

Forbes, J. D. (1995a, Fall). Kinship is the basic principle of philosophy. *Gatherings*, VI, 144-150.

Forbes, J. D. (1995b, October) "The Third World after Thirty Years," *Okike: An African Journal of New Writing*, 31, 21-30.

Forbes, J. D. (1995c, Spring). The Gulf War: Once gain the drama of human sacrifice. *Wicazo Sa Review*, XI(1), 60-62.

- Forbes, J. D. (1995d, June 1). Affirmative Action controversy in perspective. *Glacier Reporter, LXV(22)*, 12.
- Forbes, J. D. (1996a, Fall). Revolutionary genealogy. *Gatherings, VII*, 79-84.
- Forbes, J. D. (1996b, Fall). The colonialism of names. *News from Native California, 10(1)*, 51.
- Forbes, J. D. (1996c, July). *Lenaapay aasheem-aaptonakaana: Lenape poetry (dream-words) with Lucy Blalock*. Unpublished text in authors possession.
- Forbes, J. D. (1996d). Lenape/Renape writing system (proposed). Unpublished text in authors possession.
- Forbes, J. D. (1997a). We can have new visions. In Crozier-Hogle, L. & Wilson, D.B. (Eds.), *Surviving in two worlds: Contemporary Native American voices* (pp. 243-252). Austin, TX: University of Austin.
- Forbes, J. D. (1997b, Winter). Nature and culture: Problematic concepts for Native Americans. *Ayaangwaamizin: The International Journal of Indigenous Philosophy, I(2)*, 3-22. See also, Forbes 2000, reprint in Grim.
- Forbes, J. D. (1997c, October). My core, my destiny. *Cimarron Review, 121*, 95-8.
- Forbes, J. D. (1997d). *Red blood (a novel)*. Penticton: Theytus Books.
- Forbes, J. D. (1998a). Intellectual self-determination and sovereignty: Implications for native studies and for native intellectuals. *Wicazo Sa Review, 13(1)*, 11-23.
- Forbes, J. D. (1998b). The urban tradition among Native Americans. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal, 22(4)*, 15-27.

- Forbes, J. D. (1998c). Dear Sarah. Retrieved April 2, 2018 from, <http://wayback.archive-it.org/5778/20111207070009/http://nas.ucdavis.edu/jack-d-forbes/1998/11/23/dear-sarah/>.
- Forbes, J. D. (1998d, Fall). The quest. *Gatherings IX*, 95-99.
- Forbes, J. D. (1998e). Colonialism as a theme in Native American writing. In Steve Pavlik (Ed.), *A good Cherokee, a good anthropologist* (pp. 241-259). Los Angeles: UCLA American Indian Studies.
- Forbes, J. D. (1998f, Mar. 27). Native nations in the United Nations. *Yakama Nation Review*, 21(21), 8.
- Forbes, J. D. (1998g, Dec. 30). From Wounded Knee to Acteal. *San Francisco Chronicle*, A17.
- Forbes, J. D. (1998h, Spring). "Putahoi river," *Putah Creek News*, 11(2), 5.
- Forbes, J. D. (1999). In search of Aztlan – Interview w/Chuy Trevino. Retrieved April 18, 2017, from <http://www.insearchofaztlan.com/forbes.html>.
- Forbes, J. D. (2000a). Nature and culture: Problematic concepts for Native Americans. In J. A. Grim (Ed.), *Indigenous Traditions and Ecology: The Interbeing of Cosmology and Community* (103-124). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Forbes, J. D. (2000b). Western civilization as cover for white supremacy. *Ayaangwaamizin: The International Journal of Indigenous Philosophy*, 2(2), 203-230.
- Forbes, J. D. (2000c, Dec.). A racist concept. *Seminole Tribune*, 2.



- Forbes, J. D. (2001). Cosmic people, out of eden. In C. Stokes et al (Eds.), *Race in 21st. Century America* (193-204). East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Forbes, J. D. (2002a, Winter). David Risling, Junior: A giant for two millennia. *Indian Times*, 11(11), p. 6; also in, Summer 2002, *News From Native California*, 15(4), pp. 13-14.
- Forbes, J. D. (2002b, Aug. 29). Male terrorism: Dominance-seeking and violence. *Bay Mills News*, 6(17), p. 4.
- Forbes, J. D. (2002c). Indian casinos bring problems of non-federal tribes into focus. Unpublished text in author's possession.
- Forbes, J. D. (2002d). *ATTA! And other poems on 9-11, war and peace*. Bandon, OR: Kahonkok Press.
- Forbes, J. D. (2003). USA empire: Hyperbole or reality? Unpublished text in author's possession.
- Forbes, J. D. (2005, March 23). David Risling Jr. -my 'elder brother' walks on. *Indian Country Today*, 24(41),, p. A2; see also, Forbes, J. D. (2005, April 18). *News From Indian Country*, XIX(8), p. 14.
- Forbes, J. D. (2006). The name is half the game: Native American sovereignty and the name of the land. In M. Moore (Ed.), *Eating Fire, Tasting Blood, An anthology of the American Indian holocaust* (pp. 32-51). New York: Thunder's Mouth Press.
- Forbes, J. D. (2006b, May). Intelligent design and ancient American thought. *Bay Mills News*, 10(9), p. 4.

- Forbes, J. D. (2007). *The American discovery of Europe*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Forbes, J. D. (2008a). *Columbus and other cannibals: The wétiko disease of exploitation, imperialism, and terrorism* (Rev. ed.). New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Forbes, J. D. (2008b). Ethnic or world studies: A historian's path of discovery. In T. P. Fong (Ed.), *Ethnic Studies Research: Approaches and Perspectives* (pp. 59-92). Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.
- Forbes, J. D. (2009, December 9). Jesus the Palestinian. *Berkeley Daily Planet*. Retrieved April 1, 2018 from, <http://berkeleydailyplanet.com/issue/2009-12-17/article/34304?headline=3DJe=>.
- Forbes, J. D. (2010). Why does our history begin on the East Coast?. *Windspeaker*, 28(2): 12.
- Forbes, J. D. (2011, Summer). I have always loved the earth. *News from Native California*, 24(4), 13.
- Forbes, J. D. (2013). The nature of the universe. In M. Moore and T. A. Demeyer (Eds.), *Unraveling the spreading cloth of time: Indigenous thoughts concerning the universe* (61-65). Candler, NC: rENEGADE pLANETS pUBLISHING.
- Forbes, J. D. (n.d.). Ancient American philosophies: Traditional knowledge for modern times. Retrieved on 12/07/2017 from, [http://wayback.archive-it.org/5778/20111207063700/http://nas.ucdavis.edu/Forbes/NATIVE\\_AMERICAN\\_PHILOSOPHIES.htm](http://wayback.archive-it.org/5778/20111207063700/http://nas.ucdavis.edu/Forbes/NATIVE_AMERICAN_PHILOSOPHIES.htm).

- Forbes, J. D. & Adams, H. (1976). *Grassroots community development: The D-Q University Native American Language Education Project*. Davis: University of California, Tecumseh Center.
- Forbes, J. D. & Johnson, C. (1970). *Handbook for the development of Native American Studies and chronology of Native American history*. Davis, CA: Native American Studies, Tecumseh, Center, University of California.
- Forbes, J. D., Martin, K. & D. Risling Jr. (1972). *The establishment of D-Q University*. Davis: D-Q University.
- Forbes, J. D., Crum, S.J., Hernández-Avila, I., Longfish, G., Macri, M., Montejo, V., and S. Varese (2002). A hemispheric approach: Native American Studies at the University of California-Davis. In Champagne, D. & J. Stauss (Eds.), *Native American Studies in higher education: Models for collaboration between universities and Indigenous nations*, (pp. 97-122). Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.
- Forbes, J. D. (n.d.). Ancient American philosophies: Traditional knowledge for modern times. Retrieved from [http://wayback.archive-it.org/5778/20111207063700/http://nas.ucdavis.edu/Forbes/NATIVE\\_AMERICAN\\_PHILOSOPHIES.htm](http://wayback.archive-it.org/5778/20111207063700/http://nas.ucdavis.edu/Forbes/NATIVE_AMERICAN_PHILOSOPHIES.htm).
- Fortunate Eagle, A. N., & Findley, T. (2002). *Heart of the rock: The Indian invasion of Alcatraz*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Fortunate Eagle, A. (2012). *Pipestone: My Life in an Indian Boarding School*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

- Fox, J., & Rivera-Salgado, G. (2004). *Indigenous Mexican migrants in the United States*. La Jolla, CA: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, UCSD.
- Fox, K. (2016). *Ohero:kon - Under the Husk*. San Francisco: Women Who Make Movies.
- Fraser, C. & Z. Todd (2016). Decolonial sensibilities: Indigenous research and engaging with archives in contemporary colonial Canada. *Internationale*. Retrieved from:  
[http://www.internationaleonline.org/research/decolonising\\_practices/54\\_decolonial\\_sensibilities\\_indigenous\\_research\\_and\\_engaging\\_with\\_archives\\_in\\_contemporary\\_colonial\\_canada](http://www.internationaleonline.org/research/decolonising_practices/54_decolonial_sensibilities_indigenous_research_and_engaging_with_archives_in_contemporary_colonial_canada).
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1983). The importance of the act of reading. *Journal of Education*, 165(1), 5–11.
- Freire, P. (1985). Reading the world and reading the word: An interview with Paulo Freire. *Language Arts*, 62(1), 15–21. Retrieved from  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/41405241>.
- Friedland, H. L. (2018). *The Wetiko legal principles: Cree and Anishinabek responses to violence and victimization*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Frisbie, C. J. (1993). *Kinaaldá: A study of the Navaho girl's puberty ceremony*. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press.
- Froman, F., Keye, A., Dyck, C. J., & Keye, L. (2002). *English-Cayuga/Cayuga-English Dictionary*. University of Toronto Press.

- Fryer, P. (1984). *Staying power: The history of Black people in Britain*. London: Pluto Press.
- Fuentes, D., & López, J. A. (1974). *Barrio language dictionary: First dictionary of Caló*. Los Angeles: Printed by Southland Press.
- Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction*. Boston: Pearson.
- Galván, R. A. & Teschner, R. V. (1995). *El diccionario del Español Chicano/The dictionary of Chicano Spanish*. Lincolnwood, Ill.: National Textbook Co.
- Garrison, L. (1914, May-Oct.). The Army's peaceful triumph. In W. H. Page (Ed.), *The World's Work*, XXVIII, 59-61.
- Gbogbo, M. (2018, Sept. 8). "What's right for my daughter": Indigenous parents choose home-schooling. Retrieved May 28, 2018, from <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2018-09-08/indigenous-parents-homeschooling-in-face-of-education-gap/10148514>.
- Gerard, W. (1907). Virginia's Indian contributions to English. *American Anthropologist*, 9(1), 87-112. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/659021>.
- Gibson, J. A., Woodbury, H., Henry, R., Webster, H., & Goldenweiser, A. (1992). *Concerning the league: The Iroquois league tradition as dictated in Onondaga by John Arthur Gibson*. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics.
- Goetz, J.P. & LeCompte, M.D. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. Orlando, FL: Academic.

- Golla, V. (1996). *Hupa Language Dictionary* (2nd ed.). Hoopa Valley Tribe.  
Retrieved from <http://dspace.calstate.edu/handle/2148/48>.
- Gómez-Quiñones, J. (1982). Critique on the national question, self-determination and nationalism. *Latin American Perspectives*, 9(2), 62–83.
- Gómez-Quiñones, J. (1994). *Roots of Chicano politics, 1600-1940*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Gómez-Quiñones, J., & Vásquez, I. (2014). *Making Áztlán: Ideology and culture of the Chicana and Chicano movement, 1966-1977*.
- Gonzales-Berry, E. & Maciel, D. (Eds.) (2000). Introduction. In *The contested homeland: a Chicano history of New Mexico* (pp. 1-9). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Gonzales, P. (2012). *Red medicine: Traditional indigenous rites of birthing and healing*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- González Casanova, P. (1963). *Sociedad plural, colonialismo interno y desarrollo*. Erscheinungsort nicht ermittelbar: UNESCO.
- González Casanova, P. (1965). Internal colonialism and national development. *St Comp Int Dev Studies in Comparative International Development*, 1(4), 27–37.
- González Casanova, P. (1978). *Imperialismo y liberación en América Latina: Una introducción a la historia contemporánea*. México: Siglo Veintiuno Editores.
- Goodman, P. (1966). *Compulsory mis-education and the community of scholars*. New York: Vintage Books..

- Goodwin, J. A. (2017). *"Without destroying ourselves": American Indian intellectual activism for higher education, 1915-1978* (Order No. 10272546). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1896954712). Retrieved from <http://libproxy.unm.edu/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/1896954712?accountid=14613>.
- Gorman, C. N. (1972). A new vision of earth and man. *Church and Race*, 1972(1): i-vii. See also, D-334, B. 33, F. "Gorman, C."
- Grande, S. (2004). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought*. Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Green, D. (1977). W. E. B. Du Bois' talented tenth: A strategy for racial advancement. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 46(3), 358-366. doi:10.2307/2966779.
- Greenberg, H. (1996). *Power of a Navajo, Carl Gorman : the man and his life*. Santa Fe, N.M. : Clear Light Publishers.
- Griffin-Pierce, T. (1992). *Earth is my mother, sky is my father: Space, time, and astronomy in Navajo sandpainting*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Griswold del Castillo, R. (1984). *La familia: Chicano families in the urban Southwest, 1848 to the present*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Grover, H. (2018, April 3). Two Farmington schools will offer dual-language classes for kindergartners. *Farming Daily Times*. Retrieved February 3,

2019, from <https://www.daily-times.com/story/news/local/farmington/2018/04/03/two-farmington-schools-offer-dual-language-classes-kindergartners/481952002/>.

Guinard, J. (1930). Witiko among the Tete-de-Boule. *Primitive Man*, 3(3/4), 69-71.

Haas, L. (2014). *Saints and citizens: Indigenous histories of colonial missions and Mexican California*.

Hale, E. E. (1945). *The Queen of California: The origin of the name of California*. San Francisco: Colt Press.

Hall, E. T. (1959). *The silent language*. Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday.

Hall, S. G. (1904). *Adolescence: Its psychology and its relations to physiology, anthropology, sociology, sex, crime, religion and education*. New York: Appleton.

Hanke, L. (1959). *Aristotle and the American Indians: A Study in race prejudice in the modern world*. Hollis & Carter.

Harelson, S. (2018, September 20). Middle River Power Ends Pursuit of NGS Ownership. Retrieved March 30, 2019, from <https://media.srpnet.com/middle-river-power-ends-pursuit-of-ngs-ownership/>.

Harelson, S. (2019, February 28). NGS owners move forward with decommissioning. Retrieved March 28, 2019, from <https://media.srpnet.com/ngs-owners-move-forward-with-decommissioning/>.



- Harjo, J. (1990). *In mad love and war*. Middletown, CN: Wesleyan University Press.
- Harney, C. (1995). *The way it is: One water-- one air-- one mother earth*. Nevada City, CA: Blue Dolphin Pub.
- Harring, S. L. (1998). *White man's law: Native people in nineteenth-century Canadian jurisprudence*. University of Toronto Press. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3138/9781442683365>.
- Harrington, M. R. (1921). *Religion and ceremonies of the Lenape*. New York: Museum of the American Indian.
- Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development (2019). Ohero:kon “Under the Husk” rites of passage. Retrieved from [https://hpaied.org/sites/default/files/publications/Ohero%20kon%20final%20\(1\).pdf](https://hpaied.org/sites/default/files/publications/Ohero%20kon%20final%20(1).pdf).
- Hauptman, L. M. (1999). *Conspiracy of interests: Iroquois dispossession and the rise of New York state*. Syracuse, N.Y: Syracuse University Press.
- Hay, T. H. (1971). The windigo psychosis: Psychodynamic, cultural, and social factors in aberrant behavior. *American Anthropologist*, 73(1), 1–19. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/671808>.
- Henderson, J. S. (2002, Spring). Postcolonial Indigenous legal consciousness. *Indigenous Law Journal*, 1, 1-56. Retrieved 04/11/2018 from <https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/17100/1/ILJ-1-YoungbloodHenderson.pdf>.

- Heng, G. (2003). *Empire of magic: medieval romance and the politics of cultural fantasy*. New York: Columbia University Press. Retrieved from <http://public.eblib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=909118>.
- Heng, G. (2011). The invention of race in the European middle ages I&II: Locations of medieval race. *Literature Compass*, 8(5), 314-331; 332-350.
- Hernández-Avila, I. (2003). Thoughts on surviving as Native scholars in the academy. *The American Indian Quarterly*, 27(1), 240-248. <https://doi.org/10.1353/aiq.2004.0034>.
- Hernández-Avila, L. (2011). Jack D. Forbes (Powhatan--Renape, Delaware--Lenape), 1934--2011. Retrieved on 03/19/2017 from <http://wayback.archive-it.org/5778/20111205103422/http://www.ls.ucdavis.edu/harcs/news-and-research/jack-forbes.html>.
- Hewitt, J. N. B. (1892). Legend of the founding of the Iroquois league. *American Anthropologist*, 5(2), 131-148.
- Hill, C., Osawa, S. S., Westerman, F. R. C. (2002). *On & off the res': W/Charlie Hill*. Seattle, WA: Upstream Productions.
- Hill, G. (2006). *Colonization and decolonization: A manual for Indigenous liberation in the 21st century*. Retrieved from <https://warriorpublications.files.wordpress.com/2011/03/colonization-decolonization.pdf>.
- Hinojosa, S. Z. (2000). Human-peyote interaction in south Texas. *Culture & Agriculture*, 22(1), 29-36. <https://doi.org/10.1525/cag.2000.22.1.29>.

- Hirschfelder, A. B. (1995). *Native Heritage: Personal Accounts by American Indians, 1790 to the Present* (Ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Hobson, J. A. (1902). *Imperialism: A study*. New York: J. Pott & Co.
- Holm, T., Pearson, J. D., & Chavis, B. (2003). Peoplehood: A model for the extension of sovereignty in American Indian studies. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 18 (1), 7-24.
- Holm, T., Cook-Lynn, E., Red, H. J., & Riding, I. J. (2005). First panel: Reclaiming American Indian studies. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 20(1), 169-177.
- Holm, T. (2000). Sovereignty and peoplehood. *Red Ink*, 8(4), 41-44.
- Holm, T. (2005). *The great confusion in Indian affairs: Native Americans and whites in the progressive era*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- hooks, b. (1997). *Cultural criticism and transformation*. Northampton, MA: Media Education Foundation. Retrieved from <https://www.mediaed.org/transcripts/Bell-Hooks-Transcript.pdf>.
- hooks, b. (2008). *Belonging: A culture of place*. New York: Routledge.
- hooks, b. (2010). *Teaching critical thinking: Practical wisdom*. London: Routledge.
- Horsman, R. (1981). *Race and manifest destiny: The origins of American racial anglo-saxonism*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Horton, M., Bell, B., Gaventa, J., & Peters, J. M. (1990). *We make the road by walking: Conversations on education and social change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Hoxie, F. E. (2001). *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920*. Omaha, NE: U of Nebraska Press.
- Hugill, D. (2017). What is a settler-colonial city? *Geography Compass*, 11 (5), 1-11.
- Huhndorf, S. M. (2001). *Going native: Indians in the American cultural imagination*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Hyde, V. C., & Elliott, E. (1994). *Yumáyk yumáyk = Long ago*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Illich, I. (1971). *Deschooling society*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Isaac, B. H. (2006). *The invention of racism in classical antiquity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Iverson, P. (2002). *For our Navajo people: Diné letters, speeches & petitions, 1900-1960*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Jackson, R. H. (1995). *Indian population decline: The missions of northwestern New Spain, 1687-1840*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- James, H. C. (1969). *The Cahuilla Indians*. Palm Springs, CA: Malki Museum Press.
- Jensen, D. (2016). *The myth of human supremacy*. New York, NY : Seven Stories Press.
- Johansen, B. E., & Mann, B. A. (2000). *Encyclopedia of the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois Confederacy)*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press. Retrieved from <http://ebooks.abc-clio.com/?isbn=9781567508109>.

- Johansen, B. E. (2013). *Encyclopedia of the American Indian Movement*. Boston: ABC-CLIO.
- Johnson, K. (1996). *Unfortunate emigrants: narratives of the Donner Party*. Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press. Retrieved from <http://site.ebrary.com/id/10500171>.
- Johnston, B. (1990). *Ojibway heritage*. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press.
- Johnston, B. (1993). *Ojibway tales*. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press.
- Johnston, B. (1995). *The Manitous: The spiritual world of the Ojibway*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Jones, J. A. (1829). *Tales of an Indian camp* (Vol. 2). London: H. Colburn and R. Bentley. Retrieved 04/12/2017 from <http://tinyurl.galegroup.com.libproxy.unm.edu/tinyurl/75fLnX>.
- Jones, W., & Michelson, T. (1917). *Ojibwa texts collected by William Jones*. New York: G.E. Stechert & Co., Agents. Retrieved from <http://archive.org/details/ojibwatextscoll07jonerich>.
- Jung, C. G. (2014). *Collected works of C.G. Jung, volume 18: The symbolic life: Miscellaneous writings*. Princeton University Press.
- Kadar, M. (1993). An epistolary constellation: Trotsky, Kahlo, Birney. In Kadar, M. & Buss, H. M. (Eds.), *Working in women's archives: Researching women's private literature and archival documents* (pp. 103-113). Waterloo, ONT, CA: Wilfred Laurier University Press. Retrieved from <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>

- Kawagley, A. O. (2010). Foreword. In R. Barnhardt & A.O. Kawagley, (Eds.)  
Alaska Native education: Views from within. Fairbanks, AK: Alaska  
Native Knowledge Network, University of Alaska Fairbanks.
- Kawano, K. (1990). *Warriors: Navajo code talkers*. Flagstaff, Ariz. : Northland  
Pub. Co..
- Keefe, S. E., & Padilla, A. M. (1987). *Chicano ethnicity*. Albuquerque: University  
of New Mexico Press.
- Keller, G. D., Magallán, R. J. & García, A. M. (1989). *Curriculum resources in  
Chicano studies: Undergraduate and graduate*. Tempe, AZ: Bilingual  
Review/Press.
- Kerr, E. (2017, Oct. 20). What does it mean to live a good life, the Ojibwe way?  
*MPR News*. Retrieved April 23, 2019, from  
[https://www.mprnews.org/story/2017/10/20/essays-celebrate-the-ajibwe-  
idea-of-a-good-life](https://www.mprnews.org/story/2017/10/20/essays-celebrate-the-ajibwe-idea-of-a-good-life).
- Khachadorian, A. A. (2010). *Inside the eagle's head: An American Indian  
college*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- King, T. (2005). *The truth about stories: A native narrative*. Minneapolis:  
University of Minnesota Press.
- Kirkland, E. (2013). Whiteness, vampires and humanity in contemporary film and  
television. In D. Mutch (Ed.), *The Modern Vampire and Human Identity*  
(pp. 93–110). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.  
[https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230370142\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230370142_6).

- Knittle, W. A., & Fox, D. R. (1937). *Early eighteenth century Palatine emigration: a British government redemptioner project to manufacture naval stores*. Philadelphia: Dorrance & Co.
- Kohl, J. G. (1860). *Kitchi-gami: Wanderings round Lake Superior*. London: Chapman and Hall.
- Krannich, S. (2017). *The reconquest of paradise?: How indigenous migrants construct community in the United States and Mexico*. LIT Verlag Münster.
- Kresge, L. (2007). Indigenous Oaxacan communities in California: An overview. California Institute for Rural Studies. Retrieved from:  
[http://www.safsf.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/2015\\_Aug26\\_IndigenousHealthWeb\\_Report.pdf](http://www.safsf.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/2015_Aug26_IndigenousHealthWeb_Report.pdf).
- Kuznar, L. A. (2008). *Reclaiming a scientific Anthropology*. Lanham, MA: AltaMira Press.
- Kwaymullina, A., Kwaymullina, B., & Butterly, L. (2013). Living texts: A perspective on published sources, Indigenous research methodologies and Indigenous worldviews. *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Studies*, 6(1), 1–13.
- Ladha, A. & Kirk, M. (2016, Spring-Summer). Seeing wétiko: On capitalism, mind viruses, and antidotes for a world in transition. *Kosmos Journal*. Retrieved May 25, 2019, from  
<https://www.kosmosjournal.org/article/seeing-wetiko-on-capitalism-mind-viruses-and-antidotes-for-a-world-in-transition/>.

- Laenui, P. (2000). "Processes of Decolonization". In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision* (pp. 150-160). Vancouver: UBC.
- Lafaye, J. (1976). *Quetzalcóatl and Guadalupe: The formation of Mexican national consciousness, 1531-1813*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lame Deer, J. F. w/ Erdoes, R. (1972). *Lame Deer, seeker of visions*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Lara, I. (2008). Tonanlupanisma: Re-membering Tonantzin-Guadalupe in Chicana visual art. *Aztlan: A Journal of Chicano Studies*, 33(2), 61–90.
- Lee, L. L. (2007). The future of Navajo nationalism. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 22(1), 53–68.
- Lee, L. L. (2013). *Diné masculinities: Conceptualizations and reflections*. North Charleston, SC: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.
- Lee, L. L. (2017). *Navajo Sovereignty: Understandings and Visions of the Diné People*. University of Arizona Press.
- Leland, C. G. (1884). *The Algonquin legends of New England, or, myths and folklore of the Micmac, Passamaquoddy, and Penobscot tribes*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co.
- Lenape Talking Dictionary (n.d.). Retrieved May 22, 2018, from <http://www.talk-lenape.org/>.
- León-Portilla, M. (1963). *Aztec thought and culture: A study of the ancient Nahuatl mind*, trans by J. Davis. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.



- León-Portilla, M. (1988). *Huehuehlahtolli: Testimonios de la antigua palabra*. México: Comisión Nacional Conmemorativa del V Centenario del Encuentro de Dos Mundos.
- León-Portilla, M. (1990). *Aztec thought and culture: A study of the ancient Nahuatl mind*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- León-Portilla, M. (1992). *Fifteen poets of the Aztec world*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Levy, P. (2013). *Dispelling wétiko: Breaking the curse of evil*. Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books.
- Lewis, D. L. (2009). *W.E.B. Du Bois: A biography*. New York: Macmillan.
- Liddell, H. G., Scott, R., Jones, H. S., McKenzie, R., & Glare, P. G. W. (1996). *A Greek-English lexicon: [with a revised supplement]*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lie, J. (2004). *Modern peoplehood*. Boston, MA: University of Harvard Press.
- Lincoln, K. (1987). Caliban, again. *The Kenyon Review*, 9(1), 90–109. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4335788>.
- Lindsay, B. C. (2012). *Murder state: California's native American genocide, 1846-1873*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Little, B. (2018). The little-known underground railroad that ran south to Mexico. Retrieved May 11, 2018, from <https://www.history.com/news/underground-railroad-mexico-escaped-slaves>.

- Lipset, S. M. (1963). *The first new Nation: the United States in historical and comparative perspective*. New York: Basic Books.
- Livingston, R. (2011). The eagle lives. Obituary read at Forbes burial site in Davis, CA. Unpublished text in author's possession.
- Lomawaima, K. T., & McCarty, T. L. (2006). *"To remain an Indian": Lessons in democracy from a century of Native American education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lomawaima, K. T. (1996). Estelle Reel, superintendent of Indian schools, 1898-1910: Politics, curriculum, and land. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 35(3), 5-31.
- Lomawaima, K. T. (1999). The Unnatural History of American Indian Education. In K. G. Swisher & J. W. III Tippeconnic (Eds.). *Next steps research practice to advance Indian education*, (pp. 3-31.). Charleston, WV: ERIC Publications.
- Lomawaima, K.T. (2000a). Tribal sovereigns: Reframing research in American Indian education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 70(1), 1-21.
- Lomawaima, K.T. (2000b). "Making a Willing Worker: Academic and Vocational Instruction". In Archuleta, M., Child, B., Lomawaima, K.T. (Eds.), *Away from home: American Indian boarding school experiences, 1879-2000*, (pp. 30-37). Phoenix, AZ: Heard Museum.
- López, A., & Gaspar de Alba, A. (2011). *Our lady of controversy: Alma Lopez's "irreverent apparition."* Austin: University of Texas Press. Retrieved from <http://public.eblib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=3571764>.

- Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press.
- Lovejoy A. O. (1936). *The great chain of being*. Harvard University Press.
- Lucas, S. R. (2016). Where the rubber meets the road: Probability and nonprobability moments in experiment, interview, archival, administrative, and ethnographic data collection. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World*, 2, 1-24.
- Luna, G. T. (1989). Chicana/Chicano land tenure in the agrarian domain: On the edge of a naked knife. *Michigan Journal of Race & Law*, 4, 39–144.
- Luna-Firebaugh, E. M. (2010). Columbus and other cannibals: The wétiko disease of exploitation, imperialism and terrorism (review). *The American Indian Quarterly*, 34(1), 120-122.
- Lutz, H. (1980). *D-Q University: Native American self-determination in higher education*. Davis, CA: Dept. of Applied Behavioral Sciences, Native American Studies, Tecumseh Center.
- Lutz, H. and Adams, H. (2005). *Howard Adams: Otapawy! : the life of a Métis leader in his own words and in those of his contemporaries*. Saskatoon, SK, CA: Gabriel Dumont Institute.
- Lyons, S. (2000). Rhetorical sovereignty: What do American Indians want from writing? *College Composition and Communication*, 51(3), 447-468.
- Macias, R. (1975). *Educacion alternativa: On the development of Chicano bilingual schools*. Nebraska Curriculum Development Center, Andrews Hall, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE.

- Magnaghi, R. M. (1994). The Genízaro experience in Spanish New Mexico. In R. Vigil, F. Kaye & J. Wunder (Eds.), *Spain and the Plains: Myths and Realities of Spanish Exploration and Settlement on the Great Plains*. Niwot: University Press of Colorado.
- Magnaghi, R. M. (1998). *Indian slavery, labor, evangelization, and captivity in the Americas: An annotated bibliography*. Lanham, Md: Scarecrow Press.
- Maldonado, C. (2013). *Colegio Cesar Chavez, 1973-1983: A Chicano struggle for educational self-determination*. Routledge.
- Mancall, P. C. (2007). Savagery in Jamestown. *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 70(4), 661-670.
- Manuel, G. w/M. Posluns (1974). *The fourth world: An Indian reality*. Don Mills, Ont: Collier-Macmillan Canada.
- Mann, B. A. (2000). *Iroquoian women: The gantowisas*. New York: P. Lang.
- Maracle, L. (1996). *I am woman: A native perspective on sociology and feminism*. Vancouver, B.C.: Press Gang Publishers.
- Marquez, L. V. (2010). *Sacramento in el movimiento: Chicano politics in the civil rights era*. (Order No. 3434156, University of California, San Diego). ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, 418. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.unm.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.unm.edu/docview/845244547?accountid=14613>.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1960). *On colonialism*. Moscow: Foreign Languages Pub. House.

- Martinez, K. (2018). New documentary studies experience of Native Americans in public school system vs. homeschool. Retrieved May 28, 2018, from <https://www.sacurrent.com/ArtSlut/archives/2018/08/21/new-documentary-studies-experience-of-native-americans-in-public-school-system-vs-homeschool>.
- Mathes, W. M. (1973). *The conquistador in California: 1535: The voyage of Fernando Cortes to Baja California in chronicles and documents*. Los Angeles: Dawson's Book Shop.
- McGee, H. F. (1972). Windigo psychosis. *American Anthropologist*, 74(1/2), 244–246. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/672146>.
- McKenzie, J., Jackson, A. P., Yazzie, R., Smith, S. A., Crotty, A. K., Baum, D., Denny, A., Bah'lgai Eldridge, D. (2013). Career dilemmas among Diné (Navajo) college graduates: An exploration of the Dinétah (Navajo Nation) brain drain. *The International Indigenous Policy Journal*, 4(4), 1-17 . Retrieved from: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/iipj/vol4/iss4/5>.
- McKenzie-Jones, P. R. (2015). *Clyde Warrior: Tradition, community, and red power*. Norman, OK: Univ. of Oklahoma Press.
- Meland, C. (2017). It consumes what it forgets. *Transmotion*, 3(2), 137–149. Retrieved from <https://journals.kent.ac.uk/index.php/transmotion/article/view/346>.
- Memmi, A. (1965). *The colonizer and the colonized*. New York: Orion Press.

- Menchaca, M. (1993). Chicano Indianism: A historical account of racial repression in the United States. *American Ethnologist*, 20(3), 583–603. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/646643>.
- Menchaca, M. (2001). *Recovering history, constructing race: The Indian, Black, and White roots of Mexican Americans*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Merasty, M. (1974). *The world of wétiko: Tales from the woodland Cree*. Saskatchewan Indian Cultural College, Curriculum Studies and Research.
- Michelson, K., Doxtator, M., & Doxtator, M. A. (2002). *Oneida-English/English Oneida Dictionary*. University of Toronto Press.
- Miles, T., & Holland, S. P. (2006). *Crossing waters, crossing worlds: The African diaspora in Indian country*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Miller, J. R. (1996). *Shingwauk's vision: A history of native residential schools*. Toronto, ONT: University of Toronto Press.
- Mills, C. W. (1997). *The racial contract*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Mines, R., Nichols, S. & Rusten, D. (2010, Jan.). California's Indigenous Farmworkers. Retrieved from [http://www.crla.org/sites/all/files/content/uploads/pdfBrochures/IFS\\_Mines\\_Final\\_2010.pdf](http://www.crla.org/sites/all/files/content/uploads/pdfBrochures/IFS_Mines_Final_2010.pdf).
- Mofokeng, T. (1988). Black Christians, the bible and liberation. *Journal of Black Theology in South Africa*, 2(1), 34-42.

- Mohawk, J. (2004). The tragedy of colonization. *Indian Country Media Network*. Retrieved from <https://indiancountrymedianetwork.com/news/mohawk-the-tragedy-of-colonization/>.
- Mohawk, J. & Barreiro, J. (Ed.) (2010). *Thinking in Indian: A John Mohawk reader*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Press.
- Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1476399>.
- Montezuma, C. (1915). *Let my people go: Read before the conference of the society of American Indians at Lawrence, Kansas, September 30th, 1915*. Place of publication not identified: Hawthorne Press.
- Mooney, J. (1900). Myths of the Cherokee. *Nineteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology 1897-98*, 30, 3-568.
- Mooney, J. (1905). *The Cheyenne Indians*. New York: Published for the American Anthropological Association.
- Morehouse, H. L. (1896, June). The talented tenth. *The American Missionary*, 50(6), 182-184.
- Morgan, E. S. (1989). *Inventing the People: The Rise of Popular Sovereignty in England and America*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Morison, S. E. (1955). *Christopher Columbus, mariner*. Boston, Little, Brown. Retrieved from <http://archive.org/details/christophercolum00mori>.

- Morrison, K. M. (1979). Towards a history of intimate encounters: Algonkian folklore, jesuit missionaries, and kiwakwe, the cannibal giant. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 3(4), 51-80.
- Movimiento Estudiantil Chicanos de Aztlán (2019, April 5). A message from ME(ChA)'s national board: Why we decided to change the name of our movimiento. Retrieved 4/20/2019 from <https://remezcla.com/features/culture/mecha-national-board-statement-on-name-change/>.
- Mukhija, V., & Monkkonen, P. (2006). Federal colonias policy in California: Too broad and too narrow. *Housing Policy Debate*, 17, 755–780.
- Munroe, E. A., Lunney-Borden, L., Murray-Orr, A., Toney, D., & Meader, J. (2013). Decolonizing aboriginal education in the 21st century. *McGill Journal of Education / Revue Des Sciences de L'éducation de McGill*, 48(2). Retrieved from <http://mje.mcgill.ca/article/view/8985>.
- NAACP (2015). Criminal Justice Fact Sheet. Retrieved October 22, 2018, from <https://www.naacp.org/criminal-justice-fact-sheet/>.
- National Center for Educational Statistics (2017). Digest of Education Statistics 2017. Retrieved January 25, 2019, from [https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d17/tables/dt17\\_204.90.asp](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d17/tables/dt17_204.90.asp).
- Navajo Nation (2001). *Diné Bi Beenahaz'áanii*. Retrieved 04/12/2017 from, <http://www.navajocourts.org/dine.htm>.
- Nequatewa, E. (1936). *Truth of a Hopi and other clan stories of Shung-Opovi*. Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona Society of Science and Art.



- Newton, H. P., Hilliard, D., & Weise, D. (2002). *The Huey P. Newton reader*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni S. J. (2013). The entrapment of Africa within the global colonial matrices of power: Eurocentrism, coloniality, and deimperialization in the twenty-first century. *J. Dev. Soc. Journal of Developing Societies*, 29(4), 331–353.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2018). Metaphysical empire, linguicides and cultural imperialism. *English Academy Review*, 35(2), 96–115.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10131752.2018.1530178>.
- Newman, C. (2011). *Finding D-QU: The lonely struggle of California's only tribal college*. New York, N.Y.: Third World Newsreel.
- Nicholls, M. (2005). George Percy's "Trewelacyon": A primary source for the Jamestown settlement. *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 113(3), 212-275.
- North American Indian Travelling College. (1984). *Traditional teachings*. Cornwall Island, Ont: North American Indian Travelling College.
- Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*: Yale University Press.
- Oestreicher, D. M. (1994). Unmasking the Walam Olum: A 19th century hoax, in *Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of New Jersey*, 49, 1-44.
- Oestreicher, D. M. (2005). Tale of a Hoax. In B. Swann (Ed.), *The Algonquian Spirit: Contemporary Translations of the Algonquian Literatures of North America* (3-41). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

- Ogbu, J.U., & Matute-Bianchi, M.E. (1986). Understanding sociocultural factors in education: Knowledge, identity, and adjustment in schooling. In *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students* (pp. 73-142). Sacramento: California State Department of Education, Bilingual Education Office.
- Ogbu, J. U. (2002). Cultural amplifiers of intelligence: IQ and minority status in crosscultural perspective, J. M. Fish (ed.), *Race and Intelligence: Separating Science from Myth*, (pp. 241-277). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ohles, F., Ohles, S. M., & Ramsay, J. G. (1997). *Biographical dictionary of modern American educators*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Ojibwe People's Dictionary (2015). Retrieved 04/22/2018 from, <https://ojibwe.lib.umn.edu/>.
- Olan, K. & L. Matthews (2003). More than words-Mohawk language and cultural revitalization in New York. Retrieved October 12, 2018, from <https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/more-words-mohawk-language-and-cultural-revitalization-new>.
- Online Cree Dictionary (2019). Retrieved 04/22/2018 from, <http://www.creedictionary.com/>.
- Oppelt, N. T. (1990). *The tribally controlled Indian colleges: The beginnings of self determination in American Indian education*. Tsale, AZ: Navajo Community College Press.

- Ornstein-Galicia, J. L. (1987). Chicano Caló: Description and review of a border variety. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 9(4), 359–373.
- Oropeza, L., Espinoza, D., Vasquez, E., & Nichols, J. (2005). *Enriqueta Vasquez and the Chicano Movement: Writings from el Grito del Norte*. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press. Retrieved from <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/unm/detail.action?docID=3115148>.
- Oropeza, L. (2019). *The king of adobe: Reies López Tijerina, lost prophet of the Chicano movement*. Asheville, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Orwell, G. (1946, April). Politics and the English language. *Horizon*, 13(76), 252–265.
- Orwell, G. (1949). *Nineteen eighty-four: A novel*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Osiander, A. (2001). Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Westphalian Myth. *International Organization*, 55(2), 251-287.
- Pagden, A. (1986). *The fall of natural man: The American Indian and the origins of comparative ethnology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Paredes, J. A. (1972). A case study of “normal” windigo. *Anthropologica*, 14(2), 97-116.
- Parker, A. C. (1916). *The constitution of the five nations*. Albany, N.Y: University of the State of New York.
- Parker, A. C. (1923). *Seneca myths and folk tales*. Buffalo, NY: Buffalo Historical Society.

- Parker, A. C. (1968). *Parker on the Iroquois*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Parker, S. (1960). The wiitiko psychosis in the context of Ojibwa personality and culture. *American Anthropologist*, 62(4), 603-623.
- Parsons, B. (2015). The way of the rod: The functions of beating in late medieval pedagogy. *Modern Philology: Critical and Historical Studies in Literature, Medieval Through Contemporary*, 113(1), 1–26.
- Patencio, F. (1943). *Stories and legends of the Palm Springs Indians*. Palm Springs, CA: Palm Springs Desert Museum.
- Pease-Pretty On Top, J. (2003). *Native American language immersion: Innovative native education for children & families*. American Indian College Fund. Retrieved from <http://www.aihec.org/our-stories/docs/NativeLanguageImmersion.pdf>.
- Pena, D. G. (1998). *Chicano culture, ecology, politics: Subversive kin*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Perley, D. G. (1993). Aboriginal education in Canada as internal colonialism. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 20(1), 118-28.
- Pew Research Center (2017). *Indians: Data on Asian Americans*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved May 2, 2018, from <https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/fact-sheet/asian-americans-indians-in-the-u-s/>.
- Pewewardy, C. (2005). Ideology, power, and the miseducation of the Indigenous people of the United States. In A. Wilson & M. Yellow Bird (Eds.), *For*

- Indigenous eyes only: A decolonization handbook* (pp. 139-56). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Peyer, B. (2007). *American Indian nonfiction: An anthology of writings, 1760s-1930s*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Phillips, D. C. (2014). *Encyclopedia of Educational Theory and Philosophy*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.unm.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=800416&site=eds-live&scope=site>.
- Pineda, R. C. (2012, Julio-Diciembre). El Congreso Indigenista de Pátzcuaro, 1940, una nueva apertura en la política indigenista de las Américas. In *Baukara, Bitácoras de antropología e historia de la antropología en América Latina*, 2(5): 10-28.  
[http://www.interindi.net/es/archivos/Baukara2\\_05\\_Pineda\(10-28\).pdf](http://www.interindi.net/es/archivos/Baukara2_05_Pineda(10-28).pdf).
- Polkinhorn, H., Velasco, A., & Lambert, M. (1986). *El libro de Caló*. Oakland, CA: Floricanto Press.
- Poole, D. (1977). *Land and liberty: Anarchist influences in the Mexican revolution Ricardo Flores Magon*. Sanday: Cienfuegos Pr.
- Porter, T. (1993). *Clanology: Clan system of the Iroquois*. Cornwall, Ont.: North American Indian Travelling College.
- Porter, T. (2008). *And Grandma said--: Iroquois teachings, as passed down through the oral tradition*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Xlibris Corp.
- Powers, M. N. (1980). Menstruation and reproduction: An Oglala case. *Signs*, 6(1), 54–65. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3173964>.

- Pratt, R. H. (1982). Official Report of the Nineteenth Annual Conference of Charities and Correction, 46–59. Reprinted in Richard H. Pratt (1973), “The Advantages of Mingling Indians with Whites,” *Americanizing the American Indians: Writings by the “Friends of the Indian” 1880–1900* (260-271), Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Pratt, S. L. (2002). *Native pragmatism: Rethinking the roots of American philosophy*. Indiana University Press.
- Prior, L. (2004). Documents. In C. Seale, G. Gobo, J.F. Gubrium, & D. Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative Research Practice* (pp. 343-360). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Prior, M. (1997). *The bible and colonialism: A moral critique*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Proto-Algonquin Dictionary. Retrieved on April 24, 2018 from, <https://protoalgonquian.atlas-ling.ca/>.
- Prucha, F. P. (1984). *The great father: The United States government and the American Indians*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Rabaka, R. (2008). *Du Bois’s dialectics: Black radical politics and the reconstruction of critical social theory*. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Rabaka, R. (2010). *Against epistemic apartheid: W.E.B. Du Bois and the disciplinary decadence of sociology*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Ramos, A. (1994). From eden to limbo: The construction of Indigenism in Brazil. In G. C. Bond & A. Gillam (Eds.), *Social construction of the past: Representation as power* (pp. 74-88). New York: Routledge.

- Rangel, J. (2007). The Educational legacy of El Plan de Santa Barbara: An interview With Reynaldo Macías. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 6(2), 191–199.
- Reel, E. (1901). *Uniform course of study*. Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office.
- Reichert, J. S., & Trujillo, M. (1974). *Perspectives on contemporary Native American and Chicano educational thought*. Davis, CA; D.Q.U. Press.
- Reséndez, A. (2016). *The other slavery: The uncovered story of Indian enslavement in America*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Reyhner, J.A. & Eder, J.M.O. (2017). *American Indian education: A history (2nd ed.)*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Reyhner, J. A. & Eder, J.M.O. (2004). *American Indian education: A history*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Reynolds, D. (2009). *America, empire of liberty: A new history*. London: Allen Lane.
- Rheault, D. I. B. (1999). *Anishinaabe Mino-bimaadiziwin - the Way of a Good Life: An Examination of Anishinaabe Philosophy, Ethics and Traditional Knowledge*. Createspace Independent Pub.
- Ricard, R. (1966). *Spiritual Conquest of Mexico: an Essay on the Apostolate and the Evangelizing Methods of the Mendicant Orders of New Spain, 1523-1572*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Ridington, R. (1976). Wechuge and windigo: A comparison of cannibal belief among boreal forest Athapaskans and Algonkians. *Anthropologica*, 18(2), 107–129.
- Rigney, L. (1999). Internationalization of an indigenous anticolonial cultural critique of research methodologies: A guide to indigenist research methodology and its principles. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 14(2), 109-121.
- Riley, C. L. (2005). *Becoming Aztlan: Mesoamerican influence in the greater Southwest, AD 1200-1500*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Risling, D. (1975). *History of Tecumseh Center: To 1975*. Davis, CA: Native American Studies, Tecumseh Center, University of California.
- Risling, L. (1980). Indian people need to control their own institutions. In H. Lutz (Ed.), *D-Q University: Native american self-determination in higher education* (pp. 65-68). Davis, CA: Tecumseh Center.
- Risling-Baldy, C. (2013, Dec. 11). On telling Native people to just “get over it” or why I teach about the Walking Dead in my Native Studies classes...  
\*Spoiler Alert!\* [web log comment] . Retrieved 04/19/2018 from <https://www.cutcharislingbaldy.com/blog/on-telling-native-people-to-just-get-over-it-or-why-i-teach-about-the-walking-dead-in-my-native-studies-classes-spoiler-alert>.
- Risling-Baldy, C. (2015, July 28). No:’olchwin-ding, no:’olchwin-te: To grow old in a good way. *Two-Rivers Tribune*, 21(30), 9, 12. Retrieved from [https://www.cutcharislingbaldy.com/uploads/2/8/7/3/2873888/flower\\_dance\\_article\\_%60.pdf](https://www.cutcharislingbaldy.com/uploads/2/8/7/3/2873888/flower_dance_article_%60.pdf).



- Risling-Baldy, C. (2017, Spring). Water is life: The flower dance ceremony. *News from Native California*, 30(3), 12-15, 2. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/ethnicnewswatch/docview/1881920502/abstract/8E70C9111A214C13PQ/21>.
- Risling-Baldy, C. (2018). The flower dancers. *North Coast Journal*. Retrieved March 22, 2019, from <https://www.northcoastjournal.com/humboldt/the-flower-dancers/Content?oid=10229320>.
- Risling Jr., D., Lee, P.A., Ramirez, B., and A.J. Kelsey (1975/1988). *History of the Tecumseh Center*. Davis: Native American Studies department of UC Davis.
- Rivera, D. (2013). The Tribal Learning Community & Educational Exchange: Examining the space between the “us-them” binary. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 37(3), 87-94.
- Rivera-Salgado, G. (2014). Transnational Indigenous Communities: The Intellectual Legacy of Michael Kearney. *Latin American Perspectives*, 41(3), 26–46.
- Robb, J. D. (1961). The matachines dance: A ritual folk dance. *Western Folklore*, 20(2), 87–101.
- Rodríguez, M. G. (1940). *Amadís de Gaula*. Buenos Aires: Editorial C.O.P.
- Rodríguez, M. (1998). *Mito, identidad y rito: Mexicanos y chicanos en California*. México: CIESAS.
- Rodríguez, R. C. (2014). *Our sacred maíz is our mother: Indigeneity and belonging in the Americas*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

- Rodriguez, R. C. (2018). Mexico's color line and the cultural imperialism of light-skin preference. Published May 26, 2018 on *Truth-Out.org*. Retrieved May 30, 2018, from <http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/44493-mexico-s-color-line-and-the-cultural-imperialism-of-light-skin-preference>.
- Rodríguez, R. T. (2009). *Next of kin: The family in Chicano/a cultural politics*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Roeder, B. A. (1988). *Chicano folk medicine from Los Angeles, California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Roessel, R. (Ed.) (1974). *Navajo Livestock Reduction: A National Disgrace*. Tsaile, AZ: Navajo Community College Press.
- Rohrl, V. J. (1972). Comment on "The Cure and Feeding of Windigos: A Critique." *American Anthropologist*, 74(1/2), 242–244. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/672145>.
- Root, D. (1996). *Cannibal culture: Art, appropriation, and the commodification of difference*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Rose, W (1992). The great pretenders: Further reflections on whiteshamanism. In A. Jaimes (Ed.), *The state of Native America: Genocide, colonization and resistance* (pp. 403-422). Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Rudes, B. A. (1999). *Tuscarora-English/English-Tuscarora Dictionary*. University of Toronto Press.
- Sagarena, R. R. L. (2014). *Aztlán and Arcadia: Religion, ethnicity, and the creation of place*. NYU Press.

- Sahagún, B. de, Anderson, A. J. & C. E. Dibble (1977). *Florentine codex: General history of the things of New Spain; in 13 parts, Book 7: The sun, moon, and stars, and the binding of the years*. Salt Lake City: Univ. of Utah Pr.
- Sahagún, B. de, & Nicholson, H. B. (1997). *Primeros Memoriales*. University of Oklahoma Press.
- Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Saindon, J. E. (1933). Mental disorders among the James Bay Cree. *Primitive Man*, 6(1), 1-12.
- Sanborn, M. P. (1981). Clinical observations and assertions about guidance of gifted children. In Miles, W.R. (Ed.), *Research and Issues in Gifted and Talented Education: Implications for Teacher Education*, (pp. 37-40). Washington D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education (ERIC documents Reproduction Service No. ED 200 517).
- Sánchez-López, L. (2017, July). Learning from the *paisanos*: Coming to consciousness in Zapotec LA. *Latino Studies*, 15(2), 242-246.
- Sandstrom, A. R. (1991). *Corn is our blood: Culture and ethnic identity in a contemporary Aztec Indian village*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Sjöö, M., & Mor, B. (1991). *The great cosmic mother: Rediscovering the religion of the earth*. San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco.
- Sando, J. S. (1998). *Popé, architect of the first American revolution, August 10, 1680*. Santa Fe, N.M: Clear Light Publishers.

- Sandos, J. A. (2004). *Converting California: Indians and franciscans in the missions*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sapon-Shevin, M. (1994). *Playing favorites: Gifted education and the disruption of community*. Albany, N.Y: State University of New York Press.
- Saunders, V., West, R., & Usher, K. (2010). Applying Indigenist research methodologies in health research: Experiences and the borderlands. *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education Supplement*, 39S, 1-7.
- Sauvel, K. S., & Elliott, E. (2004). *'Isill héqwas wáxish: A dried coyote's tail*. Malki-Ballena Press.
- Schwarz, M. T. (1997). *Molded in the image of changing woman: Navajo views on the human body and personhood*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Seed, P. (1995). *Ceremonies of possession in Europe's conquest of the New World, 1492-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shepardson, M. (1995). The gender status of Navajo women. In L. F. Klein & L. A. Ackerman (Eds.), *Women and Power in Native North America*, (pp. 159-176). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma.
- Shreve, B. G. (2011). *Red power rising: The National Indian Youth Council and the origins of native activism*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Simmons, W. S. (1986). *Spirit of the New England tribes: Indian history and folklore, 1620-1984*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- Simpson, L. (2008). Looking after gdoo-naaganinaa: Precolonial Nishnaabeg diplomatic and treaty relationships. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 23(2), 29-42.

- Skura, M. A. (1989). Discourse and the individual: The case of colonialism in  
 “The Tempest.” *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 40(1), 42-69.
- Smallman, S. (2015). *Dangerous spirits: The windigo in myth and history*.  
 Heritage House Publishing Co.
- Smith, A. (2006). Heteropatriarchy and three pillars of white supremacy:  
 Rethinking women of color organizing. In (INCITE!, Eds.), *Color of  
 violence: The Incite! anthology* (pp. 66-73). Cambridge, Mass: South End  
 Press.
- Smith, D. H. (2000). *Modern tribal development: Paths to self-sufficiency and  
 cultural integrity in Indian country*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Smith, H. P. (1884). *History of the city of Buffalo and Erie County, with  
 illustrations and biographical sketches of some of its prominent men and  
 pioneers*. Syracuse, NY: D. Mason.
- Smith, J. S. (Ed.) (1898). *The Ontario reports ...: Containing reports of cases  
 decided in the queen’s bench, chancery, and common pleas divisions of  
 the high court of justice for ontario*. Rowsell & Hutchinson.
- Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous  
 peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Snipp, C.M. (2012). Native American studies. In (Banks, J. A., Ed.),  
*Encyclopedia of Diversity in Education* (pp. 1601-1604). Thousand Oaks,  
 CA: SAGE Publications.

- Snow, A. H. (1919). *The question of Aborigines in the law and practice of nations, including a collection of authorities and documents*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Solorzano, D. (1997). Images and words that wound: Critical Race Theory, racial stereotyping, and teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 24(3), 5-19. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23478088>.
- Sparkman, P. S. (1908). *The culture of the Luiseño Indians*. Berkeley: The University Press.
- Speck, F. G. (1925). Montagnais and Naskapi tales from the Labrador Peninsula. *The Journal of American Folklore*, 38(147), 1-32.
- Speck, F. G. (1931). *A study of the Delaware Indian big house ceremony: in native text dictated by Witapanóxwe, V. II*. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical Commission.
- Speck, F. G. (1935). Penobscot tales and religious beliefs. *The Journal of American Folklore*, 48(187), 1-107.
- Spivak, G. (1998). Race before Racism: The Disappearance of the American. *Boundary 2*, 25(2), 35-53.
- Spring, J. H. (2007). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality: A brief history of the education of dominated cultures in the United States*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Standing Bear, L. (1933). *Land of the spotted eagle*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co..

- St. Pierre, E. & L. Richardson (2005). Writing: a method of inquiry. In Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 959-978). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Stanner, W. E. H. (1979). *White man got no dreaming: essays 1938-1973*. Australian National University Press
- Stein, W. J. (1992). *Tribally controlled colleges: Making good medicine*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Stein, W. J. (2003). Developmental action for implementing an Indigenous college: Philosophical foundations and pragmatic steps. In Benham, K.P.A., Gipp, G. and W.J. Stein (Eds.), *The Renaissance in American Indian Higher Education* (pp. 25-59). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Stevens, J. R. & Ray, C. (1971). *Sacred legends of the Sandy Lake Cree*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Stewart, O. C. (1987). *Peyote Religion: A History*. University of Oklahoma Press.
- Stoler, A. L. (2010). *Along the archival grain: Epistemic anxieties and colonial common sense*. Princeton University Press.
- Styres, S. D. (2012). "*Land as first teacher*": An indigenous philosophy of education (Ph.D.). York University (Canada), Canada. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.libproxy.unm.edu/pqdtglobal/docview/1517437979/abstract/73741F20F6C64046PQ/1>.
- Suina, J. (1988). "And then I went to school". In R. Cocking & J. Mestre (Eds.), *Linguistic and cultural influences on learning mathematics* (295–299). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Swanton, J. R. (1995). *Myths and tales of the southeastern Indians*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Szasz, M. C. (2001). *Between Indian and white worlds: The cultural broker*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Takaki, R. T. (1990). *Iron cages: Race and culture in 19th-century America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, A. (2001). *American colonies*. New York: Viking.
- Talbot, S. (1994) Indian students and reminiscences of Alcatraz. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 18(4), 93-102.
- Talbot, S. (2006). Spiritual genocide: The denial of American Indian religious freedom, from conquest to 1934. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 21(2), 7–39.
- Talbot, S. (2015). My friend Jack: Reminiscences. In S. Talbot, *Native Nations Of North America: An Indigenous Perspective* (pp. xv-xvi). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc..
- Tallbear, K. (2013). *Native American DNA: Tribal belonging and the false promise of genetic science*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Teicher, M. I.(1961). *Windigo psychosis: A study of a relationship between belief and behavior among the Indians of northeastern Canada*. Seattle: American Ethnological Society.
- Terrell, J. U. (1970). *The Navajos: The past and present of a great people*. New York: Weybright and Talley.



- Thomas, L. (1977, Oct. 24). Ceremony celebrating accreditation. *Davis Daily Enterprise*, 3.
- Thomas, R. K. (1965). Pan-Indianism. *Midcontinent American Studies Journal*, 6(2), 75-83.
- Thomas, R. K. (1969). Colonialism: Classic and internal. *New University Thought*, 5, 37-44.
- Thomas, R. K. (1982). The tap-roots of peoplehood. *Americans Before Columbus*, 10(5), 7-8.
- Thomas, R. K. (1985). The Metis peoplehood: An afterword. In Peterson, J. & J. Brown (Eds.), *The new peoples: Being and becoming Metis in North America* (pp. 243-252). Winnipeg, Manitoba, CA: University of Manitoba Press.
- Thornton, R. (1987). *American Indian holocaust and survival: A population history since 1492*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Todacheene, H. J. (2015). She saves us from monsters: The Navajo creation story and modern tribal justice. *Tribal Law Journal*, 15(1): 30-66. Retrieved 04/12/2017 from, [http://lawschool.unm.edu/tlj/volumes/vol15/TLJ\\_15-2\\_Todacheene.pdf](http://lawschool.unm.edu/tlj/volumes/vol15/TLJ_15-2_Todacheene.pdf).
- Tonemah, S. (1991). Philosophical perspectives of gifted and talented American Indian education. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 31(1), 3-14.
- Torres, E. C. & Sawyer, T. L. (2014). *Healing with herbs and rituals: A Mexican tradition*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

- Traboulay, D. M. (1994). *Columbus and Las Casas: The conquest and Christianization of America, 1492-1566*. University Press of America.
- Trafzer, C. E., & Hyer, J. R. (1999). *Exterminate them: Written accounts of the murder, rape, and slavery of Native Americans during the California gold rush, 1848-1868*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Trotter, R. T., & Chavira, J. A. (1997). *Curanderismo, Mexican American folk healing*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Trudell, J. (2008). *Lines from a mined mind: The words of John Trudell*. New York: Fulcrum Pub.
- Truxillo, C. A. (2001). *By the sword and the cross: The historical evolution of the Catholic world monarchy in Spain and the New World, 1492-1825*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press.
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1). Retrieved from <http://www.decolonization.org/index.php/des/article/download/18630>
- Tuck, E., McKenzie, M., & McCoy, K. (2014). Land education: Indigenous, post-colonial, and decolonizing perspectives on place and environmental education research. *Environmental Education Research*, 20(1), 1–23.
- Tuck, E., & McKenzie, M. (2015). *Place in Research: Theory, Methodology, and Methods*. Routledge.
- Turner, D. H. (1977). Windigo mythology and the analysis of Cree social structure. *Anthropologica*, 19(1), 63–73.

United Native Americans (1970). UNA forms Bureau of Caucasian Affairs,  
*Warpath*, 4(7), p. 13.

United States. (1898). *Rules for the Indian school service*. Washington: U.S.  
GPO.

United States. (1984). *Hearing on D-Q University land transfer: Hearing before  
the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Committee on  
Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-seventh Congress,  
first session, on H.R. 3144 ... hearing held in Washington, D.C., on July  
29, 1981*. Washington: U.S. G.P.O.

United States. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (2016).  
Public Land Statistics 2016. Retrieved May 3, 2018, from  
<https://www.blm.gov/sites/blm.gov/files/PublicLandStatistics2016.pdf>.

United States. Census Bureau. (2012). The Asian Population: 2010. Retrieved  
May 2, 2018, from  
<https://www.census.gov/library/publications/2012/dec/c2010br-11.html>.

United States. Commission on Civil Rights (1969). *Hearing before the United  
States Commission on Civil Rights.: Hearing held in San Antonio, Texas,  
December 9-14, 1968*. Washington: Supt. of Docs., U.S. Govt. Print. Off.

United States. Office of Indian Affairs. (1901). Annual report of the  
Commissioner of Indian Affairs, for the year 1901. Washington : G.P.O.  
Retrieved from <http://archive.org/details/usindianaffairs01usdorich>.

Valadés, D. (1579). *Rhetorica christiana : ad concionandi et orandi vsvm  
accommodata, vtrivsq[ue] facvltatís exemplis svo loco insertis : qvae*

*quidem ex Indorum maximè deprompta sunt historiis : unde praeter doctrinam, summa quoque delectatio comparabitur.* Pervsiae [Perugia] :  
Apud Petrumiacobum Petrutium. Retrieved from  
<http://archive.org/details/rhetoricachristi00vala>.

Vecsey, C. (1986). The story and structure of the Iroquois confederacy. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 54(1), 79–106. Retrieved from  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/1464101>.

Velasco, J. (2013). The other immigrants. *Wilson Quarterly*, 37(4), 66-72.  
Retrieved from  
<http://libproxy.unm.edu/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=pwh&AN=91599196&site=eds-live&scope=site>.

Vento, A. C. (1998). *Mestizo: The history, culture, and politics of the Mexican and the Chicano: The emerging Mestizo-Americans*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Veracini, L. (2010). *Settler colonialism: A theoretical overview*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Vigil, J. D. (1980). *From Indians to Chicanos: A Sociocultural History*. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby Company.

Vigil, A. (1994). *The corn woman: Stories and legends of the Hispanic southwest// La mujer del maíz: Cuentos y leyendas del sudoeste Hispano*. Englewood, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited.

Vizenor, G. R. (1999). *Manifest manners: Narratives on postindian survivance*. Lincoln, Neb: University of Nebraska Press.

- Voegelin, C. F. (1945). Delaware texts. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 11(2), 105–119. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1263082>.
- Vogeley, N. (2001). How chivalry formed the myth of California. *Modern Language Quarterly: a Journal of Literary History*, 62(2), 165-87.
- Voth, H. R. (1905). *The traditions of the Hopi*. Chicago: Field Columbian Museum.
- Waldram, J., B. (2004). *Revenge of the Windigo: The construction of the mind and mental health of North American aboriginal peoples*. Toronto, ONT: University of Toronto Press. Retrieved from <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/unm/detail.action?docID=3443815>.
- Wallace, A. F. C. (1972). *The death and rebirth of the Seneca*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Wallace, P. A. (1994). *White roots of peace: the Iroquois book of life*. Santa Fe, N.M.: Clear Light Publishers.
- Walton, H. J. (2004). The political science educational philosophy of Ralph Bunche: Theory and practice. *Journal of Negro Education*, 73(2), 147-158.
- Warren, E. H., & Parrello, F. F. (2014). *Pioneers of Eagle Rock*. Los Angeles: Arcadia Publishing.
- Warrior, R. A. (1992). Intellectual Sovereignty and the Struggle for an American Indian Future. *WICAZO SA Review*, 8(1), 1–20.

- Washington, G. (1779). "Letter from George Washington to Major General John Sullivan, 31 May 1779," Founders Online, National Archives, version of January 18, 2019,  
<https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Washington/03-20-02-0661>.  
[Original source: The Papers of George Washington, Revolutionary War Series, vol. 20, 8 April–31 May 1779, ed. Edward G. Lengel. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010, pp. 716–719.]
- Waters, A. (2003). *American Indian Thought: Philosophical Essays*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Waters, F., & Fredericks, O. W. B. (1963). *Book of the Hopi*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.
- Waziyatawin, D. & Taylor, E. (2005). *Remember this!: Dakota decolonization and the Eli Taylor narratives*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Waziyatawin, D. (2012). The paradox of Indigenous resurgence at the end of empire. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1): 68-85.  
Retrieved from  
<http://decolonization.org/index.php/des/article/download/18629>.
- Weatherford, J. (1992). *Native roots: How the Indians enriched America*. New York: Fawcett Columbine.
- Weaver, J. (2014). *The red Atlantic: American indigenes and the making of the modern world, 1000-1927*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

- Webster, N. (1828). *An American dictionary of the English language: To which are prefixed an introductory dissertation on the origin, history and connection of the languages of Western Asia and of Europe and a concise grammar of the English language*. New York: S. Converse.
- Weigley, R. F. (1977). *The American way of war: A history of United States military strategy and policy*. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Welti, C. (2002). Adolescents in Latin America: Facing the future with skepticism. In B. Brown & T. S. Saraswathi (Eds.) *The world's youth: Adolescence in eight regions of the globe* (pp. 276-306). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, L. (2015). *Free to be Mohawk: Indigenous education at the Akwesasne Freedom School*. University of Oklahoma Press.
- Whiteman, H. V. (1974). A vision: The warrior-scholar-community activist, the end product of Indian studies. In V. Deloria Jr. (Ed.), *Indian Education Confronts the Seventies. Five Volumes, Volume III: Special Program-- Considerations*, (pp. 1-24). Tsaile, AZ: Navajo Community College and American Indian Resource Associates.
- Wilkins, D. E. (2002). Governance within the Navajo Nation: Have democratic traditions taken hold? *Wicazo Sa Review*, 17(1), 91-129.
- Williams, B. (2016). Towards a case for a second American revolution. *Theory in Action; Fair Lawn*, 9(2), 45–74.
- Williams, M. S. T. (2009). *The Alaska Native Reader: History, Culture, Politics*. Duke University Press.

- Williams, R. A. (1990). *The American Indian in western legal thought: The discourses of conquest*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, S. V., & Cole, J. M. (2017). *Native Cultural Competency in Mainstream Schooling Outsider Teachers with Insider Knowledge*. Cham Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Williams, W. A. (1969). *The roots of the modern American empire: A study of the growth and shaping of social consciousness in a marketplace society*. Random House.
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Black Point, N.S: Fernwood Pub.
- Wilson, W. A. (2004). Introduction: Indigenous knowledge recovery is Indigenous empowerment. *American Indian Quarterly*, 28(3/4), 359-372. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4138922Copy>.
- Wineburg, S. S. (2001). *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts: charting the future of teaching the past*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8(4), 387-409.
- Yazzie, E. (1975). Navajo wisdom and traditions. Paper presented to the *International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences* held in New York City, New York, November 27-30, 1975. Retrieved February 7, 2018 from ERIC Institute of Education Services at <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED124366.pdf>.



Young, G. K. (2001). *Rome's eastern trade: International commerce and imperial policy, 31 BC-AD 305*. London: Routledge.

Zais, R. S. (1976). *Curriculum: Principles and foundations*. New York: Crowell.

Zinn, H. (2005). *A people's history of the United States: 1492-present*. New York: HarperPerennial.