APA Newsletters

Volume 04, Number 2 **Spring 2005**

NEWSLETTER ON AMERICAN INDIANS IN PHILOSOPHY

ARTICLES

SYLLABI

apa
THE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716

 ISSN: 1067-9464

APA NEWSLETTER ON

American Indians in Philosophy

Anne Waters, Editor | Spring 2005 | Volume 04, Number 2

ARTICLES

Some Thoughts on an American Indian Epistemology

Agnes B. Curry
St. Joseph College

In "What Coyote and Thales Can Teach Us: An Outline of American Indian Epistemology,"[1] Brian Burkhart offers a sketch of the animating principles of an American Indigenous philosophical perspective on knowing. His sketch should be of interest to those who are suspicious of traditional models of epistemology. Burkhart's epistemological model raises the claim that all modes of knowing entail a moral metaphysics, and it implies that an epistemology that neglects this fact betrays its own metaphysics of alienation and fragmentation. At the same time, his outline has several paradoxical elements, but, far from finding these problematic, I believe they are signs of its strength. Burkhart also suggests that his conception of knowledge resonates with some of the insights of classical phenomenology, and these connections would be useful to develop. I am particularly intrigued by what is said (and left unsaid) about the notion of relation/relatedness as it operates in Burkhart's epistemology and his discussion of phenomenology. I wish to suggest that an epistemology that takes a principle of relatedness as central, and that remains true to a vision of relatedness as open-ended and fecund, may find itself in unexpected places, with unexpected bedfellows.

Taking Thales, or at least Plato's representation of Thales, along with Coyote, as symbolic of a wrong path in philosophy, Burkhart starts by giving a sketch, framed in terms of a story, of just what Thales and Coyote forget. By responding hatefully to others, acting solely on his own desires, and not letting himself be guided by the right way to act toward his relatives, Coyote forgets some important principles of an American Indian way of being and thinking:

1. The Principle of Relatedness: We must be careful what we do, want, think, and speak, not forgetting our mutual relations. We must remember "the simple things that are directly around us in our experience and the things to which we are most directly related."[2]

2. The Principle of the Limit of Questioning: The questions we choose, the questions to which we desire answers, and the way we ask questions shape the possibility of attaining the right answers. Switching our focus from epistemology to the metaphysical assumption behind it, Burkhart seems to be suggesting that reality is formed by questioning and in turn informs questioning—that reality is definitely not static and is, in a fundamental sense, interrogative. Questioning is ethical activity, a dimension of human choice and desire. And amplifying the implicit moral claim, it is not the case that we can ask any question we desire and find an answer, let alone a right answer. As Vine Deloria remarks, "The difference between non-Western and Western knowledge is that knowledge is personal for non-Western peoples and impersonal for the Western scientist. Americans believe that anyone can use knowledge; for American Indians, only those people given the knowledge by other entities can use it properly."[3]

3. The Meaning-shaping Principle of Action,[4] which forms part of the basis of the Principle of the Limits of Questioning: Human action is inherently meaning-disclosing. "The world is not empty and meaningless, bearing only truth and cold facts."[5] More precisely, I would suggest, there is no truth in what is cold and detached. Burkhart frames human action as a part of the collaborative process of disclosing meaning. Meaning arises in human entanglement with all that is, with the environing world, a web of life that is already inherently meaningful. Individual persons can change particular aspects of a meaning[6] but not its general shape, nor whether there is meaning as such. This involves, I suggest, a view of language as action, linked to other meaning-disclosing activities, and ethically weighted as well. This raises the question of the relation between humans' and other creatures' meaning-disclosing activities; do humans play any sort of pre-eminent role in the world's disclosure? I raise this question as particularly appropriate for an Indigenous epistemology to develop but will not do so in the context of this paper.

4. This Meaning-shaping Principle of Action rests in turn on the Principle of a Moral Universe: The universe is value-laden; facts, truth, meaning, existence are all morally weighted. Following from this, there are ways we should not speak and questions we should not ask. In sum, following from this principle, we can review the Meaning-shaping Principle of Action and see that it implies that "right action determines truth."[7] Thus, the basic philosophical question is this: Since humans are embedded in a morally powerful, possibly dangerous, meaning-disclosing relationship with the world, what is the right road for humans to walk?

An implication of the Principle of Limits of Questioning is that one cannot assume that more knowledge is better; indeed, the principle positively says that there are some things we *should* not know. As Burkhart acknowledges, "it makes us wonder how such a thing could ever count as a view of knowledge in the first place."[8] It is obviously a view of knowledge; I am more concerned about it as a view of inquiry. In particular, I wonder if it violates the Principle of Relatedness, a concern I will outline more fully later.

But my first question about relations concerns how Burkhart specifies the relations between these principles. Can we clarify a bit? While Burkhart notes that these principles are not philosophical principles but rather abstractions from American Indian ways of being,[9] he seems to attempt to rank

them. The Principle of Relatedness is stated first, then immediately followed by the Principle of the Limits of Questioning. The Principle of the Limits of Questioning is in turn undergirded by the Meaning-shaping Principle of Action. But the Meaning-shaping Principle of Action is an out-flowing of some sort—an implication, or perhaps the same principle in restated form—of the Principle of Relatedness. A bit later in the article, we are given the principle that both forbids us to speak and ask about some things, and that reminds us there are ways we are incapable of speaking, with only the first part specifically supported by the Principle of a Moral Universe.

What is the relationship between the Principle of a Moral Universe and the Principle of Relatedness? On one hand, it seems that the Principle of a Moral Universe offers specification to the Principle of Relatedness. One could perhaps have relations that are not moral relations; a Western perspective might insist on this possibility, given a distinction between facts and values. Perhaps there are some relations between facts that have no moral significance. On the other hand, I think an Indigenous perspective would say the Western perspective is incorrect and that to fully understand relatedness means to see all relations as inherently moral. In that case, then, the notion of something as "moral" already implies relation. Morality—on any level—makes no sense without relations. One cannot be moral alone. Thus, at least three principles, the Principle of Relatedness, the Meaning-shaping Principle of Action, and the Principle of a Moral Universe, have a less hierarchical structure than Burkhart suggests. I suggest that they exist in a web of mutual implication and need to be developed as such.

Non-propositional Listening, Humbly Petitioning

In his discussion of Western (modern and later Anglo-American) epistemology, Burkhart notes that seemingly opposed camps actually share some important presuppositions. He singles out the emphasis on knowledge as propositional and the emphasis on finding a foundation for justification. These emphases are linked. Knowledge as justified true belief turns out to be propositional knowledge for which one—in principle, anyone—can give a propositional account. The hope of foundationalism is that the chains of propositional justification eventually end and rest on a propositional claim that is somehow self-justified. The thought that propositional knowledge must rest on non-propositional knowing remains a minority opinion in Western epistemology.

In contrast, American Indian approaches regard the search for foundations both as often arbitrary and nonsensical—an asking of false questions—and as potentially destructive of the knowledge that has been attained, cultivated, and, most importantly, put to use in traditional life. Insisting that knowledge be propositional likewise can jeopardize the skills and ways of living that depend on non-propositional knowing. The most vital knowledge is lived knowledge, embodied in all bodily beings, not just humans. To illustrate that claim, Burkhart gives the examples of a child learning a song by ear[10] and the attainment of *prajna* in Mahayana Buddhism.[11] He also wants to say that vital forms of native knowledge never assume the form of any sort of theory. As we see below, this claim is central to his view. But in this light, his examples become problematic. If the child wishes to play only that song, then surely the knowledge of notes, key, time signature, etc., is not necessary. But if she wishes to go on to play other songs, it is at least arguable that these can be helpful. Both the playing by ear and the playing by note are forms of putting knowledge to use. Both performances are complete. Perhaps the system of notes, keys, and time signatures is an alienating set of tools that ultimately destroys the ability to listen. But if it's decided ahead of time that this is the case, then on what basis is that determination made? Regarding the example of *prajna*, we have the problem that while *prajna* is indeed non-conceptual, lived knowledge, it is, as far as I understand, achieved by moving through, and transcending, stages of discursive, even theoretical, knowledge. At least one route is through reading and pondering the Sutras.

The other point Burkhart wants to contrast between Western epistemology and American Indian thinking is the respective roles of knowledge and truth. Rather than seeing knowledge as an abstract truth for guiding action, for American Indian thought, knowledge is irrevocably shaped by human interests. "Knowledge is not a thing in the world that we can discover. Knowledge is not such that if we just peer into the world long enough or just sit and think long enough, it will come to us in all of its unabated glory."[12] Just because we can think of a question to ask does not mean it's a real question. He contrasts the questioning that arises out of a lived, practical relationship with the abstract formulating of questions he associates with Thales and Plato. A real question is one that, via the practical concern, "is a question that comes to us and not a question we can formulate."[13] While, indeed, knowledge is shaped by human "actions, endeavors, desires, and goals,"[14] this description nevertheless raises the question: From where, or what, do the questions come to us?

To explain what I mean, I will discuss an example Burkhart gives for another purpose. To emphasize that Indigenous knowing cannot be dissected into what Western thought would term science, philosophy, literature, or religion, with attendant rankings of adequacy and objectivity, Burkhart tells the Seneca story of the Three Sisters. This point is well taken; there are critiques of their separation from various quarters. But I am more intrigued by the shift that occurs in Burkhart's description of how the knowing came about in the first place. "Centuries ago, the Senecas *acquired* a piece of knowledge."[15] But continuing, "Three sisters, corn, beans and squash, *came to* them," made overtures of relationship, and taught the ceremonies.[16] Did they come in response to a call? Did they come as an unasked-for gift? Is it somehow both?

Burkhart notes that the story itself has spiritual and philosophical significance but does not detail that significance in his article. He focuses instead on the fact that this relationship also served as an example of what in scientific parlance would be described as the nitrogen cycle, although he stresses, rightly, that the story cannot be reduced to the scientific fact; it remains "the knowledge of the ceremonies and of the three sisters."[17] In explaining how the Senecas came to this knowledge, Burkhart notes that it was gained by a sort of open but purposive experience. Living with the earth, the people "listened and observed the earth in the same manner as one would listen to a song in order to learn it, as in the example above."[18] The point Burkhart wishes to emphasize is that, unlike a scientist, the Seneca did not formulate hypotheses and do controlled tests. Such a methodical approach would not be a respectful listening. But listening to what? I wish to emphasize the context of the story, where the sisters come to the people, and the image of listening to a song, which implies that there is a song already there to be heard. What distinguishes this listening and observing from "just peering,"[19] or the song from a truth just out there, waiting to be discovered by anyone? Presumably, the answer from an American Indian perspective would have to be: the distinguishing factor is a specific way of living, including spiritual practices. This is what Burkhart, in fact, says, when he claims that right action determines truth and not vice-versa. If the only real philosophical question for an American Indian philosophy is: "What is the right road for humans to walk?"[20]

then what we have is a version of Meno's paradox. Knowing the right road depends upon being on the right road, but how does one end up on the right road? This version of the paradox is more adequate than Plato's insofar as the ethical dimensions—and the danger—at play in the paradox are brought to the forefront.[21] Far from raising this paradox as an objection to the epistemology,[22] I think the fact that an American Indian philosophy of knowing is built squarely upon it is a sign of its greater correctness in describing our actual situation in the world and the predicaments we all face.

Nuu-chah-nulth philosopher E. Richard Atleo steps into the paradox and discusses at length the centrality for Indigenous knowledge of *oosumich,* the various practices of initiating, from the physical realm, positive interactions with the spiritual realm.[23] Atleo argues that such interactions are possible and that they serve as evidence that reality is a single, unified continuum.[24] Characterizing *oosumich* as a "'careful seeking' in the context of a 'fearsome environment'," he notes that dangers exist in both dimensions of reality: "the physical, given the dangers inherent to a mountain wilderness; and the spiritual, whose inherent dangers have long been known.[25]" Not an "otherworldly" spirituality in the sense of yearning for an escape from earth, nonetheless *oosumich* involves temporarily suspending ties to the physical and social realm in the service of cultivating courage and respect for spiritual forces by such practices as cleansing, fasting, celibacy, and prayer. Far from shrouding in secrecy the spiritual works undertaken in quest for knowledge, Atleo advocates investigation of *oosumich* methods by contemporary academic research methods. He is not advocating this uncritically; such research would demand a far more explicit awareness of the values employed in all investigations, and thus a critique of contemporary methods from an Indigenous perspective. It would demand a greater sensitivity to the possibility of connection between seemingly unconnected variables than the approach generally advocated by traditional physical- and social-scientific methodologies, and thus a shift toward a more fundamental respect and openness to unexpected answers. But Atleo specifies that it would otherwise employ familiar methods of question-formulation, gathering, and tracking of data. Atleo invites collaborative inquiries and contemporary methods because he is confident that, eventually, the efficacy of *oosumich* and the perspective of Relatedness[26] in which it is contextualized will be fully apparent. The implications for philosophers thinking about epistemology are striking: without dwelling in the paradox, and attempting, humbly, to get right with the universe, we shall not say much that is helpful, and we risk causing harm.

American Indian Philosophy as a Phenomenology

The theme of paradox, and of paradoxical relations, connects also to Burkhart's discussion of American Indian epistemology as a phenomenology. He finds resonance with Husserl's critique of a science and philosophy that forgets its grounding in the everyday lifeworld and discerns something of a similarity between Husserl's distinguishing the natural attitude from the phenomenological attitude and Native concern with retaining the natural attitude. I think there is a similarity in method, but, so far, at least, it is incompletely described.

While on the one hand, Burkhart finds agreement with Husserl, on the other, he maintains that in American Indian philosophy there is no phenomenological attitude as such. "In American Indian philosophy we must *maintain* our connectedness, we must maintain our relations, and never abandon them in search of understanding, but rather find understanding *through* them."[27] This injunction raises a question: How do we know our relations? That's perhaps a blasphemous question from an indigenous perspective. Or an obtuse one. Perhaps the relations are so obvious as to make my question the wrong sort of question, not really a question at all. But I hope there is sense to it because I think there is a lived framework for it.

One dimension of my question about how we know our relations has to do with how we awaken wonder. Here a discussion of the way Husserl's successors broke with him is perhaps instructive. Burkhart is right to be uncomfortable with Husserl's hope that the phenomenological attitude could be a complete disengagement from the natural attitude. The disengagement, or "reduction," from the natural to the phenomenological attitude was, for Husserl, the way to ensure philosophical rigor in our reflective descriptions of the lifeworld. He wanted to pass beyond the realm of facticity to focus on the essentials, the meanings beyond the individuals. In principle, he thought, one can attain a critical distance on the world that is free of theoretical and cultural presuppositions and that can be described with absolute rigor.

Sartre and Heidegger rejected the reduction. But Merleau-Ponty held onto it because he held that the tension raised in the attempt awakens the philosopher to the profoundly mysterious, paradoxical character of the world. To experience the world's paradoxical character, we must slacken our attachments to some extent. But such slackening only brings us back to the "unmotivated"—uncontrolled by us—"upsurge of the world" [28] in "its inalienable presence."[29] Attempting to break with the natural attitude is thus valuable to remind us that a total severance of our embeddedness is absolutely impossible.[30] The lesson of the reduction is that a complete reduction is impossible. We find no realm of timeless truths but rather only ourselves and worldly significances, caught up in time: as Merleau-Ponty said, "there is no thought which embraces all our thought."[31] But it's the task of philosophy not to lose sight of the paradoxes. For Merleau-Ponty (and Husserl, too), to be a philosopher is to be a perpetual beginner insofar as she or he "takes nothing for granted that men, learned or otherwise, believe they know."[32]

An attempt to describe an American Indian philosophy cannot occur from a completely natural attitude any more than any other articulation of a lifeworld because we have to step back somewhat to view what we want to describe. Here I don't use the image of the detached laboratory observer, working behind a shield, but rather the image of a person using one's hands to work on a task. One's hands place something at a distance from a part of oneself, the eyes, at the same time they retain vital, tangible contact. Even if it's obvious who and what one's relations are, one must hold them at some distance if there is to be space *through* which we travel in order to find understanding through them. And, as Atleo's discussion of *oosumich* suggests, there are practices calling for a similar bracketing, and for being open to the radically new, in indigenous lifeworlds themselves.

Who Are Our Relations?

I want to raise the other side of the question: Who are our relations? Do we always know in advance? It would seem to go against the Native principle of continual openness to new data to say that we can. Here, again, loosening—never severing—the threads that connect us can possibly open us to seeing unexpected relations. It seems as if, in noting resonances between American Indian philosophy and Husserl's phenomenology, Burkhart is doing precisely that. On a more personal level, to be philosophers attempting to communicate the insights of an indigenous knowledge and wisdom in a rather foreign frame is likewise to have slackened some ties. Learning the standard methods well enough to criticize them

in an institutional setting demands investment in them. There is pain in that. I don't think we can deny that pain and be true to who we are precisely as members of particular tribes or other special communities.

In this light, we have to consider the contact itself. Richard Rodriguez provocatively entreats us not to lose sight of the fact that contact was reciprocal and sometimes fueled by the desire to know on both sides. He remarks, "In 1492, we are told that Christopher Columbus discovered the Americas. What we are not usually told, of course, is that the Indians discovered Christopher Columbus and literally so. On that day in October of 1492 when the sight of Columbus appeared on the horizon, the Indians came out of the forest to look at Columbus. They didn't run into the forest. They came out to look."[33] "[A]nd the historians have always said, 'Oh, you know, pity that tribe. They were all to die of the plague'. You know, and I think to myself, 'Well, hell, you know, maybe they died of the plague, but don't miss the point. I mean, they were curious about these people. They saw these people...and they were getting off a boat and I'd be curious, too'."[34] In another context, to a mainly White audience, he remarks, "Sometimes strangers are attracted by the foreignness, by their difference. When I see you, I want to know who you are. That's my Indian side again. I'm not afraid of you. Never have been."[35]

My intent in using these remarks is in no way to minimize the often wholescale shattering, or theft, of indigenous lifeworlds, or the loss of all forms of life. But to rule out the curiosity that led the indigenous people to the bay as somehow inappropriate, as a step along the wrong path, seems both untrue to the principle of openness to data that I'll mention below, and a denial of part of the story of survival of many individuals, tribes, and communities. I hold that we would do well to remember that our own relatives are various, and there might be something vital, true, and perhaps quite constructive in that remembrance.

This point relates directly to Burkhart's claim that American Indian philosophy seeks an ongoing, never-completed vision of the whole. Such seeking involves being receptive to and accounting for data even when it is "messy" and apparently contradictory. In this philosophy, "there are no real anomalies or contradictions"[36] because the vision is never finished. The vision is never finished because the world is never finished; the claim that there is nothing further to observe is indeed arbitrary. Any formulation of principles, syntheses, or questions is provisional and never at the expense of a constant openness to thinking and observing. At least this is the way I interpret Burkhart's initially cryptic remark that Native philosophy "is a philosophy where the thinking and observing never stop, even to formulate theories or questions."[37] Only in the sense of a final theory, an end to thinking, there can be "no such thing as theory in Native philosophy." For what Burkhart has provided us with is a wonderful theory, both in the sense of a phenomenological description of contours of indigenous living and thinking, and in the sense of a nascent argument in favor of the greater adequacy of that theory. I look forward to its ongoing listening-to and articulating of experience.

When I use the term "experience," I, too, use it in a wider sense than individual, subjective experience. For indeed, post-Husserlian phenomenology teaches the same lesson as American Indian philosophizing. There is a movement away from Cartesian understandings of subjectivity. The lifeworld is primary and primordial, the ground of all experience and all subjectivity. Heidegger's Dasein is collective; whatever I am, I always find myself already embedded, literally already "there." There is indeed no "I," no self, no body—and these cannot be thought of as separate; such thinking makes no sense and, in that respect, is not real—without the We of people, of place, of a history full of terror and desire for connection. For Heidegger in his later writings, the world as context is manifested in poesis. And poesis is not eternal. Like American Indian thought, for post-Husserlian phenomenology, the step into the eternal is a step into nowhere. And humans cannot be nowhere. Or be alone.

Endnotes

1. Brian Yazzie Burkhart. "What Coyote and Thales can Teach Us: An Outlineof American Indian Epistemology." *American Indian Thought: Philosophical Essays,* edited by Anne Waters (Blackwell, 2004), 15-26. Hitherto designated in footnotes as AIT.
2. Ibid., 16.
3. Vine Deloria. *Red Earth, White Lies* (New York: Schribner, 1995), 53.
4. Why not just call it the Principle of Action as Meaning-shaping? Is there a particular reason for the formulation Burkhart has chosen?
5. *American Indian Thought*, 16.
6. Ibid., 16-17.
7. Ibid., 17.
8. Ibid., 17.
9. Ibid., 16.
10. Ibid., 20-21.
11. Ibid., 21.
12. Ibid., 21.
13. Ibid., 21.
14. Ibid., 21.
15. Ibid., 21, my emphasis.
16. Ibid., 21, my emphasis.
17. Ibid., 22.
18. Ibid., 22.
19. Ibid., 21.
20. Ibid., 17, 23.
21. I do not wish to deny that the ethical dimension is in Plato's understanding of the paradox as well, but it is not an element stressed by contemporary interpreters interested in his epistemology.
22. See *American Indian Thought*, 17.
23. *Umeek* E. Richard Atleo, *Tsawalk: A Nuu-chah-nulth Worldview* (UBC Press, 2004).
24. Atleo, 88.
25. Atleo, 74.
26. The Nuuh-cha-nulth principle is *heshook-ish tsalwalk*, translated as "everything is one." Atleo, xi.
27. *American Indian Thought*, 25, Burkhart's emphasis.
28. Maurice Merleau-Ponty. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Trans. Colin Smith (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962), xiv.
29. Ibid., vii.
30. Ibid., xiv.
31. Ibid., xiv.
32. Ibid., xiv.
33. "Remarks of Richard Rodriguez," at a Convocation on Providing Public Library Service to California's 21st Century Population May 23, 1997, online at http://www.library.ca.gov/LDS/convo/convoc21.html
34. "Discussion Following a Presentation by Richard Rodriguez" for the Penn National Commission on

Society, Culture and Community, June 12, 1997, online at http://www.upenn.edu/pnc/rodriguezdisc.html

35. "Remarks of Richard Rodriguez," http://www.library.ca.gov/LDS/convo/convoc21.html
36. *American Indian Thought*, 25.
37. Ibid., 25.

Discovering the Authenticity

Rhonda Francisco

In "On Authenticity" (*American Indian Thought*, ed. A. Waters), Marilyn Notah Verney answers three specific questions: "What is American Indian Philosophy?" "How can outsiders study it?" and "How can it contribute to traditional academic philosophy?" Traditional beliefs and teaching are classified under American Indian philosophy. American Indian Philosophy is finding out how to follow the beauty way of life. It is difficult to answer the questions "How can outsiders study Native American philosophy?" and "Is it ethical whether they can study American Indian philosophy, given they are studying for non-personal education?" I concentrate much on Marilyn's autobiography because it explains how she was molded into the person she is now. Through Marilyn's autobiography, the uniqueness of American Indian authenticity will shine. To Marilyn, American Indian philosophy is finding the right past to live. Marilyn claims that American Indian philosophy is authentic in every aspect and is supported by arguments revealing the differences compared to traditional academic philosophies.

Marilyn Notah Verney was born in Ft. Wingate, NM, but raised in Cornfields, AZ, by her maternal grandparents, Bah and John James. Being raised by grandparents differs from being raised by your parents. It seems as if you have to always answer and listen to your grandparents; however, you are allowed to talk back and argue with your parents. Out of respect, Marilyn absorbed knowledge through watching her grandparents. Marilyn's grandfather was blind, and it amazed her how he used to do many things; she would watch him as he used his hands to touch things while he worked on whatever he was doing. Marilyn's grandmother had little patience with her grandfather; she would always scold him, yet he remained kind and would just laugh. Marilyn's grandmother was the daughter of a medicine man, so Marilyn was entitled to sitting next to her grandmother during ceremonies while she assisted him.

On a usual day, Marilyn remembers sleeping in the Hogan, or the small house, and having to be in bed by the time it was dark because her grandparents didn't want to waste the kerosene that fed the lantern. Sometimes Marilyn's grandfather used to tell her stories and rub her feet. Every early morning, Marilyn was told to get out of bed because the sheep were crying and wanted to be let out to graze. Her grandmother would feed her and then make her lunch, and then she had to go herd the sheep all day. Before Marilyn could take out the sheep, she had to take the sheepskins and blankets that she slept with outside and hang them up. Also before leaving, Marilyn had to tidy up the Hogan by sprinkling water on the floor and sweeping gently. Other childhood stories included usual reservation lifestyles such as riding horses and going to the trading post. Going to Hubbell Trading Post was an event that would last the entire day. Marilyn's grandfather would hitch up the horses to the wagon, and then off they would go and return when the sun was setting.

Working closely with her grandparents, Marilyn adapted to Navajo lifestyles and picked up traits that led her to her current occupation. During the younger years of Marilyn's life, her teaching consisted of the Navajo tradition taught to her by her grandparents. One day, Marilyn's grandparents took her to the trading post, put her on a bus, and told her she was "going to a boarding school." This surprising event marked the beginning of Marilyn's academic career and her acculturation into the bigger world. Marilyn's primary education years started in Snowflake, AZ. Marilyn changed schools from Fort Defiance Boarding School, St. Michael's in Arizona, Cathedral High School in Gallup, NM, and Gallup High School. Although Marilyn moved around quite a bit, she believes the experience was not good. But I think the experience gave her a better understanding of the larger world.

Marilyn had always wanted to go to college, although her first husband did not approve of the effect secondary education would have on Marilyn. Against his objections, Marilyn followed her heart and enrolled at UNM in Gallup to further her education. Through this experience, Marilyn was reintroduced to the outside world. Marilyn's career was as a surgical technician, and she began working at the Gallup Indian Medical Center, assisting doctors in surgery. After remarrying, Marilyn then moved to El Paso, TX. During her years at the University of Texas in El Paso, Marilyn continued to work as a surgical assistant. Marilyn graduated in 1996 with a BA in philosophy and psychology. With a passion for philosophy, Marilyn had continued taking courses in philosophy. She learned that she could graduate with a dual degree, so she did. Marilyn loves philosophy because it allows her to express her personal opinions and do comparative writings.

In 1997, Marilyn went back to Gallup, NM, to reconnect with her family on the Navajo reservation. She soon found out that most of them were gone. During this point in Marilyn's life, she was blessed with a grandson. Marilyn's grandson is such a huge inspiration in her life that she decided to educate him with the Navajo culture. Marilyn takes her grandson to ceremonies and helps him learn the language and the ways of Navajo culture just by being with his grandmother. Marilyn started teaching her grandson at a very young age because children absorb more knowledge, and he will carry his teaching for many years. Because he is Marilyn's grandson, she has taken the privilege upon herself to lay the foundation for him to learn about Navajo culture. Marilyn spent five years building her grandson's education, and she soon realized that other people needed the same teachings.

During her five years spent in Gallup, Marilyn noticed that everyone was only interested in speaking English, and the teachings of the Navajo culture were being forgotten. The most saddening sights were seeing the Dine people in the streets drunk and unemployed. Marilyn then began to work as a licensed alcohol and drug counselor at NCI. Marilyn also worked in the City of Gallup DUI Detention Program as the director of the program and at RMCH-BHS as a licensed counselor. The DUI detention programs and RMCH work with alcoholics to help them overcome their disease; people generally become alcoholics because they suffer from poverty. Although only one percent of the general population is American Indian, American Indians make up eighteen percent of the poverty population (Segal and Kilty 3). It seems that because one lives in poor conditions, alcohol is the answer to problems because it takes the painful reality away for a short time.

The main reason Marilyn wanted to go back to school was that she noticed the important positions that tried to help Navajos were held by non-Navajos who used Western

counseling methods. And when traditional methods were attempted, they were used in the wrong manner, taken to be a "quick fix" ceremony. It was obvious to Marilyn that non-Navajos held most high job positions only because they held a degree, but she thought it would be beneficial to them if they had some American Indian knowledge. Even when these degree holders are "educated" on Navajos, they seem to have learned from books, from secondary Western knowledge. Many have never lived among Navajo people to gain direct information. Because of the non-Navajos holding important positions throughout the Navajo reservation, Marilyn was inspired to return to education and obtain a Ph.D. Marilyn has taken part of the responsibility to educate Navajos on American Indian philosophy by working with troubled individuals, by helping them to see what to believe in and what the beauty way of life is.

Marilyn applied to several graduate schools in the Department of Philosophy and was not accepted. The Department of Religious Studies at the University of California at Santa Barbara has a Ph.D. program under Native American Indian Traditions. Marilyn was heavily encouraged to apply by Ines Talamantez, whom she had met at a conference, and Anne Waters. Currently, Marilyn is studying at the University of California. She is debating whether to return to the reservation and continue working with Navajos. However, other people in academia approach Marilyn and ask her to stay in California because the urban kids also need to learn about our teachings, language, and traditions.

Marilyn's autobiography (interview) makes a huge impact on her writings because her life developed her American Indian philosophy. American Indian philosophy cannot be clearly defined, but Marilyn defines it by comparing American Indian philosophy to traditional academic philosophy. Traditional academic philosophy analyzes "what is" and "what is not," it seems to have no contextual meaning. Yet American Indian philosophy gives all things meaning in relation to each other.

For example, consider the land. Euro-Americans who follow traditional academic philosophy see land as an object to gain from, and American Indians see the land as sacred, that it is important to give back to the land rather than to only take from her, Mother Earth (Waters 134). Also, Marilyn's grandparents did not waste kerosene on the lantern because kerosene came from the land. It is understood that kerosene is valuable and should be used as little as possible. Another example of the difference in the two philosophies can be seen when researchers try to measure the authenticity of American Indians. (Lomawaima and McCarty did a study, *Reliability, Validity, and Authenticity in American Indian and Alaska Native Research*.) It is ignorant to believe you can measure how authentic American Indians are.

It is difficult to connect the two philosophies together because they often contradict each other. Marilyn suggests that American Indian philosophy has come to terms with traditional academic philosophy by understanding and accepting that academic philosophy is a way of life for some people. Navajos cannot change their way of life but have to respect it. It is yet to be proven that traditional academic philosophers accept American Indian philosophy as principles of life that Indians follow. "To begin to understand American philosophy one must understand the Native spiritual relationship, connection to the land, with our Mother Earth (Waters 134)." Once the relationship to the Mother Earth is mastered, then one can better understand our people, culture, and traditions. American Indian philosophy ties together similar political, social, and spiritual philosophical beliefs of all American Indian tribes.

Navajo philosophy can be defined as "Sa'ah Naaghaii Bik'eh Hozho"; however, the meaning is extensive. There are several translations, but the phrase basically means living the holy, walking in the beauty path, and having a long life through peace, harmony, and happiness (Witherspoon 18). Because Marilyn is a member of the Dine Nations, I believe her autobiography is an example of living the beauty way of life. She saw that her people needed help, so she helped. Marilyn saw tradition slipping away, so she began to educate the youth by starting with her grandson. Marilyn educated people with teachings she has encountered over her lifetime. Marilyn's whole life is a beauty way of life because she became educated in the Euro-American society to teach American Indians about Euro-Americans so they may live a long, happy life in both worlds. Marilyn's essay is an example of sharing American Indian philosophy to educate traditional academic philosophers.

Marilyn has a dream and a vision for the future that, on the Navajo reservation, the teachings of culture, tradition, and language will flow through all Navajo people. Native American philosophy can contribute to American Indians by exposing their culture more toward American Indians; however, it may release the sacredness of their culture to non-Native philosophers. American Indian philosophy is told through stories, songs, ceremonial dances, art, and our ways of being in the world (Waters 138). The people who want to learn American Indian philosophy just need to learn how to "see" the meaning behind the messages. The reason for Marilyn to have written her essay is to share her perspective of traditional academic philosophy and American Indian philosophy, which has evolved through her relationship with Navajo culture.

Bibliography

Fall 2004 Interview/e-mail exchange with Marilyn Notah Verney and author.

Lomawaima, K. Tsianina and McCarty, Teresa L. "Reliability, Validity, and Authenticity in American Indian and Alaska Native Research." In *Eric Digest*, Dec. 2002.

Seal, Elizabeth and Kilty, Keith. *Pressing Issues of Inequality and American Indian Communities*, Haworth Press. 1998.

Verney, Marilyn Notah. "Pluralism Project Panel: Student Interfaith Networks at Harvard University."

Witherspoon, Gary. *Language and Art in the Navajo Universe*. University of Michigan Press, 1977.

Waters, Anne, ed. *American Indian Thought*. Blackwell Publishers, 2004. (See especially chapter 11: "On Authenticity," by Marilyn Notah Verney.)

Gregory Cajete, Traditional Santa Clara Philosopher

Susan Diggle
University of New Mexico

1. Introduction

Native American Philosophy is a relatively new field of study. In 1992, two American Indian women received the first Ph.D.s in philosophy to be granted to American Indians in the United States. Today, there are eight Native Americans with a Ph.D. in philosophy and many more who have contributed to the integration of this subject into Western academics. One of them is Gregory Cajete, a Tewa Indian from New Mexico. He is director of Native American Studies at the University of New Mexico and has published four books that depict a Native

American cosmology from various perspectives. This paper aims to explore some of his main philosophical ideas inherent in a Native American worldview.

After introducing Gregory Cajete himself, I will start off with a short overview of his main ideas and then discuss American Indian concepts about evolution, interrelatedness, and morality in more detail. I will provide examples for each of his assumptions, and I will put them in the context of a Western ideology, including my own opinion. In the end, I will provide a conclusion, summarizing the main ideas of the paper.

2. Biography of Gregory Cajete

Gregory Cajete is a Tewa Indian from Santa Clara Pueblo in New Mexico. He earned his Bachelor of Arts degree from New Mexico Highlands University with majors in both biology and sociology and a minor in secondary education. He received his Masters of Arts degree from the University of New Mexico in adult and secondary education. He received his Ph.D. from International College in Los Angeles in social science education with an emphasis in Native American studies.

Dr. Cajete has lectured at colleges and universities in the United States, Canada, Mexico, New Zealand, Italy, Japan, and Russia. In addition, he worked at the Institute of American Indian Arts in Santa Fe for 25 years. There, he served as dean of the Center for Research and Cultural Exchange, chair of Native American studies, and professor of ethnoscience. He organized and directed the First and Second Annual National Native American Very Special Arts Festival held in Santa Fe in 1991 and in Albuquerque in 1992.

Currently, he is director of Native American studies and an associate professor in the Division of Language, Literacy and Sociocultural Studies in the College of Education at the University of New Mexico.

Dr. Cajete is a practicing ceramic, pastel, and metal artist. He is also an herbalist and holistic health practitioner. He has researched Native American, Chinese, and Ayurvedic healing philosophies and the cultural perspectives of health and wholeness.

He is the author of four books*: Look to the Mountain: An Ecology of Indigenous Education* (Kivaki Press, 1994); *Ignite the Sparkle: An Indigenous Science Education Curriculum Model* (Kivaki Press, 1999); *A People's Ecology: Explorations in Sustainable Living*; and *Native Science: Natural Laws of Interdependence* (Clearlight Publishers, 1999 and 2000).

3. Gregory Cajete's Universe

As a Tewa Indian from Santa Clara Pueblo in New Mexico, Gregory Cajete can be considered as a representative of the indigenous nation of North America. Even though Native peoples all over the American continent differed greatly in their economies, languages, or lifestyles, they still shared one characteristic trait—their relationship to the land, nature, the earth, and the universe in general. Gregory Cajete explores this American Indian paradigm in his various books. His first book, *Look to the Mountain*, is an ecology of indigenous education, revealing an entirely different approach to the study of education from the common, Western approach. In *Igniting the Sparkle*, Dr. Cajete gives specific examples and suggestions about how best to apply a Native American model of education. *A People's Ecology* presents perspectives on food and the interplay of health, cultural ecology, and environment, which are the foundation of all sustainable living. His most recently published book, *Native Science*, is a depiction of the Native universe—a Native way of life, thought, and action. Even though this book only touches on various Native American ideas, it contains the very essence of what it means to live and see from an Indian perspective.

Native Americans perceive the universe—the macrocosm as well as the microcosm—as "a living, breathing entity" (Cajete, *Native Science*, 41). According to indigenous cosmology, "everything is considered to be 'alive' or animate and imbued with 'spirit' or energy"(Cajete, *Native Science*, 75). Humans are related with plants, animals, stones, water, clouds, and everything else surrounding them. This concept of interdependence of all things in nature leads to a cultural expression of "'natural democracy'"(Cajete, *Native Science*, 52). Running much deeper than the modern European/ American political version of democracy, this manifestation implies that all parts of nature—and not just human beings—should have equal rights on this planet. Tied to the concept of interrelatedness is the Native idea of a moral universe. The Native American concept of morality refers to the whole world, including all of its creations. It operates on the principle of "mutual reciprocity, the rule of 'paying back' what has been received from nature" (Waters 2004: 55).

4. Evolution from an Indian Perspective

The concept of interdependence between all things can be tracked back to their perception of how the world was created. One basic characteristic of indigenous evolutionary thought is creativity. Indian peoples perceive the world to be an ever-unfolding, creative entity in which human beings are active and creative participants. As Gregory Cajete points out:

> The universe is a creative expression at a magnitude beyond human recognition. Human life at all levels is wholly a creative activity. ...We are, after all, a microcosm of the macrocosm. We are a part of a greater generative order of life that is ever evolving. It is from this creative generative center of human life that central principles of Native science emanate. Native people relate all things in myth by virtue of being born of this creative center. (*Native Science*, 15).

According to Gregory Cajete, the following three concepts of creativity are of primary importance for an understanding of an Indian worldview: chaos theory, the participation mystique, and the metaphoric mind.

Chaos Theory

Chaos theory plays a central role in the creation of the universe. It describes the way nature creates new, random forms out of the great void. It is the field from which all things come into being. This theory, at the same time, explains the Native view of interdependence: "Nature is the creative center from which we and everything else have come and to which we always return" (John Steiner 1997 in Cajete, *Native Science*, 16). This implies that we are all created out of the same substances. Hence we are all related in an interdependent, universal system.

Chaos theory also implies that everything has an effect, and that even small things have the power to change the evolutionary process. The "butterfly effect"—the notion that even a butterfly loop may cause slight changes in the system—tries to explain this assumption. "It may be an increase or decrease of temperature in a weather pattern, an individual such as Gandhi taking a stand against oppression, or a Native prayer, song, dance, or ritual to bring rain to a parched land" (Cajete, *Native Science*, 18).

Participation Mystique

Another part of creativity is participation. It basically means that we, as human beings, cannot help but participate with the world. We are all "active entities" (Waters 2004: 50) who constantly interpenetrate with the natural world at various

levels: the air we breathe, the carbon dioxide we contribute to the food we transform, and the chemical energy we transmute at every moment of our lives from birth to death all contribute to a constant mutual exchange between us and the world. Hence all human beings and, at a broader level, all living entities on this planet are in constant interaction with each other. This interaction further stresses the idea of our interrelatedness with everything that surrounds us.

Metaphoric Mind

At last, the concept of the metaphoric mind gives us an insight into human evolution: as our oldest mind, it has been evolving for approximately three million years. It develops in individuals from birth to about the time a child begins to learn a language. When language is developed and used extensively, the metaphoric mind gives way to the rational mind, receding into the subconscious. There it remains until its special skills are called upon by the conscious mind. Even though the metaphoric mind becomes significantly differentiated from the rational mind when language becomes literacy in individuals, the two minds can work together during creative play, meditation, ritual, dreams, and stories, or other modes of spontaneous thinking.

The metaphoric mind can also be called the "nature mind." Being a part of the natural order, its character is natural and instinctive. As our oldest mind, "it invented the rational mind, and the rational mind in turn invented language, the written word, abstraction, and eventually the disposition to control nature rather than to be of nature" (Cajete, *Native Science*, 30).

Gregory Cajete uses the metaphoric mind to stress the idea that we are all related to nature. It is the "earth mind" that reminds us of our origins and of our dependence and interconnectedness with the cosmos.

Indian Creation Stories

Indian mythology is a reflection of tribal ways of perceiving and relating to the world. Creation stories communicate through metaphor and art the evolutionary process of the earth. Concepts such as creativity, chaos theory, and quantum physics (a theory in Western science that equals the Native concept of interrelatedness) are embedded in metaphors and transmitted through different kinds of stories, rituals, and art. "Origin stories also show kinship between non-human and human; reciprocity with nature; intermarriage with animals, earthly and celestial beings; and youths who play a role in bringing humans and nature into closer relationships" (Cajete, *Native Science*, 35). Similar patterns of creation myths can be found among indigenous peoples all over the world, suggesting that the idea of our relationships with nature, our interdependence with the cosmos, reaches very far back into the history of evolution.

One particular story by the Navajo people demonstrates how Quantum Physics is applied to a creation myth. "At the beginning of time, it is said that Wind and the Light of Dawn lay upon one another, giving birth to Changing Woman and life. They were one and the same. Then they separated to light the way and to move all things with the different breaths of Wind" (Look, 52). This First Wind gives life, thought, speech, and the power of movement to all living things.

> When the Winds appeared and entered Life they passed through the bodies of men and creatures and made the lines on the fingers, toes, and heads of human beings, and on the bodies of the different animals. The Wind has given men and creatures strength ever since, for at the beginning they were shrunken and flabby until it inflated them; and the Wind was creation's first food, and put motion and change into nature, giving life to everything, even to the mountains and water (Look, 51-52).

According to the Dené people, Wind was the first driving force in the universe, giving life and movement to all beings. Through the metaphor of Dawn Woman, they try to explain the "birth of life." It is also Dawn Woman who determines the nature of the wind breath each person will have at birth. When a child is born, a particular wind combines with the wind of the Mother and Father to make the unique "wind which stands within" characteristic of each person. This combination of winds will determine the child's life, personality, and fortune (cf. Cajete, *Look to the Mountain*, 54). This serves as a metaphoric explanation of human creation and personality.

Oral tradition is of major importance in indigenous cultures all over the world. Stories are passed on from generation to generation, forming the primal source of history in these cultures. The creation of the world, as well as educational or ethical issues, are communicated through metaphors and symbols. I think that the value of these stories has often been underestimated in Western societies. A lot of people living in Western cultures consider stories of that kind to be nothing more than simplistic fairytales. The proper way to approach Indian mythology, however, is to understand the message behind the story. Metaphors are only a means of communicating a sophisticated metaphysic of a particular people. In fact, metaphors transmit knowledge—knowledge about the past, the evolution of human beings, and even about the creation of the universe. Through the preservation of these stories over countless generations, their content is thousands of years old. I believe that these stories contain highly valuable information of the human past—information that is eagerly sought by Western scientists and anthropologists. In fact, the development of quantum physics in Western science demonstrates parallels between the Western and the Native American worldviews. It is founded on the assumption that the universe is one indivisible whole—a worldview held by indigenous peoples for generations. Even though this science is still in its infancy in Western thought, it seems to finally build a bridge between the two diverse cultures, hopefully leading to a more inclusive approach of science among Western scholars.

5. We Are All Related

"Mitakuye oyasin" is the Lakota expression of "we are all related." This metaphor transmits the inclusive character of an Indian worldview. Basically, it suggests that everything in nature, and in the universe at large, is related. Humans are interdependent with plants, animals, stones, water, trees, mountains, rivers, clouds, stars, and everything else. "Through seeking, making, sharing, and celebrating these natural relationships, they come to perceive themselves as living in a sea of relationships" (Cajete, *Look to the Mountain*, 74). They see themselves as a part of a greater whole—neither superior nor inferior to any other element in the cosmos.

Relationship to Plants

According to Gregory Cajete, "a sustainable relationship with plants is the foundation of all human and animal life" (*Native Science*, 108). He explains this theory by suggesting that "plants and humans have been biologically and energetically intertwined since the beginning of the human species. Our relationship to plants is a part of our body memory, conditioned by the oldest survival instinct of humans" (*Native Science*, 108). In fact, humans breathe oxygen produced by plant respiration, and plants depend on the carbon dioxide produced by humans.

Therefore, our dependence and interconnectedness with plants, and vice versa, is a given fact.

Plants were a highly important source for American Indians when it came to food, medicine, clothing, shelter, art, and transportation. Through careful observation and direct experience, Native people came to possess a deep understanding of the usage of various plants. Certain plants were used for curing diseases. This was the task of the healers and medicine people, who possessed special knowledge of the curing qualities of certain plants. Disease was believed to be caused by disharmony with some key element of the natural environment. Consequently, healing rituals and ceremonies practiced by shamans served to re-establish the harmony between the individual and his/her immediate environment. The intimate relationship to plants led to the belief that plants had their own volition and therefore had to be respected and be used carefully. Rituals and ceremonies, as for example the Corn Dance among the Rio Grande Pueblos, allowed the people to express their intimate partnership with these plants.

Relationship to Animals

Various Native myths talk about the marriage between humans and animals, or the transformation of humans into animals and vice versa. Biologically, this is accurate because "when we eat an animal we are 'transformed' into that animal, and the animal is transformed into us. When we are eaten by animals […] we are then transformed back into the cycles of nature" (Cajete, *Native Science*, 40). These stories show the profound relationship between animals and Native tribes of North America. Animals were not regarded as commodities, as they are in Western societies, but rather as human relatives, who were being considered equal, or even superior, to humans. Native peoples made less of a distinction between humans and animals. Their view of human and animal nature was rather fluid, interpenetrating one another. This perception is reflected in many Native languages, which do not have a word for "animals." Instead, animals were referred to by their specific names. This fact underlines the extent to which animals were integrated into the human world.

Some Native myths contend that, in the beginning of time, animals and humans could communicate with each other. Animals cared for humans and even sacrificed themselves when needed to help humans to survive. This intimate relationship came to an end, however, when humans began to mistreat the animals. They started to abuse them, killing them without need. The animals punished humans by refusing to communicate with them through language. From that moment onward, the direct connection to the animals was submerged and could only be evoked through ritual, dream, and visioning (cf. Cajete, *Native Science*, 151-152).

During the act of hunting, individuals came so close to the animal they hunted that they "became resonant with the spirit and essence of the life of the animal" (Cajete, *Look to the Mountain*, 94). Hunting and special rituals combined to it enabled individuals to get to know the "animal spirit" within them. Individuals learned important lessons including the nature of courage, the importance of sharing, and the acquisition of the special power inherent in the animal that was hunted. Dances and offerings of thanks-giving all taught the hunter to treat the animals properly and to respect and honor the greater family of animals of which he was a part.

Relationship to Other People

To round up the circle of Indian relations with their environment, the relationship to the tribe must not be neglected. The community is of major importance to every Native individual. It is the place where "people come to understand the nature of their personhood and their connection to the communal soul of the people…[It] 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" (Cajete, *Look to the Mountain*, 165). The individual's connection and integration to the tribe was of major importance. Communities were the contexts for achieving health and wholeness—both on an individual and on a communal level. Each person was responsible for the continuity of the community. Everybody—the child, the adult, the old ones, the mentally impaired, the "he-she"—had something to offer and contributed to the vitality of the community. On a broader level, the establishment of proper relationships within the tribe was important to the extension of the community's relationship outside the tribe—to the natural world. Hence indigenous communities were expressions of mutual relationships with each other, other groups, and the natural world.

This concept of relationship is completely absent in Western cultures. Instead of viewing the world in inclusive terms, Western societies have developed a worldview that separates one thing from the other. There are countless examples that confirm this claim: humans are separate (and superior) from nature; the mind is separate from the body; the metaphoric mind is separate (and less important) from the rational mind; the individual is encouraged to be separate from the group. Furthermore, Western academics has put science, art, and religion in separate categories. This "categorization" of the world has lead to a "non-holistic" view of the world. If people take one part out of its context, its significance loses value, or even leads into a wrong direction of understanding. One example of this matter is Western medicine. An illness cannot be cured by only treating the symptoms occurring on the surface. Symptoms are the result of a dysfunction within the person; therefore, the whole person has to be taken in consideration when it comes to healing a disease. This is just one example of many that demonstrates the importance of seeing the world in more holistic terms. I believe that the creation of boundaries, and the habit to put everything into categories, facilitates, in some way, the understanding of the world. Boundaries create security. They bring order into the chaos that surrounds us. Nevertheless, we have to acknowledge that we *do* live in a chaotic universe and that reality is a lot more complex and fluent than some of us want it to be. I believe that we (Western societies) could learn a lot from the Native American inclusive view of the world.

6. The Native Moral Universe

The idea of a moral universe was deeply embedded in the Indian worldview. Contrary to the Western belief of the earth as a commodity to be possessed, bought, and sold, Native societies believe in mutual reciprocity. This means that we have to "pay back" what we receive from nature. Since we are all related, how we act and participate with the world one day comes back to us—to us, as a part of this world. Therefore, we have to be aware of our responsibility toward our "relatives" and to sustain and care for plants, animals, and the place in which we live.

Animism

The word "animism" has very often been misused in Western science, projecting prejudice and inferiority toward the worldview of indigenous peoples. French anthropologist Lucien Levy-Bruhl describes the term as follows: "the animistic logic of Indigenous, oral peoples, for whom ostensibly 'inanimate' objects like stones or mountains are often thought

to be alive" (Cajete, *Native Science*, 27). Because of the detachment from nature of many people living in Western societies, the idea that stones or mountains are "alive" is sheerly incomprehensible and looked upon suspiciously. Prior to being able to fully understand this native concept, however, one has to gain an insight into Indian culture, science, and philosophy. Only from this contextual perspective is one able to grasp the idea behind it.

In the context of Native American culture, animism basically refers to the idea that the world is "alive," or imbued with "spirit," or energy. The earth is perceived as a "living soul" (Cajete, *Native Science*, 186), or a "living, breathing entity" (Cajete, *Native Science*, 41), that has the power to move, create, and destruct. Everything existing on it shares a common origin—a common natural energy, or "spirit." "This is the Great Soul or the Great Mystery or the Great Dream that cannot be explained or understood with the intellect, but can be perceived only by the spirit of each person" (Cajete, *Look to the Mountain*, 44).

According to American Indians, breath, in all its forms, is the ultimate expression of the spirit. It is seen as being connected to the spirit of the earth itself. "We breathe the same air that the plants breathe; we breathe the same air as animals; and we depend upon the same kinds of invisible elements as plants and animals" (Cajete, *Native Science*, 117). Language, thought, prayer, chanting, ritual, dance, sport, work, story, and art are all forms of breath that form a foundation for communication and relationship with the earth.

In Navajo mythology, the combination of wind and light forms the basic characteristics of what is called Spirit in Western tradition. "Spirit denotes qualities of Being that associate with the highest level of thinking, acting and being human. The Navajo use the 'mists of light' and the 'holy winds' as metaphors to think about, explain, orient, and teach each other this quality of spirit as they perceive it" (Cajete, *Look to the Mountain*, 52). Wind was a unique expression of breath of life. It was perceived to give life, thought, speech, and motion to all things. The First Wind, or "wind soul," was believed to have manifestations in all living and non-living things. It is through this concept of wind that the Navajo people explain the term "animism."

Reciprocity

The idea of animism—that all existing things on this planet possess a "soul" or "spirit"—in Native cultures leads to a principle of social ecology that can be best described as "natural democracy." It basically means that all things on this planet should be treated equally. Everything on earth—plants, lakes, animals, stones, mountains, trees, humans, and everything else—have intelligence and a right to exist. Humans have to be aware of these relationships and should treat their "relatives" correspondingly. This awareness is a foundational paradigm in Native philosophy. Through mutual reciprocity, people establish and celebrate their relationships to their surroundings. This basic principle is reflected in various Native practices. One of them is the act of hunting. The Hunter of Good Heart, for example, is a common metaphor in hunting cultures around the world that evolved from the primal relationship between hunters and the animals they hunted. Serving as an educational metaphor, he represents a way of ethics and proper behavior toward the animal world. Based on the realization that the life in the animals killed was not different from the life he experiences, the Hunter of Good Heart developed some hunting methods that were not as painful or disruptive to the animals as others. He also realized that animals lived in a community that needed certain terrain to live and reproduce. Therefore, he did not kill all animals of one kind in an area because then animals could not live and reproduce (cf. Cajete, *Native Science*, 40). Every act of hunting was carefully prepared and celebrated by the tribe. Hunting rituals and ceremonial dances served as a reminder that human beings must honor the relationship they had with the hunted animals. "There was a widespread belief that each animal had a spirit village to which they returned and reported their treatments by humans, which henceforth directly affected whether that animal species would in the future give its life for humans" (Cajete, *Native Science*, 161). Therefore, people conducted in prayers of thanksgiving and made offerings to the animals they had killed.

The paradigm of mutual reciprocity was not only relevant to animals. It extended to all natural entities existing on the planet. "The land nurtures humans and humans nurture the land, the foundation of a reciprocal compact of care and responsibility, which is continually reaffirmed through the various expressions of Native technology" (Cajete, *Native Science*, 183).

Morality is a universal principle that guides the behavior of all human beings. It is existent both in Western and in Native cultures. In Western cultures, the bible is a foundational source that promulgates morality: if you show charity to your fellow man, you will go to heaven. If you treat your fellow man in a bad way, you will go to hell. In Native American culture, the term has a very broad and inclusive meaning. It is not solely applied to the human world but extends to the whole universe and all its creations. This is due to the Indian perception of animism—since all creations on this planet are "alive," humans should conduct in a "morally proper way" toward them. This concept of animism is totally missing in the Western view of the world. In Western society, nature and (partly also) animals are commodities that exist to sustain and enrich *our* lives. Humans have the right to obtain, control, and dominate these natural resources. People have a detached, objective view of nature. They perceive themselves as a completely separate, abstract entity that is superior to all other existing elements. There is no such thing as "animism," or "spirituality" as it occurs in indigenous cultures. Reality is what they see with their eyes. But these eyes only create "human reality." We do not perceive the world in the same way as animals or plants do. Even though we live on the same planet, each of us perceives the world differently. Reality, in this context, is relative according to various species. No species alone is able to grasp the greatness of the universe. Rather, each is conditioned to perceive parts of it.

I believe that this world, or this universe, contains so much more than we, the human species, will ever be able to comprehend. Even though we know of the existence of certain things, we are not able to see them: we cannot see the air we breathe, for example, but we know that it exists. I think that a lot of people rely too much on what their eyes tell them. This world, however, is a lot more complex than we think. Its meaning goes a lot deeper than our "humanness" allows us to understand. Only if we start to look beyond our horizons, if we start to "read between the lines," will we be able to see the world in more inclusive terms.

7. Gregory's Worldview in the Context of a Dominant Western Culture

Indigenous peoples presently living in the United States suffer greatly from the consequences of European colonization. Not knowing where to belong to, Native individuals hover between their deeply-rooted Indian identity and the dominant American identity the government is trying to impose on them. This has led to confusion, poverty, and misery among the indigenous nation of America. The clash of two cultures that are so

different in their histories, beliefs, and ideas about the world made friction between the two inevitable.

When the Europeans conquered the American continent more than five hundred years ago, they brought with them a deeply-rooted cosmology, which was entirely different from the one of the people they encountered. This cosmology included the faith in a male God who had created the universe in seven days and who had dominion over the earth and all its inhabitants. People had to serve their God by spreading his glory and by bringing Christianity to the people. This cosmology also included the human's dominion over nature and the hierarchy of life. "Humans were seen to have a connection to this divine God, but in order to fully consummate this union or connection, people had to transcend the material world, and become transcendent and exercise dominion over it in God's name" (Cajete, *Native Science*, 53). This religious orientation explains the Western view of the world that "tends to separate living creatures and nonorganic matter into hierarchies with humans at the center or pinnacle of all" (Cajete, *A People's Ecology*, viii). Western societies developed a sense of detachment that was religiously justifiable. The land became a property, without spirit, that could be used or exploited according to the people's needs. This worldview formed the basis for the development of Western systems of science and technology. It is a deeply-rooted understanding of the world that explains the progress of objectification, modernization, and scientification of the world.

Through expansionism and colonization of the world by Europeans, the Western worldview is the most influential and powerful force in global politics. For many people living in Western-dominated cultures, the values imposed by this culture are perceived as "the one and only, true reality." The "reality," however, is that reality is culturally relative. As Gregory Cajete points out: "There can be no such thing as a fully objective story of the universe" (Cajete, *Native Science*, 60). Each culture has developed different cosmologies, and these cosmologies are "real" only in the context of the particular culture. Therefore, it is very important that people living in Western societies become aware of metaphysics of different cultures from their own.

The maintenance of balance and harmony is an important factor when it comes to the prosperity and well being of individuals. American Indians believe that illness is caused by the disruption of harmony. When applied to the present situation of the planet, we realize that the world is not in an equilibrium. One culture has too much power, leading to the oppression and extermination of other cultures. The world is out of balance, and the planet suffers from this "illness." So what can be done about this present global situation? One answer to this question is to diversify the educational system in Western cultures. If we want to change something in this system, it is our duty to make future generations aware of the current problematic global situation so that they can make changes. The future lies in the hands of the children of tomorrow. We have to teach the children about the importance of diversity in this world. They have to grow up with an understanding that diversity and difference are necessary characteristics of this planet, and that these absolutely should be preserved. The underlying reason of the rejection of other cultures than their own is fear of "the other." It is a psychological phenomenon that leads to prejudice and racism. We have to teach the next generation to overcome their fears in order to be open to diversity. I think this is where we should start if we want to make changes in this world.

8. Conclusion

Gregory Cajete has made a great step ahead in the progress of acknowledging, understanding, and appreciating Native American philosophical ideas in a dominant American society. He has enabled a complex, sophisticated Indian cosmology to be accessible to a wide variety of readers and therefore has contributed a great deal to an authentic recognition of Native American philosophy.

Because of today's dominant Western ideology, it is extremely important to make people aware of different cosmologies from their own. A worldview based on capitalism, materialism, individualism, and objectification of the world is only *one* among many others. One of the others is the Native American worldview, which promulgates the existence of a moral universe where body, mind, soul, and spirit are interconnected with all aspects of nature. The belief that the earth and all of its creations share a common "life energy," or "spirit," leads to the concept of "natural democracy," which means that each species has a right to live and perpetuate as a species. Therefore, the establishment of harmony, balance, and reciprocity with all other forces of the universe is a primal principle in American Indian cultures. As Berry points out descriptively: "We are the Earth becoming conscious of itself, and collectively, humans are the Earth's most highly developed sense organ. In this sense then, 'humankind is nature, looking into nature'"(Cajete, *Native Science*, 55).

A change in the Western educational system could lead to a more tolerant and holistic perception of the world and its cultures. The acknowledgement of the preservation of diversity on our planet is of major importance. Our world needs to be in an equilibrium in order to progress and prosper. The Western idea of democracy *within* a society is a good starting point. The extension of democracy *outside* only one society, including *all* other existing cultures, is even better. The extension of democracy to all creations this earth has given birth to, however, is the ultimate desirable goal. Gregory Cajete has accomplished a commendable contribution to this goal.

Bibliography

Cajete, Gregory. *Native Science: Natural Laws of Interdependence.* Santa Fe Clear Light Publishers, 2000.

Cajete, Gregory. *Look to the Mountain: An indigenous Education.* Skyland: Kivaki Press, 1994.

Cajete, Gregory. *Ignite the Sparkle: An Indigenous Science Education Curriculum Model.* Skyland: Kivaki Press, 1999

Cajete, Gregory. *A People's Ecology: Explorations in Sustainable Living.* Santa Fe Clear Light Publishers, 1999.

McNeley, James K. *Holy Wind in Navajo Philosophy.* Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 1981.

Waters, Anne, ed. *American Indian Thought.* Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2004.

Native American Studies <http://www.unm.edu/~nasinfo/NAS%20Gregory%20Cajete.htm>

Interview with Anne Waters - Transcribed Sections of Interview Filmed at the Indigenous Knowledge and Bioprospecting Conference*, MacQuarie University, Sydney, Australia, 2004*

Interview Conducted and Filmed by Evans Omari

[Note: '……' in the text represents one or two words I could not decipher.]

What brings you here?

I came to Australia to participate in a conference on what was being identified as bioprospecting of indigenous plants, and I was concerned because the word "prospecting" suggested to me something that was perhaps, um, indicative of a colonial mindset about properties belonging to indigenous peoples, and so I wanted to come and hear what people had to say on the topic of bioprospecting, which is really bioresearch in a prospecting way.

Which indigenous group are you representing?

"I don't represent, ah, any indigenous group. I see the world through my Seminole eyes. I am a Seminole woman from the United States from the Tampa Bay, Florida, area…six generations of matrilineal descent, and so I come here as a Seminole woman from the United States, actually, from a Seminole nation geographically located within the colonial regime of the United States, to participate in this conference."

What was the key message of your presentation at the conference? [Question not asked clearly enough - misinterpreted].

"There seemed to be a fundamental theme that indigenous peoples needed to be thinking about the colonial regime involving trademarks and patents of indigenous plants. My concern with that was that the talk was of a vertical nature and that there was very little, in fact probably no, discussion of nations to nations relations regarding patents, traditional methods of law as being employed, and those customary methods of law or, say, common law, as it will be respected in the nations of indigenous peoples."

Do you think the non-indigenous presenters are well informed about indigenous people?

"I think that people who are not indigenous who are involved in discussions of this nature first need to recognize not only traditional lands of indigenous people which they walk upon but also that there are customs and that there's common law in indigenous nations, and only when they first recognize that and acknowledge that can they begin to treat their academic endeavors with respect. I think that the important thing is not who does what but whether or not they get it right, and I think "right" in this instance means those people who are most directly involved, affected, and concerned with traditional health of our indigenous people ought to be the people involved in sharing information because those are the people who are going to get to the local grassroots."

Do you think it is important for information from this conference to reach indigenous people?

"Absolutely. I think that one of the important things that I'm concerned about…is….When indigenous people do not have the ability to control their own resources from theft and piracy of colonial regimes, then they need to begin reaching out and sharing with other indigenous people around the world to find out which ones *have* been successful in maintaining self determination and some control over their resources and how that can be done. It's very important to find that out."

How well informed are indigenous people about bioprospecting?

"Probably the big differences between colonial nations of knowledge and many—I can't speak for all—but many indigenous nations as I understand is that I seem to have come across no indigenous nation that has a notion of a value of knowledge in itself, and that's something that colonial nations like to talk about having, and so they say, well, it's important to share knowledge because knowledge is valuable in itself, and then try to put an obligation on indigenous communities to share whatever they know. I think that knowledge is for a purpose, and it's important for somebody who wants to have access to knowledge, what is their purpose for wanting that access—how are they going to use it? And I think those kinds of questions need to be asked, they need to be clarified before an honest, respectful dialogue can occur."

SYLLABI

Native Studies 436-001: Environmental Practice and Ethics in Native America, Spring 2005, University of New Mexico

Anne Waters, J.D., Ph.D.
Native American Studies
University of New Mexico
Mesa Vista Hall 3rd Floor
Albuquerque, NM 87131 (505) 277-3917
E-mail: awaters@unm.edu or docwaters92@earthlink.net

Course Level, Type, and Text

Graduate and Undergraduate Seminar; Texts/E-Readings/ Handouts

Hours and Place of Instruction

Mondays 1:00 pm to 3:30 pm

Native American Studies Conference Room, 3rd Floor Mesa Vista, Room 3082

Course Description.

This course explores complex ways that *Native peoples form relationships with environments*. Native American environmental thought, ethics, technology, and aesthetics of practices will be analyzed. A comparative approach shows differences and similarities of Native and Western *templates of understanding* that frame relations in our human environment. The class analyzes, critiques, and evaluates *environmental case studies* via discussion. We explore how *values, beliefs, and practices are carried across generations and centuries*. Environmental practices make explicit and implicit *assumptions about the nature of reality, the place of human beings in our cosmos, and human relationship with all other being*. Our focus is experiential communal learning about place that sustains beneficial relations and preserves the meaning of human place in environmental practices for future generations. *Readings* provide an *understanding of traditional and contemporary indigenous philosophical frameworks of environmental practices, and why they collide with technology.*

Pedagogy. Each student will initiate, complete, and present an independent research project that clarifies philosophical presuppositions of a Native American environmental issue. Class attendance and participation is required, as each week a précis (summary) will be presented and discussed in class pertaining to the reading for that week. The critical role of responsibility for personal and cultural contextual interpretation will be addressed.

Required Texts/WebReading

Gregory Cajete, Native Science: Natural Laws of Interdependence (Santa Fe: Clearlight) 2000.

Gregory Cajete, A People's Ecology: Explorations in Sustainable Living (Santa Fe: Clearlight) 1999.

J. Baird Callicott and Michael P. Nelson, American Indian Environmental Ethics: An Ojibwa Case Study (New Jersey: Pearson) 2004.

Donald A. Grinde and Bruce E. Johansen, Ecocide of Native America: Environmental Destruction of Indian Lands and Peoples (Santa Fe: Clear Light) 1995.

See Each Week for Assigned WebReading.

Recommended Texts/WebReading

Krim Benterrak, Staphen Muecke, and Paddy Roe, Reading the Country: Introduction to Nomadology (South Framantle: Fremantle Arts Centre Press) 1984, rev 1996.

David Suziki & Peter Knudtson, Wisdom of the Elders: Sacred Native Stories of Nature (New York: Bantam) 1992.

Course Readings

Week One 1/18: Introductions, Review of Syllabus, and Overview

Reading: Cajete, Native Science, Chapters 3, 4, 5 (pages 85-174)

Monday: Martin Luther King Holiday

Recommended WebReading: Articles

http://www.yesmagazine.org/article.asp?ID=592

http://www.yesmagazine.org/article.asp?ID=726

Week Two: Natural Laws of Interdependence

Reading: Cajete, Native Science, continue as assigned above

Monday: Presentation by Gregory Cajete

Week Three: *Metaphysics and Ethics*

Reading: Cajete, Native Science, Chapter 6 (pages 177-211)

Monday: Presentation by Gregory Cajete

Week Four: *Worldviews and Environment*

TOPIC STATEMENT DUE

Reading: Cajete, Native Science (pages 1-82)

Monday: Presentation by Gregory Cajete

Week Five: *Food, Health, Abode*

PRELIMINARY THESIS DUE

Reading: Cajete, A People's Ecology (pages 1-81 & 245-255)

WebReading:

Monday: Discuss Cajete text.

Week Six: *Diet, Healing, Permaculture*

PRELIMINARY BIBLIOGRAPHY DUE

Reading: Cajete, A People's Ecology (pages 121-160 & 189-242)

Recommended WebReading: See Indigenous Climate Issues

Monday: Discuss Cajete text

Week Seven: *Worldview*

MIDTERM HANDED OUT (Four Pages Due in Two Weeks)

Reading: Callicott, American Indian Environmental Ethics (pages 1-37)

Monday: Discuss Comparative Environmental Philosophy

Week Eight: *Narratives*

TOPIC DATA DUE

Reading: Callicott, American Indian Environmental Ethics (pages 38-98)

WebReading:

Monday: Discuss Callicott

Week Nine: *Interpretation*

MIDTERM DUE

Reading: Callicott, American Indian Environmental Ethics (pages 100-135)

WebReading:

Monday: Discuss Callicott

Week Ten: *Environmental Destruction (Ecocide)*

PRESENTATION OUTLINE and LIST OF VISUALS DUE

Reading: Grinde, Ecocide of Native America pages 79-141

Monday:

Week Eleven: *Case Studies*

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY DUE

Reading: Grinde, Ecocide of Native America (pages 145-218)

Recommended WebReading: United Nations Guide for Indigenous Peoples; and The Rights of Indigenous Peoples. [www.unhchr.ch/html/menu6/2/fs9.htm]

Monday:

Week Twelve: Presentations

Week Thirteen: Presentations

Week Fourteen: Presentations

Week Fifteen: Presentations—All Papers Due on Monday

Final Project Paper and Synthesis Essay both Due April 22!

Week Sixteen: Exam Week

Native American Environmental Ethics Project TOPICS

BioColonialism and Climate Justice; Environments of Sustainable Development; Global Taxonomy, Alien Species, and Biological Diversity; Health & Environment; Food, Education, Environment; Diet, Development, Science; Environment Economics; Women, Children, and Place; Environment Economics of IMF, WB, WTO & NAFTA; Human Environmental Needs; Species Environmental Rights; Environment, Treaty Rights, and the United Nations; World, Nation, and Individual Intellectual and Cultural Property; Peace, Negotiation, Mediation, and Ecocide; United Nations, Land, Geography, and Global Governance; Environmental Issues in World Indigenous Forums; Best Agricultural Practices; other issues approved in writing.

Native American Environmental Ethics Research Project

Because this course is a seminar, the primary course assignment is a research project. Each student will engage in a detailed study of a Native American Environmental Issue.

Date 2/6	Choice of Topic Statement (Why I Chose Topic)
Date 2/13	One Sentence Thesis (Topic Statement)
Date 2/20	Preliminary Bibliography of Works Read/Used
Date 3/4	Historical-Contemporary Data Regarding Issue
Date 3/18	Presentation Outline (Outline of Paper); List of Visuals
Date 3/25	Annotated Bibliography

_____ My Presentation 4/22 Research project due.

Native American Environmental Paper Format.

Part One. Introduction: Identify the Environmental Moral Issue by Presenting Global Historic and Current Data.

Part Two. Descriptive non-Native American Philosophical Analysis: What are Philosophical Assumptions that operate to create/maintain the current non-Native system in place?

Part Three. Descriptive Indigenous Philosophical Analysis: What are Native American Philosophical Assumptions that suggest change of modus operandi with respect to indigenous nations?

Part Four. Conclusions: What Viable Political Actions can bring about positive change for Indigenous nations regarding the issue? Annotated Bibliography.

Native American Environment Annotated Bibliography.

1. Must include at least two texts, three articles from texts, and three articles from websites (give title and URL address).

2. Suggested Form: Gregory Cajete, Native Science: Natural Laws of Interdependence (Santa Fe: Clearlight) 2000.

3. How to annotate = Finish this sentence: This article is about _____; the author presents the view that _____.

4. Feel free to express your opinion about the work, e.g. "I liked it because……." Or, express the contrary opinion.

Course Requirements

(1) prior to class complete the assigned readings and journal query;

(2) attend and participate substantively in class, regularly;

(3) write and submit a four page take-home mid-term;

(4) initiate, complete, write, present, and submit an original, substantive research project (8-15 page paper) on approved topic;

(5) write and submit a final two page synthesis essay integrating the assigned readings with the research project;

(6) submit all project assignments in a timely fashion;

Grading Criteria: Class participation and course assignments will by graded on a point system. The most effective way to earn points is to have the assignment completed on the date due. Each assignment can receive up to a maximum amount of points, according to the following categories.

Date	Attendance: Participation & Journal	30 Points
2/6	Choice of Topic Statement	5 Points
2/13	One Sentence Thesis (Topic Statement)	5 Points
2/20	Preliminary Bibliography	5 Points
3/4	Data Regarding Issue	5 Points
3/11	4 Page Take Home Midterm; DUE MAR 11	5 Points
3/18	Presentation Outline-List of Visuals	5 Points
3/25	Annotated Bibliography	5 Points
____	Class Presentation	10 Points
Last Class	Paper DUE APRIL 22	20 Points
Last Class	Synthesis Essay DUE APRIL 22	5 Points
Total		100 Points

Lateness: Assignments that are submitted late will have one-half point deducted per day (counting weekends, so stay ahead!). No work accepted past April 22 unless prior permission in writing.

Incompletes will be given only by prior approval in writing.

Final grades will be determined according to the following numerical scale:

A 90-100 points, B 80-89 points, C 70-79 points, D 60-69 points

Native Studies 450-001: Global Indigenous Philosophy, Spring 2005, University of New Mexico

Anne Waters, J.D., Ph.D.
Native American Studies
University of New Mexico
Mesa Vista Hall 3rd Floor
Albuquerque, NM 87131 (505) 277-3917
E-mail: awaters@unm.edu or docwaters92@earthlink.net

Course Level, Type, and Text

Graduate and Undergraduate Seminar; Texts/E-Readings/ Handouts

Hours and Place of Instruction

Monday and Wednesday; 4:00 pm to 5:15 pm; Dane Smith Hall #232

Course Description.

This course engages dialogue about indigenous philosophical *ideas and issues* that frame contemporary global indigenous thought, perspective, and worldview. We explore *how presuppositions* of indigenous philosophy, including epistemology (how/what we know), metaphysics (what is), science (stories), and ethics (practices), *affect* global research programs, intellectual cultural property, economic policies, ecology, biodiversity, taxonomy, health, housing, food, employment, economic sustainability, peace negotiations, climate justice, human/treaty rights, colonial law, refugees and incarceration, self-determination, sovereignty, nation building, and digital information. *Readings* provide an *understanding of traditional and contemporary* indigenous philosophical frameworks of interpretation, developments of the 1994-2004 United Nations Decade of Indigenous Peoples, the UN Permanent Forum of Indigenous Peoples, and the recent Indigenous Conference in Cancun (philosophical importance of the World Trade Organization [WTO], the World Bank [WB], the International Monetary Fund [IMF], and NAFTA).

Pedagogy. Each student will initiate, complete, and present an independent research project that clarifies philosophical presuppositions of a major global indigenous issue. Class attendance and participation is required, as each week a *précis* (summary) will be presented and discussed in class pertaining to the reading for that week. The critical role of responsibility for personal and cultural contextual interpretation will be addressed along with the social, cultural, and political impact of indigenous worldviews.

Required Texts/WebReading

Gregory Cajete, Native Science: Natural Laws of Interdependence (Santa Fe: Clearlight) 2000.

Alexander Ewen, Voice of Indigenous Peoples: Native People Address the United Nations (Santa Fe: Clearlight) 1994.

David Suziki & Peter Knudtson, Wisdom of the Elders: Sacred Native Stories of Nature (New York: Bantam) 1992.

See Each Week for Assigned WebReading.

Recommended Texts/WebReading

Brian Goehring, Indigenous Peoples of the World: An Introduction to Their Past, Present, and Future (Saskatchewan: Purich) 1993.

See also recommended films.

Course Readings

Week One: Introductions, Philosophy, and *Indigenous Place*

Reading: Cajete, Native Science, Chapters 3, 4, 5 (pages 85-174)

Monday: Martin Luther King Holiday

Wednesday: Introductions, Review of Syllabus, and Overview of course

Week Two: Lecture-Global *Indigenous Data* (from Goehring Text)

Reading: Cajete, Native Science, continue as assigned above

Monday: Lecture Continuation: Global Indigenous Data

Wednesday: Discuss What Know, How Know, What Need to Know? Why?

Week Three: *Metaphysics and Ethics*

Reading: Cajete, Native Science, Chapter 6 (pages 177-211)

Recommended Film - *The Gods Must Be Crazy*

Monday: Lecture, Cajete: Tenets of a Native Philosophy

Wednesday: Discuss Cajete: Tenets of a Native Philosophy

Week Four: *Worldviews and Self-Determination*

TOPIC STATEMENT DUE

Reading: Cajete, pgs. 1-82; Suzuki, Mayan Creation

Monday: Presentation/Discussion: What is a Worldview?

Wednesday: Film - Sixth Sun (Zapatista Uprising)

Week Five: *Indigenous Identity, Theory, Politics*

PRELIMINARY THESIS DUE

Reading: Ewen, *Voice of Indigenous Peoples* (pages 9-77)

WebReading: "Law and Identity," Dr. A. Onsman (Fourth World Journal)

WebReading: "Reinterpreting Europe & Cataluna," Review by R. C. Ryser

Recommended Film: Annexation of Hawaii

Monday: Discuss Ewen text.

Wednesday: Discuss Onsman & Ryser—Shared Indigenous Politic?

Week Six: *Resources, Climate, and BioColonialism*

PRELIMINARY BIBLIOGRAPHY DUE

Reading: Ewen, *Voice of Indigenous Peoples* (pages 78-127)

WebReading: See Indigenous Climate Issues

Recommended Film: The Cutting Edge of Progress

Monday: Discuss Ewen text

Wednesday: Discuss Philosophical Interweave of Issues

Week Seven: *Indigenous Knowledge, Taxonomy, Science*

MIDTERM HANDED OUT (Four Pages Due in Two Weeks)

Reading: Reading: Ewen, *Voice of Indigenous Peoples* (pages 127-174)

Read Assigned Case Law Summaries from Web

Monday: Film: Leech and the Earthworm

Wednesday: Discussion of Cases, Film, Text

Week Eight: *Indigenous Women, Children, & Nation Building*

TOPIC DATA DUE

WebReading: Women's International Declaration from Cancun Online: [http://www.ifg.org/programs/indig/CancunDec.html]

Monday: Discuss Role of Women & Children in Local/ Indigenous Politics

Wednesday: Stories about Indigenous Women, Children, Nation Building

Week Nine: *Economics: Potlatch, WTO, IMF, WB, NAFDA*

MIDTERM DUE

WebReading: "Potlatch Economics" by Larry Kinley

Recommended Film: *A Poor Man Shames Us All*

Monday: Possible Film Showing; Discuss Potlatch

Wednesday: Discuss Potlatch in Context of Prior Readings

Week Ten: *Interpretation, Oral History and Wisdom*

PRESENTATION OUTLINE and LIST OF VISUALS DUE

Reading: Suzuki Selections as Assigned

Monday: Reading Oral Philosophy Discussion

Wednesday: Reading Oral History – Invited Speaker

Week Eleven: *Indigenous Place*

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY DUE

WebReading: United Nations Guide for Indigenous Peoples; The Rights of Indigenous Peoples. [www.unhchr.ch/html/menu6/2/fs9.htm]

WebReading: "Living Anishnabe" by Allen Gabriel; "Fourth World Nations in the Era of..." by Kathy Seton; "My Word," R. Ryser

Monday: Discuss UN web materials.

Wednesday: Discuss above assigned articles.

Week Twelve: Presentations

Week Thirteen: Presentations

Week Fourteen: Presentations

Week Fifteen: Presentations—All Papers Due on Monday

Final Project Paper and Synthesis Essay!

Week Sixteen: Exam Week

Global Indigenous Project Topics. *BioColonialism and Climate Justice; Sustainable Development; Global Taxonomy, Alien Species, Biological Diversity; Health & Environment; Food, Education, Development, Science; Refugees, Incarceration, Economics; Women, Children, Nation Building; Economics and IMF, WB, WTO & NAFTA; Human Rights, Treaty Rights, and the UN; World/Nation/Individual Intellectual and Cultural Property; Peace, Negotiation, Mediation, and War; United Nations, Land Geography, Global Governance; other issues approved in writing.*

Global Indigenous Research Project.

Because this course is a seminar; the primary course assignment is a research project. Each student will engage in a detailed study of a major global indigenous topic. Project assignments due 4:00 p.m.

Date	2/6	Choice of Topic Statement (Why I Chose Topic)
Date	2/13	One Sentence Thesis (Topic Statement)
Date	2/20	Preliminary Bibliography of Works Read/ Used
Date	3/4	Historical-Contemporary Data Regarding Issue
Date	3/18	Presentation Outline (Outline of Paper); List of Visuals
Date	3/25	Annotated Bibliography

_____ My Presentation 4/22 Research project due.

Global Indigenous Paper Format.

Part One. Introduction: Identify the Global Moral Issue by Presenting Global Historic and Current Data.

Part Two. Descriptive NonIndigenous Philosophical Analysis: What are Philosophical Assumptions that operate to create/ maintain the current system in place?

Part Three. Descriptive Indigenous Philosophical Analysis: What are Indigenous Philosophical Assumptions that require change of modus operandi with respect to indigenous nations?

Part Four. Conclusions: What Viable Political Actions can bring about positive change for Indigenous nations regarding the issue?

Annotated Bibliography

Global Indigenous Issue Annotated Bibliography.

1. Must include at least two texts, three articles from texts, and three articles from websites (give title and URL address).

2. Suggested Form: Gregory Cajete, Native Science: Natural Laws of Interdependence (Santa Fe: Clearlight) 2000.

3. How to annotate = Finish this sentence: This article is about _____; the author presents the view that _____.

4. Feel free to express your opinion about the work, e.g. "I liked it because……." Or, express the contrary opinion.

Course Requirements

(1) prior to class complete the assigned readings and journal?;

(2) attend and participate substantively in class regularly;

(3) write and submit a four page take-home mid-term;

(4) initiate, complete, write, present, and submit an original, substantive research project (8-15 page paper) on approved topic;

(5) write and submit a final two page synthesis essay integrating the assigned readings with the research project;

(6) submit all project assignments in a timely fashion.

Grading Criteria: Class participation and course assignments will by graded on a point system. The most effective way to earn points is to have the assignment completed on the date due. Each assignment can receive up to a maximum amount of points, according to the following categories.

Date	Attendance: Participation & Journal		30 Points
2/6	Choice of Topic Statement		5 Points
2/13	One Sentence Thesis (Topic Statement)		5 Points
2/20	Preliminary Bibliography		5 Points
3/4	Data Regarding Issue		5 Points
3/11	Take Home Midterm	DUE MARCH 11	5 Points
3/18	Presentation Outline-List of Visuals		5 Points
3/25	Annotated Bibliography		5 Points
____	Class Presentation		10 Points
Last Class	Paper Due APRIL 22		20 Points
Last Class	Synthesis Essay	DUE APRIL 22	5 Points
Total			100 Points

Lateness: Assignments that are submitted late will have one-half point deducted per day (counting weekends, so stay ahead!). No work accepted past April 22 unless prior permission in writing.

Incompletes will be given only by prior approval in writing.

Final grades will be determined according to the following numerical scale:

A 90-100 points, B 80-89 points, C 70-79 points, D 60-69 points