

Indigenous Philosophy



FALL 2017

VOLUME 17 | NUMBER 1

FROM THE EDITOR

Agnes B. Curry

FROM THE CHAIR

Anne Waters

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

POEM

John Powell

Prayer for First Day Teaching American Indian Lit

ARTICLES

Anna Cook

When Listening Isn't Enough: Settler Denial and Epistemic Injustice

Andrea Sullivan-Clarke

Tips for Teaching Native American Philosophy

Alejandro Santana

Syllabus for Philosophy 336 Metaphysics: Native American Philosophy



FROM THE EDITOR

Agnes B. Curry
UNIVERSITY OF SAINT JOSEPH

Along with a report to the community from our committee chairs, this issue of the newsletter features work that considers some of the challenges of educating about Native American and Indigenous history, life, and thought in a context of ongoing struggles for decolonization. These topics are particularly timely as the topic of justice for Native and Indigenous communities has re-emerged in general public discourse.

The summer of 2017 saw some good news for those opposed to the North Dakota Access Pipeline when, on June 14, U.S. District Judge James Boasberg ruled that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers did “not adequately consider the impacts of an oil spill on fishing rights, hunting rights, or environmental justice, or the degree to which the pipeline’s effects are likely to be highly controversial.”¹ The fact that controversy was noted in Boasberg’s ruling highlights the fact that the pipeline protests drew broader attention to injustices to Native communities in the U.S. in a way not seen since the 1970s.

Meanwhile, the celebrations and controversies surrounding the Sesquicentennial of Canadian Federation serve to illustrate the urgency of points raised by Anna Cook in our first article, “When Listening Isn’t Enough: Settler Denial and Epistemic Injustice.” Cook utilizes work on the epistemologies of ignorance to critique the assumptions operative in Canadian governmental efforts toward Truth and Reconciliation regarding its settler-colonial history. Suffice it to say here in this introduction that these assumptions are philosophically naïve.

Moving from the question of mis/education and the tentacles of ideological colonialism on the world stage to the always-fraught activities in our classrooms, two authors gift us with experienced-based suggestions for undergraduate teaching of topics in what we can (problematically) call Native American philosophy.

First, Andrea Sullivan-Clarke offers a plethora of resources and advice for dealing with the likelihood that both nonnative and native students know little of their history and operate from colonialist assumptions about identity,

epistemic authority, and academic disciplinary boundaries. At the same time, she reassures nonnative instructors that even quite limited efforts can have some salutary effects for themselves, their students, and their institutions.

Then Alejandro Santana offers a concrete example in his presentation and discussion of a syllabus for a course he developed in Native American philosophy structured to address the institutional constraints of his university. The course description, along with the narrative describing its development and institutional approval, may provide both inspiration and succor for those wondering how to develop courses that could “grow” along with their expertise.

Santana’s personal narrative also speaks directly to some of the motivations for navigating the often rocky waters of course development and curricular approval. As a first-generation Mexican-American, Santana notes one of his motivations for teaching a course that introduces Aztec and Maya thought along with work by contemporary American Indian philosophers working in the United States: “I teach it in an attempt to genuinely understand myself and engage in my own self-decolonization.”

Some of us personally have a felt urgency to embark on the endless work of decolonization as we recognize colonization as the literal condition of our being. (At the same time, this may mean that to the extent to which we find meaning and value in our existence, we may be less likely to be binary in our judgments about the history and myriad effects of colonial enterprises.) Yet one need not be of Native identity to see oneself as colonized, or of “mixed” heritage to see oneself as always-already both colonized and colonizing. I submit that doing philosophy, in the Americas and elsewhere, has always been a profoundly mixed enterprise: colonizing and decolonizing effects can blend as well as turn on a dime in the shifts of history. And to that extent, working toward decolonization—of our perspectives, our classrooms, and our profession—is everyone’s task. Given this, it is appropriate that prefacing all these discussions is a poem/prayer by John Powell that reminds us that words can have immeasurable weight. May our words be good.

NOTES

1. Tamara Williams, “NREL Amicus Brief Supports Tribes in Their First DAPL Victory,” University of New Mexico School of Law, June 30, 2017, <http://lawschool.unm.edu/news/2017/06/nrel-amicus-brief.php>

FROM THE CHAIR

A Committee of Change

Anne Waters

INTERIM CHAIR, APA COMMITTEE ON NATIVE AMERICAN AND INDIGENOUS PHILOSOPHY AND PHILOSOPHERS

Some twenty years ago (about 1996) the American Philosophical Association (APA) asked me if I might create an APA committee for Native Americans. At that time only two self-identified American Indians held a Ph.D. in Philosophy: Viola Cordova and myself. We named this committee "Committee on the Status of American Indian Philosophers." Our newsletter was similarly named, and it announced this naming included those of the Americas and Indigenous to the Americas, as our traditional Native nations and families stretched across colonial settler boundaries.

About ten years later (about 2006) some Canadian APA members informed the APA board they felt excluded and insulted by the name of this committee, as Canadians were not "Americans." Thus this committee name changed to "Committee on Indigenous Philosophers." The newsletter was similarly renamed. Although one might think this naming held global inclusion, Indigenous philosophers beyond North America have not been in participation until very recently.

The renaming of the committee, to be effective in this association, was too broad, unyielding, and confusing. Canadian First Nations members had participated in the committee since its inception, both as members, and as the second-in-line chair. And, problematically, the renaming was not effective to bring in Indigenous philosophers from other regions (or diversity committees), e.g., "American" or other nationality Latin American philosophers from Mexico, further South, or elsewhere—much less from Africa, Australia, Asia, or other global regions.

Thus, over several years, the committee fell into decline, with no articulated guiding light of mutual interest among its members. Worse, most United States American Indians were still not getting hired or published and were thus unable to have the wherewithal, including mentors, to build the field of American Indian philosophy, much less any global Indigenous philosophy.

Then, about ten years later (about 2016), some Native Americans complained that they felt excluded and insulted by the name of this committee, as they did not identify as "Indigenous." Subsequently, the committee name changed again to "Committee on Native American and Indigenous Philosophers." And just as before, our newsletter may likely be named "Newsletter on Native American and Indigenous Philosophers and Philosophies."

What is the import of this renaming? First, because we are the American Philosophical Association (APA), this naming brings Native Americans into consonance with those who are at this American APA table. It brings Native Americans into

a role as creators, caretakers, and protectors of "American Indigenous Philosophers and Philosophies," alongside global Indigenous philosophers and philosophies. Native Americans are no longer made invisible by the amorphous naming of "indigenous." It says we are here, in the Americas, and we deserve a place setting at the table of the APA. It makes us visible.

This committee, alongside the many Indigenous philosophers who will eventually come to this "American" association, will include those global members who identify as "Indigenous" and those who may not so identify, but believe they work in the fields of Indigenous Philosophy. (And malleable belief, not static knowledge, might be our guiding light of inclusion here.) As Indigenous to the Americas, Native Americans in this "American" association thus have a crucial and important role to make extra efforts to continue to diversify and include all Indigenous philosophers and philosophies as our colleagues in this American association.

May we never forget that we Native Americans, we, Native to the Americas, whether tribal or nation enrolled, or not, are, as Native Americans, "Of the Americas." More, as well as "Native" or indigenous to our American or America's roots, "you are," as Geronimo told us so many years ago in a famous speech, "the Red, the White, and the Blue." And as such we need to keep the Indigenous fires burning for all.

Many say where there are "Indians" there are "politics," and I agree. Anticipations of some are that the inclusion of all Indigenous persons of the globe in this committee (remembering that we are all indigenous to somewhere!) will bring forth a new global "philosophy of indigeneity." Such philosophy might be inclusive of different knowledge bases, experience oriented with elder participation, and continue the passing along of Indigenous community thought through generations, ever expanding our understanding of humanity and our human place in the galaxy.

The American Philosophical Association plays the role of facilitator to develop intergenerational and global philosophical thought. Many years ago, in a Michelangelo moment, President Kennedy announced a new NASA program, proclaiming that humanity would go to space and touch the face of God. Today some philosophers will reach, as Mike Pence says, to "touch the heavens." Yet others, including Indigenous philosophers, will step into both an old and new world of learning more about how to understand our human place on earth in the context of our outer spacial regions of the galaxy.

In the near future this committee will connect traditional philosophies of Indigenous technological knowledge bases with those of Western scientific enterprises. This work has already begun by some members now associating with this committee. If the APA ever intended to be an "American" Philosophical Association in philosophical reach, beholden only to the USA and Canada, and excluding Central and South America, and other earthly regions, our current committee work challenges this thought! After almost forty years in this association and knowing the originating

history, I am still not clear whether “American” in the context of “the APA” might mean nation, region, a school of thought, or a political cadre of in-house philosophers with institutional money and power, or all of the above! Yet I am still here, a member, and perhaps there is reason to be creatively encouraged about this! But I do know that we come to this room because we are philosophers! And to have this space is important to me.

Our committee might perhaps now be more closely aligned with the Committee on Global Cooperation, and their interests (hopefully) in Indigenous philosophy, than any other committee or group at this time. For this reason it may be important to continue to include Native America as a guiding light and caretaker of this “American” association. For as we expand our human associations, a vast expanse of differing philosophical ontologies, epistemologies, metaphysics, and value theories presented by global Indigenous thought may propel the APA forward intellectually in a way our association has not yet been challenged to think.

The notion that Western thought can anymore be taught as a representative of human philosophy in an introductory philosophy (or any other) course has been put to rest by many. In this context Indigenous philosophy seeks to search for human understanding rather than dogmatic truth, and relegate some unchanging static truth assertions to a misguided notion of global colonial settler history books. Some have contemplated that Native American philosophy ought to be taught as introductory philosophy to American students. I see no reason why this suggestion is not a good one. At any rate, as I face an oncoming new septuagenarian chapter of my own life, I hope to look back one day at how this APA committee has played a role in the development of ideas of both Indigenous and what was once known as “Western” colonial settler ideas.

In the same spirit that my father contributed to the invention of the “Black Box” that later became and remains the *sin qua non* of American wartime communication, and later developed the theory of inertial guidance for NASA to return our spaceships using gravitational forces, I have thought to articulate my and others’ worldview, as an Indigenous philosopher, within the ambiance of this committee, this philosophical association, and current global and galactic consciousness. As such I have drawn heavily upon my mother’s American Indian guidance.

I believe that in the United States there is currently no other association than the APA to work with to develop a cadre of intergenerational and diverse Indigenous philosophers devoted to inclusive cooperative understanding of multifarious global Indigenous philosophy. It is for this reason that I have continued to work within the APA for forty years. As originator of this committee so many years ago, and political activist on behalf of America’s Indigenous philosophy within the APA, I view this committee as making great strides to envelop diverse thought that has and will continue to lead to substantial interaction with global and Indigenous philosophy and philosophers. I predict that inter-galactic philosophy will also find an important place within Indigenous philosophy.

It is in this spirit that I recently accepted the task and honor, once again, to assist this committee, this time to act as interim chair in the middle of the 2016 academic year. At the time I was a mere newsletter consultant at the request of the chair. However, during my recent tenure, our committee has changed from a committee with only one Native American to a committee of several Native American philosophers working alongside Indigenous philosophers of differing global traditions. As earlier mentioned, all philosophers native to the Americas have a special role to play within the APA.

The recent changes undergone by this committee lead the way not toward “touching the heavens,” or “the face of God,” in a traditional Western religious philosophical standpoint, but allow us to go forward in the pursuit of kneading the traditional historical flow of global Indigenous thought as it touches the lives of humanity. It is now the task of Indigenous philosophers of this association to lead where our hearts may take us. It may take time throughout the global Indigenous philosophical world to bring forth an offering of communicative interaction of ideas about ourselves and the world as we have known it, whereby humanity itself will have a more accurate assessment of our place.

Thus many Indigenous philosophers, by calling, do not see our place as folks who are leaders or followers of Western religious thought, but as developers of global Indigenous thought that will upturn current human paradigmatic scientific theories of our universe. Philosophers can now, through this Association, and this committee work, better touch the face of humanity. As we approach the contemplations of many of our traditional Western assumptions about the world, whether in areas of metaphysics, epistemology, value theory, science, or social and political thought, we are being and will continue to be challenged.

My comments here for the association this year are not about changing this committee to keep with the times. There will always be a chair and members to assist us in this way. Rather, my comments of my tenure in this association are about how the APA has changed us, through this committee, to more fully explicate who we are, as American Indians, and Indigenous philosophers, in the APA. When first I walked into the APA I was an Indian, and a red, white, and blue American of color. Today I am that same person, but my life and others’ lives, have changed and been enriched by the APA committees, conferences, newsletters, and ongoing collegial mentoring and support through interactions of many global Indigenous philosophers. For this, I thank the APA. And my vision is that the APA and our members, through this committee, will experience more of this kneaded interaction.

I have spent much time this past year and a half thinking about this committee, our members of the committee, and members of the APA, as well as the institution of the APA itself! I have hashed and rehashed Indigenous issues, including the naming of ourselves and others. I do not expect all of the things I have set in motion since originally working with this committee in the 1990s, or even in the

past year and a half, to come to fruition, but only to have placed a few drops in the bucket of issues this committee will face over the next millennium. I hope my contributions have assisted in the development of human justice through philosophy, and most especially Indigenous philosophy, and that such development will move us closer to intergalactic philosophies.

A COMMITTEE OF MEMBERS: NATIVE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHERS

I could be equally but not more proud of any committee I have chaired in the past than I am now of the excellent ongoing work of our renaissance philosophy members of this committee. I continue to be honored to work with our committee members. I have learned much working with our astutely philosophical members. I take a moment to share in this report to the board and APA members the ways these committee members contribute to this committee and global philosophy herself.

Agnes B. Curry, Indigenous to North and Central America, whom I have known and worked alongside for over 20 years, and with whom I edit a SUNY series devoted to Living Indigenous Philosophies, gifts this committee with her heart, her perspicuous philosophical and writing skills, her expansive committee experience, and her invaluable energy to committee success by filling the all-important role of managing editor of our newsletter. Since she has taken on this role, the committee has been able to diversify our perspectives and move toward our goal of inclusivity of global Indigenous philosophy. My hope is that Agnes will continue to provide the all-important interpersonal and philosophical skills, acumen, and passion she exercises all year long on behalf of this committee, its communicative newsletter, and the future of global Indigenous philosophies.

Shay Welch, Indigenous to North America, and well-published feminist philosopher, is a guiding light of how far our committee needs to reach to conjoin our sisters and brothers of Indigenous philosophy. She proves with enthusiasm that we can accomplish our goals and concretely bring Indigenous philosophers together at the APA. Shay has worked tenacity, in her own creative ways, to take our inclusive Indigenous committee message to the Feminist Social and Political conferences. More, she then returns to our committee to create conference and newsletter space for mutual dialogue interaction that inspires and propels this committee forward toward knowing how to touch our shared humanity on earth. I envision more leadership roles for Shay in the future and hope they will happen in the APA.

Brian Y. Burkhart, Indigenous to North America, whom I have known and worked with for over twenty years, since he began graduate school, offers this committee a constant in producing scholarship that propels us to step outside habitual philosophical frameworks to envision an Indigenous American Indian ontological worldview. Ever on the cusp of understanding and integrating the thought of Indigenous and all philosophers with that of settler colonialist thought, Brian sits upon this committee to provide that cutting-edge knowledge, research, and method. My hope is that we

will soon see Brian's manuscript ("Indigenizing Philosophy through the Land: The Geographical Locality of American Indian Thought") alongside that of Thomas Norton Smith and Chike Jeffers in the State University of New York (SUNY) Indigenous Philosophies series edited by myself and Agnes Curry. Until then, I hope Brian will continue to share his fresh ideas about Indigenous philosophy with this committee and the APA.

Andrea Sullivan-Clark, Indigenous to North America, is an astute poet, outstanding scholar, and recent philosophy Ph.D. specializing in philosophy of science (value theory) and social epistemology. She brings to our committee well-honed grant writing success! This year she received a \$10K diversity grant from the APA to engage in what I believe to be one of the most inclusive summer programs the APA has ever supported financially. This success and, more importantly, Andrea's understanding of the role and nature of "diversity in philosophy" supports the overarching goals of the APA to increase inclusion and diversity within our profession. Andrea's strong insight and leadership synthesizes with those same skills in our committee members. My hope is that Andrea will remain in philosophy and continue to encourage her students to pursue philosophy of a diverse bent with the support of the APA.

James Maffie, an Indigenous, Latin American, and comparative philosopher, is well published and is the gifter of "Aztec Philosophy: A World in Motion" (see IEP "Aztec Philosophy"). He has successfully challenged some of the internalized settler colonial Platonic metaphysics of our most important Latin American philosopher, Leon Portillo. He is also one of the recent originators and editors (with Monika Kirloskar-Steinbach) of "Confluence: Online Journal of World Philosophies." James joins our committee this year to bring perspicuous detail to our sometimes muddled thoughts about science and global Indigenous philosophy. Jim has been a quiet supporter of several members of this committee (publishing several of us) and of the committee itself for almost 20 years. It is exciting to have him work with us alongside environmental philosophers this coming year. His philosophical understanding of the seams of North, Central, and South America in the context of settler colonial philosophy will serve this committee well.

Robert M. Figueroa, Indigenous to Central America, whom I have come to know only recently, promises to continue to contribute to this committee his expertise in environmental philosophy and justice studies (e.g., "Indigenous Populations and Cultural Justice," Oxford Handbook of Climate Change). Hopefully Robert will take the lead within the APA, along with Brian, Lori, Andrea, James, Andrew, and others, to bring an Indigenous philosophical perspective of environmental justice as it affects Indigenous people and cultures, especially in the Americas, to the APA. I hope our members can look forward to hearing about new paradigmatic shifts toward understanding our environmental value issues in the next few years, articulating differences of Indigenous philosophy from Western thought, and seeing some cognitive changes in core areas of philosophy, most especially metaphysics, ontology, epistemology, and science, will help guide these efforts.

Scott L. Pratt, an Indigenous philosopher since his graduate school, supports this committee as a senior scholar as he has since its inception. Scott has been pivotal in his commitment to caretaking some of the Indigenous conceptual glue that has brought “Canadian” and “American” Indigenous philosophy to the APA. His lengthy history with this committee, and his experience as a dean, has enabled him to mentor and assist in our committee development over the years. I know he will continue to support this committee.

Andrew F. Smith has only recently joined this committee, though his interests are in environmental ethics and political philosophy. Andrew brings new energy and commitment to our committee. Andrew assisted in developing programming this year, and I hope he will be active next year assisting in programming and bringing together the thought of our diverse Indigenous environmentalists on the committee. We thank Andrew for his interest and commitment to Native American and Indigenous philosophy!

Lori J. Underwood, Indigenous to North America, is the new chair of this committee. Her fields include Kant, philosophy of law, and political philosophy, and she has interest in Kant’s cosmopolitanism and global terrorism. She is editor of Peter Lang’s Terrorism Studies series. New to this committee as both dean and philosophy faculty, Lori brings honed administrative skills to our committee. Her interest in environmental Native justice complements committee members’ interests and will serve her well over the next three years working with such a diverse group of Indigenous philosophers who are, each in their own unique manner, outstanding scholars. Lori tells me she is honored and excited to work with our committee members and looks forward to celebrating and increasing our diversity while directing our attention to environmental philosophy and Indigenous populations. We are honored to have her guide and facilitate the work of this committee.

IN CLOSING

The best way I know of to close this report is to say thank you on behalf of the Committee on Native American and Indigenous Philosophers, thank you to members of this committee, to members of the APA who continue to support this committee over the years, to the board for letting it happen, and to Amy, Erin, and Linda, who also help us make things happen!

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

We invite you to submit your work for consideration for publication in the spring 2018 newsletter.

We welcome work that foregrounds the philosophical, professional, and community concerns regarding Native American philosophers and philosophers of all global Indigenous nations. We welcome comments and responses to work published in this or past issues. Editors do not limit philosophical methods, modes, or literatures, as long as the work engages in substantive and sustained re-centering of the philosophical conversation to focus on Native American and Indigenous concerns. Nor do we limit the format of what can be submitted; we accept a range of submission formats, including and not limited to papers, opinion editorials, transcribed dialogue interviews, book reviews, poetry, links to oral and video resources, cartoons, artwork, satire, parody, and other diverse formats. In all cases, however, any references should follow the *Chicago Manual of Style* and include endnotes rather than in-text citations except for extensive reference to a single source.

For further information, please see the Guidelines for Authors available on the [APA website](#). The submission deadline for the spring 2018 newsletter is January 15, 2018. Please submit copies electronically to Agnes Curry at acurry@usj.edu.

POEM

Prayer for First Day Teaching American Indian Lit

John Powell

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY

May these things we say here not be words.
May they have a trajectory and a weight.
May we tilt our heads back,
May we let our feet come out our mouths,
Let our bellies and bowels come out our mouths,
Let our tear ducts and our scratches,
Our stab and exit wounds come out our mouths.
Let our living ancestors and our children
Fly around us, strike us with blows
And kiss us and caress us.
Let this work of ours not be stuck on pages,
Let this work not be caught in a room,
Let it not move from within these walls
To within other walls.
Let every thing we say be our viscera
And our blood,
And let our stories be our lives
And let our lives be prayers.

ARTICLES

When Listening Isn't Enough: Settler Denial and Epistemic Injustice

Anna Cook
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

"I want to acknowledge these stories as gifts . . ."

– Therese Boullard, director of the Northwest Territories Human Rights Commission

The Indian Residential Schools system has been referred to as "Canada's greatest national shame."¹ Beginning in the 1880s, the Canadian government sought to assimilate Indigenous children by requiring, under the Indian Act of 1876, their attendance at church-run schools. The result was that 132 federally supported schools were set up in almost every province and territory, and functioned for well over a century.² Most schools were operated as joint ventures with Anglican, Catholic, Presbyterian, or United Churches. Over 150,000 children were separated from their families and communities to be sent far away to schools where they were forbidden to speak their languages, practice their spirituality, or express their cultures.

On June 11, 2008, the (now former) Prime Minister of Canada, Stephen Harper, made a Statement of Apology on behalf of the Canadian government for the Indian Residential Schools system: "The government now recognizes that the consequences of the Indian Residential Schools policy were profoundly negative and that this policy has had a lasting and damaging impact on Aboriginal culture, heritage, and language."³ The Canadian government's 2008 Statement of Apology for the residential school policy came in the shadow of the dissolution of the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in 2005 that unsuccessfully settled thousands of residential school survivor lawsuits.⁴ The Settlement Agreement came into effect September 19, 2007, and provided approximately five billion dollars in compensation, commemoration, and the establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (hereafter TRC).⁵ The TRC has had the stated purpose of promoting public awareness about the residential school system, and educating Canadians about the 150-year history of residential schools, rather than bringing about legal reparations. As part of the truth-telling and reconciliation process, there have been seven national events across Canada (Winnipeg in 2010, Inuvik in 2011, Halifax in 2011, Saskatoon in 2012, Montreal and Vancouver in 2013, and Edmonton in 2014) that aim to engage and educate the Canadian public about the history of the residential school system through personal testimony from survivors. This truth-telling and reconciliation process was finalized in the final report, "Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future," which was published in December 2015.⁶

Truth commissions have most often been established in countries making the transition to more democratic politics such as in South Africa, Chile, El Salvador, and Argentina,

for example. For this reason, the establishment of a truth commission in a stable Western democracy such as Canada was an unusual occurrence. While truth commissions differ, they share the basic commitment to investigate and publicly disseminate information about past human rights abuses and to provide a public platform for victims to tell their stories. One of the goals of truth commissions is to give voice to the survivors of human rights violations. For this reason, Teresa Godwin Phelps emphasizes the potential of storytelling as a nonviolent means of achieving retribution that avoids cycles of revenge. She argues that victims of human rights abuses lose *language*, such that truth commissions can provide the opportunity for victims to reconstruct their "shattered voices" and regain their dignity and self-respect.⁷ While truth commissions provide a public platform to share survivors' experiences, the reconciliatory potential of the TRC rests, however, on whether the personal testimonies of residential school survivors can be *heard*. This concern is further articulated by Paulette Regan, the Research Director of the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission, who sees the Apology and the creation of the TRC as uncovering an uncomfortable "historical amnesia" of the residential school system by a non-Native audience. She contends that this amnesia reveals the "continuing complicity in denying, erasing, and forgetting this part of our own history as colonizers while pathologizing the colonized."⁸ For this reason, she exposes the pressing need to decolonize the way non-Natives hear the voices of residential school survivors in such a way that can effectively disturb the fiction of Canada as a peacekeeping country that respects human rights.

The TRC demands survivors of the residential school system to share their personal narratives under the assumption that the sharing of narratives will inform the Canadian public of the residential school legacy and will motivate a transformation of settler identity. The TRC assumes that the testimonies will be heard in a politically meaningful way. I am critical of this assumption, and in response, I examine the relationship between truth-telling and reconciliation in light of structural settler denial.⁹ I contend that the characterization of settler denial as an epistemology of ignorance gives us the tools and language to better articulate how the denial of past and ongoing settler colonialism is sustained.

By settler denial, I mean both the explicit and implicit denial of past and ongoing settler colonialism. Settler denial can be explicit—in the denial of ongoing settler colonialism in the 2008 Statement of Apology, which positions the ills of colonialism strictly in the past and thus denies the realities of an ongoing settler colonial present, or in the denial of past settler colonialism in Stephen Harper's 2009 G20 address in which he proudly claimed that "Canada has no history of colonialism." Settler denial is often more pernicious and subtle, however, in forming the settler everyday—for example, in Canadian history education curricula that frames the founding peoples of Canada as French and English settlers, or in recent discourse about non-European immigration as people who are "not from here."

DENIAL AND IGNORANCE

One outcome of the turn to testimony in social epistemology has been to seriously consider ignorance, that is, the failure of knowledge-production and knowledge-circulation, as an epistemic practice. An epistemology of ignorance aims to identify different forms of ignorance and examine how ignorance is produced and sustained, and to investigate the role it plays in knowledge practices. In short, an epistemology of ignorance asks which epistemic practices make it such that “S does *not* know p.” In this way, ignorance is not taken to be a neglectful epistemic practice or simply a result of failed inquiry, but is rather considered as a “substantive epistemic practice.”¹⁰ Moreover, investigations of *racial* ignorance examine how a lack of knowledge is actively produced for purposes of domination and exploitation. The central claim of an epistemology of ignorance is that an account of knowledge is incomplete without an account of ignorance, and an account of ignorance is incomplete without an account of who benefits and who is disadvantaged by such ignorance.

Analyses of ignorance with an emphasis on race were first articulated in Marilyn Frye’s 1983 *The Politics of Reality* and in Charles Mills’s 1997 *The Racial Contract*. Frye defines ignorance not as a simple absence, but as an active force. In particular, she names the non-accidental ignorance of white feminists who think of themselves as anti-racist while remaining largely oblivious to the worlds of women of color. Additionally, she cites “the determined ignorance most white Americans have of American Indian tribes and clans, the ostrich-like ignorance most white Americans have of the histories of Asian peoples in this country, the impoverishing ignorance most white Americans have of Black language—ignorance of these sorts is a complex result of many acts and many negligences.”¹¹ Ignorance is here described as more than an effect of the knower’s general situatedness, but rather defined in terms of structures of power.¹²

The formulation of an epistemology of ignorance within white supremacy is famously expressed in Mills’s articulation of the “racial contract,” which prescribes for “its signatories an inverted epistemology, an epistemology of ignorance, a particular pattern of localized and global cognitive dysfunctions (which are psychologically and socially functional), producing the ironic outcome that whites will in general be unable to understand the world they themselves have made.”¹³ An epistemology of ignorance (or an inverted epistemology) is a requirement for the racial division of the human race into “full persons and subpersons.”¹⁴ Ignorance is here defined as more than just the *individual* prejudicial blind spots according to one’s group identity, but it is structural such that dominant groups not only have less interest in criticizing the status quo, but they “have a positive interest in ‘seeing the world wrongly.’”¹⁵ There are concrete benefits to this sustained ignorance. Mills illustrates this by looking at the notion of “color blindness.”¹⁶ Color blindness fosters a worldview in which racial violence can be easily overlooked (for example, consider the “All Lives Matter” slogan in response to Black Lives Matter). Rather than promoting racial equality, color blindness, in the wake of historical inequality and white normativity, actively separates present perception from

past wrongs, thus ignoring the ways in which a history of domination shapes the present.

Mills further elaborates on the “inverted epistemology” of the racial contract by describing white ignorance as it is connected to white supremacy. White ignorance supports the social cognition that distorts reality shaped by white supremacy. For example, the lens shaped by white supremacy causes people suffering from white ignorance to “mis-see whites as civilized superiors and nonwhites as inferior savages.”¹⁷ White ignorance has the result of cultivating a collective amnesia about the past that undermines the testimony and credibility of nonwhite people.

SETTLER IGNORANCE

Mills’s articulation of white ignorance can be expanded, I argue, to a consideration of *settler* ignorance. Over and above an account of *white* ignorance, such an account will have to consider the underlying logics of settler colonialism. For this, I turn to both Patrick Wolfe and Lorenzo Veracini. Wolfe argues that settler colonies operate under a “logic of elimination” whereby settlers attempt to “‘tame’ a variety of wildernesses, end up establishing independent nations, effectively repress, co-opt, and extinguish indigenous alterities, and productively manage ethnic diversity.”¹⁸ The logic of elimination that underlies settler colonialism aims not only at the elimination of Indigenous peoples but also to its very own extinction. Colonialism seeks to reproduce itself, whereas settler colonialism seeks to become invisible. Veracini writes: “Settler colonialism justifies its operation on the basis of the expectation of its future demise.”¹⁹ For this reason, settler colonialism, when successful, “effectively covers its tracks.”²⁰ As such, he notes that settler colonialism is “most recognizable when it was most imperfect—say, 1950s Kenya or 1970s Zimbabwe.”²¹ Settler colonialism aims for complete *settlement*, and, therefore, demands both the elimination of Indigenous peoples, and the ignorance of its own operations. The settler colonial project is always incomplete, however, given the survival and resurgence of Indigenous peoples.

Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang argue that the settler desire for land (“land/water/air/subterranean earth”) has the effect of both making Indigenous land into the “new home and source of capital” for the settler, but also of disrupting Indigenous relationships to land, which represents a profound epistemic, ontological, cosmological violence.²² Following Wolfe, they affirm that this violence is not a particular event but a *structure* that is reasserted each day of occupation. Land is remade and reconceptualized as property, and, as such, epistemological, ontological, and cosmological relationships to land other than as a property are “interred, indeed made pre-modern and backward.”²³ In other words, settler colonialism *requires* the delegitimization of Indigenous knowledges to function. To be colonized is to be discredited as a knower. Settler colonialism involves, to borrow Miranda Fricker’s term, epistemic injustice.²⁴

In considering how these logics map out in terms of the Canadian TRC, I turn to an analysis of how the logic of imperialism manifests in present-day Canada. In

light of the failure of classical imperialism to control Indigenous populations, Canadian imperialism becomes what Taiaiake Alfred and Jeff Cornthassel refer to as “shapeshifting colonialism,” which is more reactive and adaptive in its enforcement of “an ideology of control than creating specific structures.”²⁵ Adam Barker affirms that contemporary Canadian colonialism need not necessarily involve “the establishment of physical colonies, forced military suppression of peoples, [or] slave labor” but rather requires the creation of the *narratives* of the benevolent settler and the chaotic Indigenous people who “act as both a cover and a motivator for actions of control.”²⁶ The narrative of the benevolent settler informs a denial of ongoing settler colonialism (we’re so benevolent!), and the narrative of chaotic Indigenous peoples justifies a denial of past settler colonialism (they needed to be tamed!).

These settler narratives underlying settler ignorance complicate the TRC’s underlying epistemic claim that a collection of facts and testimonies can and will reconcile relationships between Native and non-Native Canadians. The epistemic presumption of the TRC is that there is simply the lack of information, that we just need more information about the evils of the residential school system, that the government and the general public are just *unaware* of the violence perpetrated against Native peoples in Canada. This epistemic story fails to consider the role of systemic settler denial in preventing personal testimonies from being heard by a settler audience in an unsettling way, that is, in a way that transforms self-conception of settler identity. There are mechanisms of ignorance that complicate the assumption that non-Native Canadians simply need to hear testimonies of residential school survivors in order to challenge their historical amnesia. Moreover, this preliminary consideration of settler ignorance reveals that the problem of settler denial is not *accidental*, but is integral to the settler colonial project. The denial of past and ongoing settler colonialism is not explainable in terms of a lack of access to resources for knowledge and information. It is, or appears to be, a willful ignorance. Over and above a lack of information, settler denial involves complicity in erasing and forgetting the inconvenient truths of past and ongoing settler colonialism.

Crucially, sustained settler denial in the face of the testimonies of residential school survivors relies upon an epistemology that delegitimizes Indigenous peoples as *knowers* in addition to the willful ignorance of Native tribes, treaties, and the violence of ongoing land dispossession. As such, an analysis of settler denial as an epistemology of ignorance exposes the pressing need for settlers to decolonize how they hear Native experiential testimonies of colonial violence as a call to fundamentally rethink and re-member their settler past and present. The epistemic injustice of settler colonialism cannot be so easily addressed through the TRC’s truth-telling events. Although the final report of the TRC names the establishment of residential schools as a policy of “cultural genocide,” that is, a policy that set out to destroy the political and social institutions of Aboriginal peoples in Canada, it is not a report that can bring about reconciliation within current dominant epistemologies that support settler denial.²⁷ Moreover, without an investigation into epistemic conditions of

the TRC, the Canadian government performs the settler colonial narrative of the “beneficent settler,” and that of a post-colonial Canada.

Residential school survivors cannot be properly heard as knowers outside of an account of Indigenous resurgence and self-determination. Unlike the limited TRC, meaningful reconciliation must support Indigenous self-determination. This criticism of the TRC’s limitations is further articulated by Taiaiake Alfred who contests that “without massive restitution, including land, financial transfers and other forms of assistance to compensate for past harms and continuing injustices committed against our peoples, reconciliation would permanently enshrine colonial injustices and is itself a further injustice.”²⁸ Without restitution and support of self-determination, apologies and truth commissions engage in a “politics of distraction” whereby “they shift the discourse away from restitution of indigenous homelands and resources and ground it instead in a political/legal rights-based process that plays into the affirmative repair policies of states and ultimately rewards colonial injustices.”²⁹

Genuine reconciliation must promote an awareness of indigenous histories, ongoing relationship to their homelands, and recognition of indigenous epistemologies. Moreover, reconciliation requires an investigation and transformation of who counts as a knower under settler colonialism. Without this transformation, the testimonies of residential school survivors will fall on deaf ears—that is, on settler ears.

NOTES

1. Kim Stanton, “Canada’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission: Settling the Past?” 1.
2. The last federally run facility, the Gordon Residential School in Saskatchewan closed in 1997.
3. “Statement of Apology to Former Students of Indian Residential Schools,” *Indigenous and Northern Affairs: Canada*.
4. Rosemary Nagy, “Truth, Reconciliation and Settler Denial: The Canada-South Africa Analogy,” 354.
5. The monetary repayment (\$10,000 for the first school year the survivor attended, and an additional \$3,000 for each subsequent school year) has been met with mixed reaction. The repayment process has been criticized by some students whose compensation claims were denied, while others report that the payment was important to them as tangible recognition of the systemic harms they suffered at the schools.
6. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*.
7. Teresa Godwin Phelps, *Shattered Voices: Language, Violence, and the Work of Truth Commissions*, 39.
8. Paulette Regan, *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*, 6.
9. The final report notes the amorphous definition of reconciliation throughout the truth-telling events, yet officially defines reconciliation as “an ongoing process of establishing and maintaining respectful relationships.”
10. Shannon Sullivan and Nancy Tuana, eds. *Race and Epistemologies of Ignorance*, 39.
11. Marilyn Frye, *The Politics of Reality*, 118.
12. Mills’s structural account extends both Lorraine Code’s claim about the general situatedness of knowers, and Sandra Harding’s

claim about the blind spots that arise from the situatedness of a knower's group identity.

13. Charles Mills, *The Racial Contract*, 18.
14. Ibid., 118-119.
15. Charles W. Mills, "White Ignorance," 47.
16. Mills, *The Racial Contract*, 25.
17. Sullivan and Tuana, *Race and Epistemologies of Ignorance*, 3.
18. Lorenzo Veracini, "Introducing," 3.
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid.
21. Ibid.
22. Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor," 5.
23. Ibid.
24. Miranda Fricker, *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*.
25. Gerald Taiaiake Alfred and Jeff Corntassel, "Being Indigenous: Resurgences against Contemporary Colonialism," 601.
26. Adam J. Barker, "The Contemporary Reality of Canadian Imperialism: Settler Colonialism and the Hybrid Colonial State," 326, 347.
27. *Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report 2015*, 3.
28. Gerald Taiaiake Alfred, "Restitution is the Real Pathway to Justice for Indigenous Peoples," 152.
29. Jeff Corntassel and Cindy Holder, "Who's Sorry Now? Government Apologies, Truth Commissions, and Indigenous Self-Determination in Australia, Canada, Guatemala, and Peru," 471.

REFERENCES

- Alfred, Gerald Taiaiake, and Jeff Corntassel. "Being Indigenous: Resurgences against Contemporary Colonialism." *Government and Opposition* 40 (2005): 597-614.
- Alfred, Gerald Taiaiake. "Restitution Is the Real Pathway to Justice for Indigenous Peoples." *Response, Responsibility, and Renewal: Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Journey*. Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2009.
- Barker, Adam J. "The Contemporary Reality of Canadian Imperialism: Settler Colonialism and the Hybrid Colonial State." *American Indian Quarterly* 33, no. 3 (Summer 2009): 325-52.
- Corntassel, Jeff, and Cindy Holder. "Who's Sorry Now? Government Apologies, Truth Commissions, and Indigenous Self-Determination in Australia, Canada, Guatemala, and Peru." *Human Rights Review* 9, no. 4 (2008): 465-89.
- Fricker, Miranda. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Frye, Marilyn. *The Politics of Reality*. New York: Crossing Press, 1983.
- Mills, Charles W. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.
- Mills, Charles W. "White Ignorance." *Race and Epistemologies of Ignorance*, eds. Shannon Sullivan and Nancy Tuana. New York: SUNY Press, 2007.
- Nagy, Rosemary. "Truth, Reconciliation and Settler Denial: The Canada-South Africa Analogy." *Human Rights Review* (2012): 349-67.
- Phelps, Teresa Godwin. *Shattered Voices: Language, Violence, and the Work of Truth Commissions*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Regan, Paulette. *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010.
- Stanton, Kim. "Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Commission: Settling the Past?" *The International Indigenous Policy Journal*. 2.3 (2011). Retrieved from: <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/iipj/vol2/iss3/2> doi: 10.18584/iipj.2011.2.3.

"Statement of Apology to former students of Indian Residential Schools." *Indigenous and Northern Affairs: Canada*, Government of Canada/Gouvernement du Canada. Last modified September 15, 2010. <https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100015644/1100100015649>

Sullivan, Shannon and Nancy Tuana, Eds. *Race and Epistemologies of Ignorance*. New York: State University of New York Press, 2007.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. <http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/index.php?p=890> (July 2015).

Tuck, Eve, and K.Wayne Yang. "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 1, no. 1 (2012): 1-40.

Veracini, Lorenzo. "Introducing." *Settler Colonial Studies* 1, no. 1 (2011).

Wolfe, Patrick. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* (2006): 387-409.

Tips for Teaching Native American Philosophy

Andrea Sullivan-Clarke

DEPAUW UNIVERSITY

Today, many institutions of higher education seek to increase diversity on their campuses. This can be accomplished in various ways. For example, some institutions may attempt to hire faculty from diverse social groups while others might seek out candidates who conduct diverse research. One difficulty, especially as regards Native American philosophy, is that there may not be enough scholars to meet the demand, and unless their presence in academia increases, students will not receive the benefit of these courses.

I have written this article with the intent of encouraging our academic allies to test the waters, to teach an article, topic, or concept connected with Native American philosophy. In this paper, I offer some tips for introducing Native American philosophy, and, below, I include some materials and topics that are accessible for incoming freshmen.¹ While I do think an entire course devoted to Native American thought offers distinct benefits—it raises awareness among nonnative and native students alike—I encourage those who are hesitant to create such a course to begin by including some Native American philosophy in a relevant section of their syllabus.

During the 2017-2018 academic year, I had the fortune of working at DePauw University as a Consortium for Faculty Diversity Postdoctoral Fellow.² My appointment was split 50/50 between research and teaching. My courses included an introduction to philosophy, a seminar on feminism and science, a lower-level introduction to Native American philosophy, and a course on ethical issues affecting Native Americans today. Each of these courses included at least one reading from Native American or indigenous thought, if not more, as part of the assigned material. My experience as a mixed-race Native American teaching at a predominantly white institution and the interactions with my students while teaching the above courses inspired the following suggestions for teaching Native American philosophy.

NATIVE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHERS (WHO?)

Generally speaking, “Native American philosophers” refers to individuals who are native and work in either Native American philosophy, traditional philosophy, or both. Even so, there are also nonnatives whose research includes Native American philosophy, and they sometimes go by the same term.³ I call attention to the variety of scholars working in Native American philosophy because I wish to dispel a worry that might prevent a nonnative educator from taking on the task of teaching Native American or indigenous materials: the question of authenticity. Others have addressed this topic elsewhere, and although some of the concerns are legitimate, I will not engage the issue here.⁴ Drawing from my experience as a mixed-race Native American instructor, I merely want to emphasize that being native is neither necessary nor sufficient for teaching Native American philosophy.

In the classroom, I have found that most students, both native and nonnative, are not fully acquainted with the historical relations between tribes and the U.S. government. For example, my students had a vague notion of the Trail of Tears and the actions of President Andrew Jackson, but they knew very little about events in contemporary history such as the American Indian Movement (AIM). For example, after viewing *A Good Day to Die*, one student remarked that he had never heard about the occupation of Alcatraz and the Bureau of Indian Affairs by members of AIM. This particular revelation prompted a class discussion on what subjects are included in a typical American history course and what topics are often omitted. The movie itself is a great way to talk about activism and the events in Native American history that impact contemporary attitudes toward Native Americans.

During my stint as a postdoc, I had the (mis?)fortune to teach while the protests against the construction of the North Dakota Access Pipeline (NoDAPL) were taking place, so none of my students doubted that Native Americans currently existed.⁵ However, what my students failed to understand about the pipeline “protests” was that it was not merely a local event. It has its roots in the historical, and often antagonistic, relations existing between the Lakota people, the dominant community, and the state/federal government. A particularly good movie based on the history of South Dakota is *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee*. Although it is a dramatic piece, it presents the native perspective in a respectful manner and provides a historic framework for understanding the motivations of the Lakota people today. Viewing it along with *A Good Day to Die* is very helpful for understanding the sacredness of land and its significance for the people living there. For example, it provides context for why Wounded Knee was selected as the locale of a contemporary standoff between the U.S. government and AIM in the early 1970s.

Many students are uninformed when it comes to what modern Native Americans look like or how they live. To introduce modern examples of Native Americans, I showed a couple of videos that featured young, native, college students, who were talking about what it is like being Native American living in a contemporary world. One is a short YouTube video titled “Who We Are,” and the other is

a segment of a PBS series called *In the Mix*, titled “Native American Teens: Who We Are.” These videos were useful because each focuses on the lives of their peers from across the United States. A couple of documentaries, which may be useful, are *Miss Navajo* and *Up Heartbreak Hill*. Each of these chronicles the lives of teens from the Navajo Nation, revealing what it is like to live on a reservation, the challenges these young people face, and how to negotiate traditional-contemporary life.

In addition, I found it useful to create discussion questions about the stereotypes perpetuated by Hollywood using the film *Reel Injun*. This documentary takes on the stereotypes/identities of Native Americans perpetuated by American filmmakers. It discusses some of the effects of images, like the noble savage and the plains warrior, even noting how some Native Americans have internalized these depictions.

Mixed-race native students, like their peers, may not know much beyond their own tribe’s history, and even that knowledge may come in degrees due to effects of governmental policies based on colonialism, such as the removal of tribes from their homelands and the forced assimilation into the dominant society.⁶ These particular shortcomings attest to the need to teach the diverse perspectives and histories of Native Americans. The information provided by the National Congress of American Indians is a good place to start, as is the history of the U.S Federal Indian Policies provided by David E. Wilkins.

DRAW ON LOCAL HISTORY

Another strategy I recommend for those teaching Native American philosophy is to research the history of the area where your institution is located. This serves a couple of purposes: 1) it acknowledges the history between Native Americans and the federal government, and 2) it will give you an idea of what your students know about those relations.

In other disciplines, there is a practice that native scholars use before presenting their research: they preface their talks by acknowledging the people who originally occupied the land prior to European contact. This isn’t a common practice in philosophy, but it can be quite useful for motivating class discussion. In preparation for my classes, I decided to research the people who lived in what is now the state of Indiana. When I asked my students if they knew the names of the local tribes, very few of my students, even those who grew up in the state, knew that Indiana was home to several tribes and that these tribes were also affected by the federal policy of Indian Removal.

Having grown up in Oklahoma, the names of some of the Indiana tribes, such as the Potawatomie, Miami, and Kickapoo, were familiar to me. Until I researched the area, however, I did not know that they, like my own tribe, underwent forced removal to Indian Territory. I suggest asking your students if they know the names of the people who occupied the area prior to colonization; further, ask if they know the tribes’ current whereabouts. It could be that the tribes no longer have a physical presence in the area. In the case of the tribes of Indiana, some resisted removal and were able to remain in the state. It may prove

useful to talk about how the separation of people affects group and personal identity. In addition, while researching I learned that the local tribes hold pow-wows and festivals that are open to the public.⁷ This may provide additional opportunities to learn outside of the classroom.

IS IT NATIVE AMERICAN, AMERICAN INDIAN, OR INDIGENOUS PHILOSOPHY?

While at DePauw University, I had several students and faculty ask me this question. As philosophers, we are very conscious about the terms we use, so it make sense to consider how we should refer to the philosophical thought of the people living in North America prior to European contact. Although there are no hard and fast rules regarding how to refer to the discipline, I think discussing this difficulty with your students can also be a useful introduction to key concepts such as necessary-sufficient conditions, pan-Indianism, and decolonialism. In addition, it is useful to consider the reasons for and against the use of each term.

Many scholars prefer “American Indian” because it appears in the treaties and other government documents of the United States; the justification for its use is that it serves in an official capacity. Some scholars, however, object to its use because Columbus failed to reach the Indies. Thus, the people cannot be properly called “Indians.” The term “Native American” is often considered more politically correct and is often included as a racial category on the census. Although this term may appear more appropriate by some, it has its share of critics as well. For example, individuals born in the United States have claim to the same title.⁸ An additional worry regarding the use of “Native American” is its association with being primitive or uncivilized. Critics charge that the term reifies a static, colonial conception of American Indians. The use of “indigenous” differs from the previous terms. While it is true that Native Americans are indigenous people, not all individuals who are indigenous are Native American. Thus, the term “indigenous” has a broader scope than either “American Indian” or “Native American.”

Given the difficulties, what’s a philosopher to do? In my dealings with nonnatives, I often use “Native American.” It is generally identifiable by my target audience, nonnative students, and it avoids confusion with course offerings on Indian philosophy.⁹ That said, I am careful to point out the use of “American Indian” to my students, and I make sure to note its use in our course materials. Confusion about which term to use also invites discussion about Pan-Indianism, which is the act of applying a single term, like “Native American,” to refer to a large number of distinct groups of native people. I caution my students against the uncritical use of such a term, noting that it may lead to dangerous generalizations. For example, as a category in medical research, it may result in negative consequences against a whole group of people, such as when researchers claim that Native Americans are predisposed to alcoholism.¹⁰ However, it can be useful as well, such as when tribes unite for a social event, like a pow-wow, or when they come together to protest government policies, such as AIM or the NoDAPL protests.

To counter the tendency to think that all Native Americans are alike, I ask my students to look over materials from the National Congress of American Indians. I highlight the number of recognized tribes in the U.S. (over 650!) and the areas in which they live. I ask them how the people of these tribes might differ from each other and how they might be similar. Some possible answers to these questions are particularly telling: there are many ways in which they differ from one another (language, customs, traditions, stories), but there may be only a few in which they are similar (survivors of genocide, resisters to contemporary oppression). It is important to note too that when asked, a Native American may not claim to be Native American or American Indian. Instead, he or she may respond by claiming membership in a particular tribe. For example, I often respond as being a member of the Muskogee Nation of Oklahoma when asked.

In the literature, Native American philosophers are often careful to note the particular tribe from which they draw support for their claims. For example, Brian Burkhart notes that the story of the Three Sisters used in his paper on Native American epistemology comes from the Iroquois Confederacy, and Lee Hester discusses excellence as conceived by the Choctaw Nation. While there may be similarities among the thought of the people of different tribes, the differences should not go unnoticed. Towards achieving this goal, I selected three creation stories belonging to different tribes across the United States.¹¹ I broke my class into groups, giving each group one story to read and present to the rest of the class. The creation stories of the Yuchi, Iroquois, and the Ute tribes not only demonstrate different beliefs, but these stories have elements of the three areas of Western philosophy: metaphysics, epistemology, and axiology.

The creation stories I assigned provided a useful foundation for understanding Native American philosophy. For example, my students identified an emphasis on relationships (to people, animals, nature and its many objects), they also discovered that there exists some knowledge that should/should not be known, and through these discoveries, they recognized the moral obligations and notions of the right/wrong way to act. For example, by requiring my students to convey these stories orally, the traditional method of transferring knowledge, I was able to emphasize the moral obligations for members of the tribe to learn and participate in the traditions so that they may pass this knowledge on to future generations.

Some students made the connections between the metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics, realizing that we might be unable to separate the questions into separate categories as easily as we do in Western philosophy. I challenged their discoveries by bringing up the fact that white anthropologists who conducted their research through the lens of colonialism recorded many of these creation stories as well as the tribal traditions, languages, and cultural practices. This point of critique invited other points of discourse about the need to collaborate with tribal elders and members as well as the need to establish respectful relations with people who were often treated as objects of study and not thought of as fully human.

A PITFALL TO AVOID

Native American identity, specifically who is and who is not native, is not clear. Like other racial groups, determining who is Native American is fraught with pitfalls, and recent stories in the media about questionable claims to heritage invite some to take on the role of identity police.¹² It is wise to tread lightly concerning identity when encountering faculty and students who identify as having native ancestry. For example, many mixed-race Native American individuals may not display the physical features commonly associated with the racial stereotypes that have been reified within the dominant society. When dealing with faculty or students who identify as Native American, responses that challenge their claim are not welcome. These types of responses include, but are not limited to,

- replying that they do not look native,
- asking what degree of native blood they have,¹³
- asking if they practice the culture or maintain ties to their community,
- and asking if they speak the language.

While such responses may be well-intentioned, they are often taken as a direct challenge to the individual's assertion of having native ancestry. Federal policies—such as removal, assimilation, and the withdrawal of federal recognition—have created a variety of native identities, and it should be noted that even in native communities, the above criteria is often used to establish a hierarchy of indianness. In some extreme cases, the result has been disenrollment from a tribe.¹⁴ As an academic, I have personally experienced these responses, and my mixed-race native students have also confided having similar responses to their claims as well.

It is also best not to single students out as representatives for an entire racial group. Some students have expressed to me that they struggle with living in both dominant and traditional societies. I understand their struggle. For example, I had several people who made assumptions about my knowledge with the NoDAPL based on my identity. They assumed I would know who to contact and how to help. Neither my areas of research, feminist philosophy of science and social epistemology, nor my being a member of a tribe in Oklahoma made me an authority on the NoDAPL.¹⁵ In that particular case, my decision to protest the project was based on personal beliefs and not professional. Students should feel comfortable in the classroom, and challenging their identity or having them reveal personal experience may detract from learning. The point of incorporating diversity into the class is to introduce students to material beyond the traditional canon; even native students may not be familiar with native philosophy.

I hope that the faculty who would like to introduce Native American philosophy into their courses find these tips useful and that they do not discourage them from incorporating diversity into their syllabi. Below, I have included resources along with descriptions to engage students in the classroom. In future issues of this newsletter, the Committee for Native

American and Indigenous Philosophers plans to introduce even more resources and materials. This article serves as a brief introduction to this endeavor, and I wish success for those who draw from them.

RESOURCES

On the Web:

National Congress of the American Indian, <http://www.ncai.org>

Movies:

A Good Day to Die

A documentary about the founding of the American Indian Movement and its connection to the historic place, Wounded Knee.

Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee

Based on the book by Dee Brown, the subject matter includes treaties, Indian removal, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the massacre at Wounded Knee, and the government motivations for locating the Lakota people on reservations.

Skins

Based on the novel by Adrian C. Louis, the subject matter includes living on the Pine Ridge Reservation, alcoholism, and the relations between native and nonnative people.

The Cherokee Word for Water

The story of how Wilma Mankiller and Charlie Soap organized the Cherokee community in rural Oklahoma in order to complete the Bell Waterline Project, providing running water to native homes. Subject matter includes distinctions between full bloods and mixed-blood communities, the Cherokee concept of "gadugi" (the traditional notion of working together), and the bureaucracy constraining improvements in native communities.

Up Heartbreak Hill

Documentary by Erica Scharf that chronicles the lives of two high school students from the Navajo Nation. Topics covered in the film include reservation life, growing up, career/college options, and what it means to be both native and modern. Additional resources provided on the Public Broadcasting website, <http://www.pbs.org/pov/upheartbreakhill/film-description/>.

Apache 8

Documents the true story of the first all-women wildland firefighter crew from the White Mountain Apache Tribe. Topics of interest include feminism, tribal traditions, poverty, and pride.

Reel Injun

Neil Diamond, Cree filmmaker, explores the treatment of Native American identity in Hollywood films. Discussion topics include stereotypes, appropriation, internalization, images like the noble savage, and personal identity. See <http://www.pbs.org/independentlens/films/reel-injun/> for additional resources.

Miss Navajo

Documentary about women and the preservation of the Navajo culture presented through the life of twenty-one-year-old Crystal Frazier as she trains for the title. Topics include contrasting with Miss USA pageants, preservation (and loss) of tribal languages, living on a reservation, and Navajo values.

Videos:

"We Are Still Here," A Documentary on Today's Young Native Americans by Director Emma Li. 2012, Available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HnPKzZzSCIM>.

"Indigenous Knowledge and Western Science: Dr. G. Cajete." An academic talk comparing/contrasting indigenous knowledge and Western science. His talk was given at the Banff Centre as part of the Indigenous Knowledge and Western Science: Contrasts and Similarities event, January 14, 2015. See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nFeNIOglbwz>.

In the Mix, *Native American Teens: Who We Are*. Originally broadcast as a segment of the PBS weekly television series for teens, *In the Mix*, in 2006. Teenaged Native Americans share stories about their lives and concerns with rap star and film actor Lilefoot (G. Paul Davis). On DVD Format. See http://www.pbs.org/inthemix/shows/show_nativeamericanteens.html.

Readings:

Government Relations

Wilkins, David E. *American Indian Politics and the American Political System*, 3rd ed. The Spectrum Series: Race and Ethnicity in National and Global Politics. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011.

Cultural Appropriation

Rogers, Richard A. "From Cultural Exchange to Transculturation: A Review and Reconceptualization of Cultural Appropriation." *Communication Theory* 16: 4 (2006): 474–503. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2006.00277.x.

Root, Deborah. "White Indians': Appropriation and the Politics of Display." In *Borrowed Power: Essays on Cultural Appropriation*, edited by Bruce H. Ziff and Pratima V Rao, 225–33. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1997.

Epistemology

Burkhart, Brian Yazzie. "What Coyote and Thales Can Teach Us." In *American Indian Thought: Philosophical Essays*, edited by Anne Waters, 15–26. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2004.

Feminism

Grey, Sam. 2004. "Decolonising Feminism: Aboriginal Women and the Global 'Sisterhood'" *Enweyin: The Way We Speak* Vol. VIII, <http://works.bepress.com/samgrey/13/>

Moreton-Robinson, Aileen. *Talkin' Up to the White Woman: Aboriginal Women and Feminism*. St. Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press, 2000.

Creation Stories

Iroquois Creation Story, <http://coursesite.uhcl.edu/HS/Whitec/texts/Amerind/origins/AmindorsIroquois.htm>

Ute Creation Story, <https://www.southernute-nsn.gov/history/creation-story/>

Yuchi Creation Story, <http://ufdc.ufl.edu/AA00011679/00001>

Native Excellence

Hester, Lee. "Choctaw Conceptions of the Excellence of the Self, with Implications for Education." In *American Indian Thought: Philosophical Essays*, edited by Anne Waters, 182–87. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2004.

Science

Brugge, Doug, and Mariam Missaghian. "Protecting the Navajo People through Tribal Regulation of Research." *Science and Engineering Ethics* 12, no. 3 (2006): 491–507.

Racial Identity

Weaver, Hilary N. 2001. "Indigenous Identity: What Is It and Who Really Has It?" *American Indian Quarterly* 25: 2 (2001): 240–55.

Environment

Lewis, David Rich. 1995. "Native Americans and the Environment: A Survey of Twentieth-Century Issues." *American Indian Quarterly* 19: 3 (2005): 423–50.

Teaching Native Studies Courses

Lee, Erica Violet, "Indigenizing the Academy" without Indigenous people: who can't teach our stories?," *Moontime Warrior*, November 9, 2015. <https://moontimewarrior.com/2015/11/09/who-can-teach-indigenous-philosophy/>.

NOTES

1. This list is by no means complete, but it is offered as a starting point for future study. In future newsletters, the Committee for Native American and Indigenous Philosophers will provide more resources and topics; my remarks are only the first steps of the journey.
2. See <http://www.gettysburg.edu/about/offices/provost/cfd/index.dot> for more information about this program.
3. Arguments can be made for who should be teaching Native American philosophy, but that is not the point of this article.
4. In fact the question of who should teach native studies and how it should be taught is a great topic to discuss in a philosophy course. I have added only some readings in the resources list.
5. I have heard that some students may believe that Native Americans were an historical group that is no longer present today. I did not encounter this.
6. One student confided to me that they were not taught the history or traditions of their tribe because their grandparents believed them to not be Indian enough to teach them. They took my class wanting to learn what they could about an important part of their self identity.
7. You may want to check out the following website to see if there are any events in your area: <http://www.powwows.com>.

8. In fact, a non-native makes this claim in a comedic piece on the use of redskin as a professional team name, created by the Daily Show with Jon Stewart. See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=loK2DRBnk24>.
9. I have had students from Asia ask about my use of Indian Country and American Indian. For them, it can be a source of confusion.
10. Even when refuted, the stereotypes often stick around. See <http://opa.ahsc.arizona.edu/newsroom/news/2016/stereotypes-about-native-americans-and-alcohol-debunked-ua-study>.
11. Looking back, I realized that I should have selected even more.
12. Examples like Senator Warren, see <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2012/05/is-elizabeth-warren-native-american-or-what/257415/>, or Professor Andrea Smith, see <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2012/05/is-elizabeth-warren-native-american-or-what/257415/>, come to mind.
13. Referred to as the Certificate of Degree of Indian Blood or CDIB, this card is issued by the U.S. Government and states the amount of Indian blood of the individual. There are too many problems associated with the CDIB and how the degree of Indian blood is determined to mention here. You may want to start by reading this: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED280661>.
14. See <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/18/magazine/who-decides-who-counts-as-native-american.html?mcubz=1&r=0>.
15. While many native scholars are happy to share their work, one should also note that, like other philosophers of color, some may be asked to do many tasks (native project, bring a speaker, etc.) simply because of their identity. I encourage those seeking to teach to go out and do some research, just as you would when developing a new course.

Syllabus for Philosophy 336 Metaphysics: Native American Philosophy

Alejandro Santana
UNIVERSITY OF PORTLAND

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

It is truly an honor to have my course syllabus included in this edition of the newsletter. This syllabus is somewhat unusual, so for the sake of making its content and structure clear, some preliminary remarks are in order. To begin with, a brief remark about myself. I am a Mexican-American philosopher and a first-generation son of Mexican immigrants. I do not claim any kind of status as an indigenous person, but my Mexican ancestry inspires me to explore this area of my cultural heritage. The course I teach is not perfect, nor do I teach it perfectly. I teach it in an attempt to genuinely understand myself and engage in my own self-decolonization. I submit this syllabus with profound humility, respect, and gratitude for those who have struggled to study and teach in this area for longer than I have.

Next, a remark about my audience. I teach at a private liberal arts institution with a predominantly white, upper-middle class to wealthy student body. However, there is a sizable Latinx minority, consisting largely of Mexican and Central Americans. There is a very small minority of American Indian students; to my knowledge, I have had the privilege of teaching only one. This course is for everyone, but it has a particular interest in helping Latinx and native students either begin or continue their own process of self-

discovery and self-decolonization. This is also a junior-level metaphysics course, which is one of a distribution of college core courses that every student with a major in the arts and sciences is required to take. The course is therefore pitched to a general audience, usually nonmajors, who have little to no background in metaphysics and perhaps even less in the history and traditions of indigenous peoples.

A few remarks about the course name and description. As I was initially constructing this course (in the spring and summer of 2011), I wrestled with this for some time before I finally decided how to proceed. There is a good deal more to say about this, but overall, the decision was grounded in four considerations: (1) I am the only one in the department who teaches in this area, and (2) there is room in my teaching schedule for only one course like this.

I also have (3) aspirations to teach at least two versions of this course. The first version is a course devoted strictly to the Mexica and the Maya. The second version will be devoted to contemporary North American Indian thought. The syllabus below (for a summer session) is an amalgamation of the two, as I am slowly working now to develop the second version. I should point out that the course description in the syllabus states that the course “explores Native American philosophy with particular emphasis on Mexico *or* the continental U.S.” The disjunctive nature of this statement and its emphasis is intentional so that the description makes clear that the course is *not* intended to represent nations across the entire western hemisphere. Instead, the description is intended to narrow the scope of the course but be flexible enough to encompass the future versions I have in mind as well as versions I undertake far into the future. So the strategy that I employed is to begin teaching the course emphasizing the indigenous traditions with which I am most familiar, and then as I expand my competence in other traditions, I would slowly add content modules to the course until I ultimately ended up with enough material for a new version.

There were also (4) institutional dynamics in play as I was framing the course. To be clear, my department has been totally supportive of me and this course. My university has also been very supportive. There was, however, one member of the upper administration who, at the time I was getting this course approved, had idiosyncratic views on what metaphysics is and should be. Consequently, care had to be taken to make this course recognizable as a “genuine” metaphysics course, which would thereby forestall any potential criticism about the course content. As a result, Western philosophical sources had to be included, but I added sources that would serve to either complement or serve as useful contrasts to the indigenous outlooks we were considering. This, however, put further constraints on what could be covered in the course, which already had to satisfy the learning objectives placed on all metaphysics courses offered at my university. Ultimately, the course name and description seemed to be the best fit for the future plans I have for the course and the institutional context within which it was constructed. This institutional dynamic has changed over the years, as the aforementioned administrator has left the university and the upper administration has more broadly come

to recognize the vital importance of diversity in the core curriculum. However, the course still reflects the distortive effects of its initial construction, and it is probably a good time to revisit the course title, description, and schedule.

I should add that the course title and description is discussed with the students at the beginning of the class so that students are very much aware of the kind of course for which they signed up. On the very first day of lecture, I make three things clear to the students. First, I make it clear that indigenous traditions and philosophical outlooks are far too broad and diverse to be covered adequately in one course. I have therefore opted to focus the course on a few traditions, because they are the ones I know best and could cover well in their proper context. Second, I make it clear that there are many traditions about which I am as yet unfamiliar (those in South America, for example) and that is why they are not included. Third, I use the previous point to emphasize that we (the students and I) are all outsiders and that the guiding principle for the course would be to listen—listen to the voices of a people from a different time, place, and cultural context; listen with genuine sensitivity, openness, and a desire to understand; and listen without judgment, arrogance, condemnation, or romanticism. So, in effect, I use the course title and description as a learning tool to emphasize both my own limitations and the highly particularized nature of studying in this area, which has the derivative effect of disabusing students of their tendency to inappropriately universalize over indigenous peoples and their traditions.

Another important point of clarification has to do with the fact that the course schedule makes frequent reference to course notes that I have prepared for the students. The course notes are an amalgam of notes I have taken from several books. Fundamentally, they are notes from Michael Coe's *Mexico: From the Olmecs to the Aztecs*, with notes included from Richard Townsend's *The Aztecs* and David Carrasco's *Daily Life of the Aztecs*. They also include some excerpts from Bernal Diaz del Castillo's *Conquest of New Spain* and Bernardino de Sahagún's *General History of the Things of New Spain*. When we discuss Miguel León-Portilla's *Aztec Thought and Culture*, I also include several interpretive updates from Jim Maffie's *Aztec Philosophy: Understanding a World in Motion*. For the Maya, I use Robert Sharer's work in *Daily Life in Maya Civilization* and some of his work in *The Ancient Maya*. I also use León-Portilla's *Time and Reality in the Thought of the Maya* as well as parts of Diego de Landa's *Relación de las Cosas de Yucatán*. I use other texts; however, the abovementioned texts are used the most.

I put all of these notes together in Power Point lectures that include photos and videos I took while touring multiple museums and indigenous archeological sites in Mexico and Guatemala as well as photos gleaned from reliable online sources. I do this to help students become familiar with the places and peoples that are frequently referred to in class as well as to help students understand the amazing cultural legacy of the Mesoamerican indigenous peoples on which the course is focused. This is neither a tourist nor voyeuristic approach to teaching. Moreover, this is not intended to be an exercise in objectification. Rather, it is

intended to be a dynamic, multi-modal, and immersive learning experience for students who usually know little to nothing about the history and culture of the people whose philosophical perspectives they will be studying. My course notes are intended to help bootstrap students in this historical and cultural context before we begin the process of understanding the details of the overall philosophical outlook. This also helps prevent the students' tendency to either barbarize, primitivize, romanticize, or anachronize indigenous peoples.

Because this is a philosophy class, there is no time to read all of these books on which I have taken notes, so I blend them in course notes, along with the multiple visual aids mentioned above, to provide the necessary context for the philosophical exploration that happens later. I then supplement all of this by requiring students to watch documentaries (almost all of which are available on YouTube) that help fill in gaps and raise awareness about issues that confront Native Americans to this day. The documentaries currently emphasize either more historical context or U.S. foreign policy in Latin America. The latter is done primarily to help students understand the sheer scale and violence of U.S. imperialism, which usually comes as a surprise to a majority of them. It is a regrettable—but, unfortunately, not surprising—fact that many of my students are confronted with issues of Western imperialism, colonialism, and genocide for the first time in my course. No documentary is perfect, but again, I use the imperfection as a teaching tool, as we spend class time discussing inaccuracies, distortions, exaggerations, or filling in overlooked details. One might think that this historical and cultural context should be provided in a different class, but, unfortunately, there is no such class at my university. Several history courses offered at my university cover various facets of this context, but many of the students who take my course have not taken any of them, and they report that my course is their first exposure. I have therefore determined that my course has to provide this context.

Overall, my sincere hope is to teach a good course in a good way—one that respects the indigenous peoples on which we focus, while at the same time bearing in mind good pedagogical practice, the broader institutional context, and my own limitations as a scholar and teacher. I would be happy and honored to receive constructive advice on how to improve it.

PHILOSOPHY 336 METAPHYSICS: NATIVE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY

INSTRUCTOR AND COURSE INFORMATION

Instructor: Dr. Alejandro Santana

Office, office phone, and email: BC 143, (503) 943-7248, santana@up.edu

Office hours: TR 1100–1230; and by appointment

Course section, reference #, time, days, and location: A, 6219, 1240–1420, MTWR, Franz 217

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course explores Native American philosophy with particular emphasis on Mexico or the continental U.S. Typically, the course focuses on metaphysical aspects of Native American thought such as the nature of reality, time, space, truth, freedom, the self, and the relation between the self and the world. The course will also draw comparisons to the Western philosophical tradition on these issues.

This course satisfies the College metaphysics requirement. It is therefore intended to enable and encourage students to critically engage certain basic questions of human existence: Who am I? Who am I becoming? Why am I here? Who or what is God? How can one relate to God? Because the metaphysical problems explored in Native American philosophy bear directly on such questions as meaning or purpose of existence, and the existence or nature of a deity, Native American Philosophy is included among the courses meeting the College metaphysics requirement.

COURSE GOALS

The course aims to (1) familiarize students with important metaphysical perspectives and concepts in Native American philosophy; (2) develop students' abilities to write and think clearly about some of the major metaphysical theories and debates in this area; (3) encourage students to integrate philosophical perspectives with other aspects of their lives; (4) broaden student understanding of the contributions of non-Western traditions to philosophical inquiry; (5) prepare students for more advanced study in this area.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

The course aims to enable the student to:

1. Comprehend the major perspectives, concepts, and discussions in Native American philosophy;
2. Understand how topics in Native American philosophy are related to problems in Western metaphysics;
3. Read Native American philosophy texts (in translation) in a competent manner;
4. Write technically competent essays that display a critical awareness of issues in metaphysics;

5. Express and discuss philosophical ideas;
6. Integrate readings and discussions with other aspects of the student's intellectual and personal life;
7. To aid students in developing a multicultural perspective in philosophy.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA (percentage of final grade):

1. Pop Quizzes (10 pts. ea.; **at least** 10 pts. possible; 20% of grade).
2. 2 Exams (30 pts. ea.; 60 pts. possible; 20% of grade).
3. 4 Homework Assignments (10 pts. ea.; 40 pts. possible; 20 % of grade).
4. 1 Reflection Paper (50 pts. ea.; 50 pts. possible; 20% of grade).
5. Attendance (1 pt. for each ½ class attended; 22 pts. possible; 10% of grade).
6. **Active** class participation: **consistent participation** in class discussions and activities; asking questions; after-class visits; office hour visits; or email correspondence.

REQUIRED TEXTS

1. Miguel León-Portilla, *Aztec Thought and Culture*.
2. Electronic Reading materials on the course Moodle page.
3. Course Notes on the course Moodle page.

OPTIONAL READING

(Library On-Shelf Course Reserves)

1. Bernardino de Sahagún, *General History of the Things of New Spain: Florentine Codex*, Books 1–13.
2. David Carrasco, *Daily Life of the Aztecs*.
3. Robert Sharer, *Daily Life in Maya Civilization*.

COURSE SCHEDULE

Week 1

- M:** Introduction, syllabus, quizzes, homework assignments, papers, and icebreaker.
- Discussion: What do you know about the Aztecs and Maya? What do you know about metaphysics? How relevant is metaphysics in your everyday life?
 - Course Notes:
 - Approach to Native American Thought.

T: Lecture and Discussion on the following:

- Course Notes:
 - Mesoamerican history and culture I (Archaic and Pre-classic).
 - Mesoamerican history and culture II (Classic and Post-classic).
 - Aztec history and culture I (The Rise and Fall of the Aztec Empire).

W: Lecture and Discussion on the following:

- Course Notes:
 - Aztec history and culture II (Empire, Social Organization, and Becoming an Aztec).
 - Aztec history and culture III (War and Human Sacrifice).
 - Discussion: What is your reaction to Aztec Human Sacrifice? Regarding war, violence, human sacrifice, or all three, what similarities (if any) do you notice with the world in which you live?

R: Lecture and Discussion on the following:

- *Aztec Thought and Culture (AT&C):*
 - The Birth of Philosophy among the Nahuas.
- Electronic Reading:
 - Santana, "Did the Aztecs Do Philosophy?"
- Discussion: Did the Aztecs *do* philosophy? What *is* philosophy? Why *do* philosophy, more specifically, why *do* metaphysics?
- **Homework Assignment 1 Due**

Week 2

M: Lecture and Discussion on the following:

- AT&C:
 - The Pre-Columbian Concept of the Universe.
- Discussion:
 1. How do you see *yourself* in *the world*? More specifically, what features (e.g., laws of physics, mathematics, divine or primordial forces, social relations, religion, race, gender, ethnicity, age, market forces, media, social media, advertising, politics, technology, etc.) of the world are active and affecting your everyday life?

2. If your view of the world was like a screen of a video game (e.g., with background and indicators of ammunition, gas, maps, lives you have, etc.) what features of the world described in question 1 (above) would your video screen include?

T: Lecture and Discussion on the following:

- AT&C:
 - Metaphysical and Theological Ideas of the Nahuas.
 - The Approach to Man in Nahuatl Thought.

W: Lecture and Discussion on the following:

- Electronic Reading:
 - Maffie, "Aztec Philosophy."
- Discussion: Is there fundamentally *one* thing in this world or *many*? Is reality fundamentally *fixed*, *changing*, or *both*?

R: Lecture and Discussion on the following:

- Electronic Reading:
 - Benjamin, "Ideas of Time in the History of Philosophy."
- Discussion: How do you see *yourself* in time? If you were to draw your past, present, and future with three circles, what would it look like?
- **Homework Assignment 2 Due**

Week 3

M: **Memorial Day Vacation: No class!**

T: Lecture and Discussion on the following:

- Electronic Reading:
 - Rescher, *Process Metaphysics* Ch. 2, "Basic Ideas"
 - Gingerich, "Heidegger and the Aztecs: The Poetics of Knowing in Pre-Hispanic Nahuatl Poetry."
- Discussion: What is it *to be a thing*? What *explains* the existence of a thing (Matter? Energy? Nothing?)?
- Discussion: What is truth? Is there a relationship between truth and aesthetic concepts like beauty, harmony, or artistic expression?

W: Lecture and Discussion of the following:

- Electronic Reading:
 - Aristotle, *De Anima* (Bk. II, Chs. 1 – 3) and *Politics* (Bk. I, Chs. 1 – 6).
- Discussion: Besides rationality, in what *other* ways does the metaphysical rubber hit the road in your experience of the world? More specifically, in what *other* ways do metaphysical concepts affect how people are seen and treated?

R: Lecture and Discussion of the following:

- Electronic Reading:
 - Lukes, "Some Problems about Rationality."
- Discussion: What beliefs strike you to be *irrational*? Why? Is there a *universal* rationality?

Week 4

M: Exam 1 and Lecture and Discussion on the following:

- Course Notes:
 - Maya history and culture I (Timeline of Maya Civilization).

T: Lecture and Discussion of the following:

- Course Notes:
 - Maya history and culture II (Economy, Society, and Government).
 - Maya history and culture III (Daily Life of the Maya).

W: Lecture and Discussion of the following:

- Course Notes:
 - Maya history and culture IV (Cosmology and Religion).
 - Maya history and culture V (Cosmology and Religion).
- Discussion: Why is suffering and sacrifice spiritually enhancing or redemptive?

R: Lecture and Video:

- Course Notes:
 - Maya history and culture VI (Maya mathematics).
 - Maya history and culture VII (Maya Writing)

- Video (*Nova: Cracking the Maya Code*). (**Food Provided: Guacamole, Salsa de Nopales y Camarones, Pico de Gallo, sweetened popped amaranth, and Chía Fresca!**)
- **Homework Assignment 3 Due**

Week 5

M: Lecture and Discussion of the following:

- Course Notes
 - The Maya Concern with Chronology.
- Video (*Nova: The Fabric of the Cosmos – The Illusion of Time*)

T: Lecture and Discussion of the following:

- Electronic Reading.
 - Ohiyesa (Eastman), Selections from *The Soul of the Indian*.

W: Lecture and Discussion of the following:

- Electronic Reading.
 - Deloria, Jr., "Philosophy and the Tribal Peoples."
 - Deloria Jr., *God is Red*, Chs. 5 and 6.

R: Lecture and Discussion of the following:

- Electronic Reading.
 - Burkhart, "What Coyote and Thales Can Teach Us"
 - Burkhart, "The Physics of Spirit."
- **Reflection Paper Due**

Week 6

M: Lecture and Discussion of the following:

- Electronic Reading.
 - Waters, "Language Matters: Non-discrete Nonbinary Dualism."
 - Waters, "Ontology of Identity and Interstitial Being."

T: Lecture and Discussion of the following:

- Electronic Reading.
- Cordova, "Approaches to Native American Philosophy."
- Cordova, "Ethics: The We and the I."
- Cordova, Excerpts from *How It Is*.

W: Lecture and Discussion of the following:

- Electronic Reading.
 - Norton-Smith, *Dance of Person and Place*, An Overview
 - Cajete, *Native Science*, Ch. 2
- **Homework Assignment 4 Due**

R: Lecture and Discussion of the following:

- Course catch-up.
- Discussion: What do you know about the Aztecs and Maya? What do you know about metaphysics? How relevant is metaphysics in your everyday life?
- **Reflection Paper Re-Writes Due; All Extra Credit Due**
- **Exam 2**

POP QUIZZES

1. Format: True/false, multiple-choice, short-answer questions
2. Each quiz will be worth a total of **10 pts**.
3. Questions will be drawn from the **text** and/or **notes** that are scheduled to be covered for that day.
 - a. **The text and/or notes should be read carefully, analyzed, and studied prior to the day they are scheduled to be covered!**
4. In regards to the **texts**, focus on the following things:
 - a. The main moves the author makes in the text.
 - b. The main conclusions the author draws.
 - c. The main lines of evidence, in detail, that the author uses to draw his/her main conclusions.
5. In regards to the **notes**, focus on the first **three** layers of indentation.

HOMEWORK

- I. Due: See Course Schedule
- II. Assignment
 1. On any one of the videos below, write a **minimum** two-page **summary** and **philosophical reflection** as follows.
 - a. Page 1: Summarize the main elements of the video.
 - b. Page 2: Philosophical reflection, making **at least two connections** to the course material.
 1. This is **NOT a movie review**; it is a chance for you to **demonstrate your deep philosophical reflection** about the course material or a philosophical idea.
 2. *Acceptable*: "The video reminded me of León-Portilla's *Aztec Thought and Culture* in the following ways..." or "The video reminded me of course reading x in the following ways ..." "The video made me think more deeply about philosophical topic x in the following ways..."
 3. *Unacceptable*: "I thought the video was interesting entertaining..." or "I thought the video was boring..." or "I really liked the video, but the graphics were out of date ..."

III. Videos (**To be done in this order**).

1. *When Worlds Collide: The Untold Story of the Americas after Columbus*
2. *Engineering an Empire: The Aztecs*
3. *Engineering an Empire: The Maya*
4. *The Secret Genocide Funded by the USA* and Bill Moyers, *The Secret Government*.

EXTRA CREDIT

- I. Complete the **minimum requirements** for an extra Homework Assignment as outlined above for the following videos: (**2 pts. ea.; extra credit awarded to pop quiz grade**)
 1. *The Five Suns: A Sacred History of Mexico*.
 2. *Nova: Lost King of the Maya (on the Maya city of Copan, featuring Robert Sharer)*
 3. *Nova: The Fabric of the Cosmos – What Is Space?*

4. *Nova: The Fabric of the Cosmos – Quantum Leap*
5. *Nova: Ghosts of Machu Picchu*
6. *A Place Called Chiapas* (on the Zapatista Movement in Chiapas, Mexico)
7. National Geographic: *America before Columbus* (on the interaction between biological, agricultural, and ecological factors that led to and influenced the European colonization of the Americas).
8. *The Empire Files: Native American Genocide with Roxane Dunbar-Ortiz.*
9. *We Shall Remain, any* of the five parts (available in the library).
10. *Race – The Power of an Illusion, any* of the three episodes (available on DVD in the Clark Library: GN269 .R33 2003b)

REFLECTION PAPERS

Assignment Structure

(Each part is worth 10 points and must be at least one page)

Part I: State and explain, *in detail and with proper citation*, the major issues, perspectives, and/or concepts in the course material on which you would like to reflect.

Part II: Regarding the material in Part I, explain how it relates to topics in Western metaphysics.

Part III: Regarding the material in Part I, explain (a) how it relates to your life and (b) how you personally react to it.

Part IV: Regarding the material in Part I, (a) take a position on it and (b) give reasons for your position.

Part V: (a) Raise and (b) address an objection to your view. **Be sure to argue on behalf of the objection and give a new response of your own!**

EXAM STUDY GUIDES

Scantron; 24 T/F, M-C; and 2 out of 3 S-A

All exam questions will be drawn only from the course notes. All the material below *could* be used in T/F, M-C questions. *Only* the items marked with an * will be used for short-answer questions.

Exam 1 Study Guide – TBD

Exam 2 Study Guide – TBD

REFERENCES

- Aristotle. *De Anima*. In *Readings in Ancient Greek Philosophy*, 4th ed., edited by S. Marc Cohen, Patricia Curd, and C. D. C. Reeve. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2011.
- Aristotle. *Politics*. Translated by C. D. C. Reeve. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1998.
- Benjamin, A. Cornelius. "Ideas of Time in the History of Philosophy." In *The Voices of Time: A Cooperative Survey of Man's Views of Time as Expressed by the Sciences and by the Humanities*, 2nd ed., edited by J. T. Fraser, 3–30. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1981.
- Burkhardt, Brian Yazzie. "What Coyote and Thales can Teach Us: An Outline of American Indian Epistemology." In *American Indian Thought: Philosophical Essays*, 1st ed., edited by Anne Waters, 15–26. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- Cajete, Gregory. *Native Science: Natural Laws of Interdependence*. Santa Fe, NM: Clear Light Publishers, 2000.
- Carrasco, David, with Scott Sessions. *Daily Life of the Aztecs: People of the Sun and Earth*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, 2008.
- Coe, Michael. *Mexico: From the Olmecs to the Aztecs*, 7th ed. London: Thames & Hudson, 2013.
- Cordova, V. F. "Approaches to Native American Philosophy." In *American Indian Thought: Philosophical Essays*, 1st ed., edited by Anne Waters, 27–33. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- Cordova, V. F. "Ethics: The We and the I." In *American Indian Thought: Philosophical Essays*, 1st ed., edited by Anne Waters, 173–81. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- de Landa, Diego. *Yucatan Before and After the Conquest*, Translated by William Gates. New York: Dover Publications, 2012 (revised edition).
- de Sahagún, Bernardino. *Florentine Codex: General History of the Things of New Spain*. Translated by Charles E. Dibble and Arthur J. O. Anderson. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1969.
- Deloria, Jr., Vine. "Philosophy and the Tribal Peoples." In *American Indian Thought: Philosophical Essays*, 1st ed., edited by Anne Waters, 3–11. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- . *God is Red*. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1973.
- Diaz Del Castillo, Bernal. *Conquest of New Spain*, translated by John M. Cohen. London: Penguin Books, 1963.
- Fitzgerald, Michael Oren, ed. *The Essential Charles Eastman (Ohiyesa): Light on the Indian World*. Bloomington, IN: World Wisdom, 2007.
- Gingerich, Willard. "Heidegger and the Aztecs: The Poetics of Knowing in Pre-Hispanic Nahuatl Poetry." In *Recovering the Word: Essays in Native American Literature*, edited by Brian Swann and Arnold Krupat, 85–112. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.
- León-Portilla, Miguel. *Aztec Thought and Culture: A Study of the Ancient Nahuatl Mind*, translated by Jack Emory Davis. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1990.
- . *Time and Reality in the Thought of the Maya*, translated by Charles L. Boilés and Fernando Horcasitas. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988.
- Lukes, Steven. "Some Problems of Rationality." In *Rationality*, edited by Bryan Wilson, 194–213. Great Britain: Basil Blackwell, 1970.
- Maffie, James. *Aztec Philosophy: Understanding a World in Motion*. Boulder, Colorado: University Press of Colorado, 2014.
- . "Aztec Philosophy." In *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. University of Tennessee at Martin, 1995. <http://www.iep.utm.edu/aztec/>.
- Rescher, Nicholas. *Process Metaphysics: An Introduction to Process Philosophy*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1996.
- Santana, Alejandro. "Did the Aztecs Do Philosophy?" *APA Newsletter on Hispanic/Latino Issues in Philosophy* 8, no. 1 (2008).
- Sharer, Robert J. *Daily Life in Maya Civilization*, 2nd ed. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2009.
- Sharer, Robert J., and Loa P. Traxler. *The Ancient Maya*, 6th ed. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1994.
- Townsend, Richard F. *The Aztecs*, 3rd ed. London: Thames & Hudson, 2009.

Waters, Anne, Ed. *American Indian Thought: Philosophical Essays*, 1st ed. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2004.

———. "Language Matters: Nondiscrete Nonbinary Dualism." *APA Newsletter on American Indians in Philosophy* 1, no. 2 (2001).

———. "Ontology of Identity and Interstitial Being." *APA Newsletter on American Indians in Philosophy*, no. 2 (2001).

Documentaries

A Place Called Chiapas. Directed by Nettie Wild. 1998.

American Experience: We Shall Remain. Written by Dustinn Craig, Rick Burns, Sarah Colt, and Mark Zwonitzer. 2009.

Engineering an Empire: The Maya. Directed by Mark Cannon. 2005–2006.

National Geographic: America before Columbus. Written and Directed by Christina Trebbi and Fabian Wienke. 2009.

Nova: Cracking the Maya Code. Written and Directed by David Lebrun. 2008.

Nova: Ghosts of Machu Picchu. Produced by Own Palmquist and Ricardo Preve. 2014.

Nova: Lost King of the Maya. Produced by Gary Glassman. 2001.

Nova: The Fabric of the Cosmos. Hosted by Brian Greene. 2011.

Race: The Power of an Illusion. Produced by Larry Adelman. 2003.

The Empire Files with Abby Martin: Native American Genocide with Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz. Created and Directed by Abby Martin.

The Five Suns: A Sacred History of Mexico. Produced and Directed by Patricia Amlin. 1996.

The Secret Genocide Funded by the US. Journeyman Pictures. 1999. <https://www.journeyman.tv/film/635/an-american-genocide>.

The Secret Government: The Constitution in Crisis. Bill Moyers. <http://billmoyers.com/content/secret-government-constitution-crisis/>. 1987.

When Worlds Collide. Written and Hosted by Rubén Martínez. 2011.