

where we are now

[Peter] (0:02 - 1:52)

Hi there, Steve.

[Steve] How are you, Peter?

[Peter] Good, doing well. Beautiful day, feeling good. You look good.

[Steve] Trying to stay on top of it.

I'd say you're succeeding. Well, today's topic is about how the theme of domination that infuses our work has become a meme, I guess, sort of a slogan, rather than the heading for a body of work. And so there's all kinds of people who are attacking domination, quote unquote, and finding domination in all kinds of places and decrying it without necessarily doing anything deeper than that, not based on anything other than a kind of a surface grasp, if you can even call it a grasp, of a phenomenon that, as you and I have explained, is millennia old and built into civilizational structures and so on and so forth. And it's what people end up talking about seems to, I think, both of us as it's sort of the end of the conversation, rather than the beginning.

And I think that that's not really useful. In fact, I think it's actually a little dangerous to state conclusions and not really understand how to get to those conclusions or what lies before those conclusions. And there are books out with, you know, the word domination and title that really seem fairly beside the point or shallow when you try to dig into them.

[Steve] (1:54 - 5:03)

Well, I think that I would, I see it a little differently. I think that the use of domination, specifically, it might be a little bit more common, but it's not something that most people are very comfortable with. They prefer to use the word such as dominant, the dominant society, and that sort of thing.

But the theme that we have been working on for a while, and by the way, this goes back decades, because when I look at our Indigenous Law Institute framework that we had, Virgil Kilstraight and I had put together way back in 1992, I have a section in there, and we have our mission statement and so forth. And then we have the empire domination model. So, I was already on to it in 1992, but that was the result of a decade of research up to that point.

And when I found that source by William Brandon, *New Worlds for Old*, and he went through that etymology of the word dominion, taking it back to dominium in Latin, and then summing it up with that sentence, political power grown from property, dominium, was in effect domination. That's when I really pinpointed, I think it gelled for me in such a way that I understood that was the key focus that we needed to really zero in on. But I wasn't necessarily comfortable with using the word domination.

I was still using dominion and ultimate dominion, such as we find in the Johnson versus Macintosh ruling. So, here we are all these decades later, and realizing that this discovery was never the issue. I came to a certain point where I began to become irritated with hearing discovery over and over and over, and even using it myself.

But that's how I had been introduced to the whole subject matter by writers such as Vine Deloria Jr. and so forth. We kind of picked that up as younger people, and just use that as a matter of habit. And then once I realized, well, okay, domination, but I had to refine that.

I had to get deeper into the information, and finally come up with that notion of a claim of a right of domination, because I don't want to just say a right of domination. Then it might seem as if they really have that right, rather than claiming it and asserting it and assuming it. And so, now there are some people that are picking up the theme of domination, but I wonder to what extent they are really understanding the details and the nuances of the paradigm, the pattern of domination, and how is that playing out as a phenomenon?

And so, anyway, that's kind of my opening statement that I want to make.

[Peter] (5:04 - 7:28)

Well, there's a lot there. Just to stick with Johnson v. McIntosh for a second, the infamous phrase talking about the extravagant pretension.

So, Marshall doesn't use the phrase claim of a right of domination, but he uses synonyms for that, which we've unpacked many times, and then calls it a pretension. And that gets me thinking that people who don't really grasp what was happening in that language, and that just is, that's a microcosm of this centuries-long, millennia-long claim of a right of domination that Marshall is pointing to, because he points to the papal bulls, etc. But just to come back to the pretension, so when he says this is a pretension that we have a right of domination, but we're going to assert it anyway, we're going to claim this right of domination, even though it is really a pretension, it raises a flag for me because people with a simplistic understanding of what's going on may be led by pretenses of non-domination.

So, when a social movement claims, oh, we want to have, you know, fill in the blank, whatever it is, this is going to be equity, this is going to be inclusion, you know, etc., and we unpack how the structures that they're wanting to put in place involve domination, but they're being presented as if they don't. So, there can be pretenses that obscure domination. Marshall is at least clear, this is one thing you got to say to him, he's admitting it's a pretense, and he says, who cares, we're going to do it anyway, no matter that it's a pretense.

But there are pretenses that somebody, some agency, some entity is doing this for, oh, this is for your benefit, this is for your public health, this is to protect your public safety, you know, etc. And in fact, what's going on is the domination. It's like the sewage on the Navajo Mountain, it's like the forest service, this is for your public safety, where you have to scratch your sense of what, how, what are they talking about, snow, sewage, snow is for public safety?

I can't quite figure that out, and I've given up trying to figure out what's in their minds, but all I know is that it's a reverse pretense, that we're not doing this because we're going to dominate the Navajos and dominate their mountain, we're doing this to help everybody.

[Steve] (7:29 - 7:34)

Well, and to help the, the snow, snowball corporation.

[Peter] (7:34 - 7:35)

Yeah.

[Steve] (7:35 - 10:12)

In that instance, but that's such a key point, Peter, because the extravagant pretension, I came across the phrase recently, a mere pretension, a mere pretension, that minimizes it in terms of, okay, it's only a pretension. There's nothing more significant than that. That doesn't come through when Marshall says an extravagant pretension.

I think that's the, what I'm trying to get at is, he's not saying domination. He's, he's cloaking that in such a way, he's saying, well, we're going to convert, we're going to pretend to convert the discovery of an inhabited country into conquest. We have to look at the word conquest and realize, well, hang on a second, that's a synonym and a euphemism to an extent of the theme or the idea of domination, because a conquest is a victory.

So, oh, the mere discovery, meaning our new knowledge of this place or the ancestors that, of our people that had the new knowledge of this place, they had a victory just by showing up. It's their consciousness, their language, their way of thinking, their decision making, their argumentation was now going to be in charge of everything and everyone. And, but they had to work at that.

And so, I think it, what a lot of people don't realize is how detailed and, and specific all of the excavation of these various terms needs to be. And, and we need to slow down. People tend to want to go fast.

We have to hurry up. I remember being so frustrated because I had to wade through all these old dictionaries and go through so many terms and reflect upon them. I thought this is going to take forever because this is one term, but look at all these things that are in here.

And, and gradually over time, I had to have the patience to continue with that over such a long period of time, but the accumulated information and accumulated understanding that I ended up with and enabled me to do the work, which is reliant upon that accumulation. If you don't have a massive amount of information to work with as your starting point or as a frame of reference, I should say, then you're not going to get where we are today. Yeah.

And I think that's part of the difficulty is that you have a lot of people that want to hurry up and go in a direction, but they didn't do the preliminary work to set up the preparation for what they really need to be doing.

[Peter] (10:13 - 12:23)

Yeah. In fact, when we look at any series of words, every single word can be excavated. The word right can be excavated.

The word claim can be excavated, right? That sort of thing. And so just to make a half step sideways, people want to talk about treaty rights.

Okay. So you say, well, what is a treaty? And if you really start unpacking what is a treaty, you begin to question like, well, were these things that were called treaties really treaties?

And you actually not only can unpack that word and say, well, what actually is a treaty? Is it a treaty if it's only written in one language and there are two parties and two languages to it? Does that count as a treaty?

That'd be one course to go down. Another one is, well, did the entities that claimed a right of domination actually even intend to ever make something that would be a real treaty? The two different competing dominating powers.

So let's say France and England are both competing dominating powers and throw Spain in the mix and throw Portugal in the mix. They maintain the capacity to have treaties with each other. And they could ask the Pope to please mediate our treaties.

And they were able to work in all of their languages simultaneously. That's not what happened when they went to these so-called discovered lands. And so I guess what I'm saying is every single word we use can be excavated and will benefit our understanding.

But if what we do is to rush to say, oh, we have treaty rights as if that really means one thing and you know exactly what it means and that it's not a problematic concept in itself. It's our last conversation we talked about tribal sovereignty. That word is used all the time.

Oh, tribal sovereignty as if it means one thing, one definite thing, one common understood agreed upon thing. And we find out with just a very little scratching of the surface, let alone the depth that we've gone into say, well, that's a very problematic set of two words, treaty, tribal sovereignty, three words.

[Steve] (12:24 - 15:00)

Well, and treaty is interesting without getting too much into detail, but the word treat in that word treaty. Okay. So what does that mean?

I mean, Rick Hill had his great line about trick or treaty, right? And that was a good comedic line. But the thing is that it's how we're going to treat each other.

We're sitting down and having a conversation about how we're going to treat each other. And there has to be, I think, a certain kind of, oh, trust that the person you're sitting across from is actually sitting there with sincerity and wanting to come to an agreement about how we're going to treat each other. And they're going to honor that agreement.

But if you know for a fact that the United States never had that intention to be a, what do you call that? A trustworthy party to then such an agreement, right there at the get-go, you have major problems. Then to transition back to what you were saying that every term can be excavated, meaning delved into, well, every term needs to be excavated.

Every term that we use needs to be excavated because otherwise, are we just kind of half conscious of, okay, we're making a sound such as the word treaty as if we know what that means. But does it mean something different in a different context? Yeah.

Does it mean something different in the context of international law and a treaty between the United States and Spain or the United States and Mexico? And how does the setting or the context shifting to include an original nation or what's also called an indigenous nation,

to what extent does that change that concept of treaty? And there's not one party, not one perspective.

So which perspective is going to prevail? Which is the one that's going to be ruling or controlling? Or maybe neither of them.

Maybe there's a correct balance, but that's unlikely. And if you know for a fact that the premise of the entire enterprise called the American empire is to gain control, to gain domination, to assert sovereignty, which is another word for domination, then you know that that's going to be woven. Their intention is woven into that quote unquote agreement.

[Peter] (15:00 - 15:00)

Yeah.

[Steve] (15:01 - 15:15)

Those are a lot of details and we have to have the patience necessary to get to the comprehensive understanding of what we're really talking about and then have the ability to carry on a conversation such as this.

[Peter] (15:15 - 18:47)

Yeah. Even the word excavate, we have to excavate. Somebody can say, oh yeah, I looked it up in the dictionary, I know what that word means.

Oh, did you do etymology, philology? Have you gone into, you know, the structure of the language? Any of that?

You know, that's part of the excavation and maybe you never get to the end. Maybe there isn't any end to these processes of asking questions. You know, you used the phrase some sessions ago about curiosity, you know, being driven, but the curiosity doesn't end just because it came to a particular dictionary definition.

It's constantly evolving. And I want to just segue back, you said something about whose interpretation or which view prevails, et cetera, is that we can begin just with that little insight. It's a big insight, but it's, I'm saying, given the whole large picture, you can begin to get to an understanding that the idea of one government, especially in light of things that have happened in the last few years, one world government, the pressure toward having oneness at that level is really a reflection of the whole past millennium or so.

One God, there's one true God, there's one true faith, there's one true church. Then you get, there's one true government, there's one world. Okay, we can agree we live on a planet and I think we can probably agree, but I don't know how much, there's plenty of excavation going on looking for lithium and the rest of it, but just to make a play on words, but there was one planet, but that doesn't mean that there's one people.

There are as many peoples as there are peoples, I guess. And so if we take it, just step aside for a minute, the US versus some particular native nation, well, what about the native nations themselves? And my sense is that what's so crucial about your phrase claim of a right of domination is that at every moment when there, let's say there was a treaty between the Comanche and the Kiowa, okay?

And it would have to be understood in both languages. And part of what made it be real is that both the Comanche and the Kiowa recognize each other as continuing peoples. They didn't say, oh, well, one of us is going to become the people and you're going to have to find your place inside it.

They may have had other arrangements like we'll hunt here in this season, you hunt there in that season or whatever it may be, just to come up with some examples. But they sat down with the recognition that there was a multiplicity of peoples, which meant a multiplicity of gods, which meant a multiplicity of realities in some sense. And maybe even you could say a multiplicity of earths, because they had different senses of what the earth was, especially if they came from, some came from a very mountainous region and some came from a wide open plains region, they may have actually had a different understanding what the earth was.

So I guess what I'm saying is, it's that multiplicity plurality of realities that allows us to say, there's a possible way to survive here without a world domination, a local domination. There's a way in which ongoing conversations like you and I talking, and we agree on things, we disagree on things, where we disagree, we keep talking, even where we agree, we keep talking and trying to flesh it out. What is that all about?

Neither one of us is talking is like, well, by the way, I have the true answer here. And you better believe it or not, or I won't have this podcast with you.

[Steve] (18:48 - 18:51)

And again, you know, that brought that up, I was just coming to that.

[Peter] (18:52 - 19:52)

You were just gonna say that. And can I add one more thing, just to trace back to that beginning, that first phone call that you and I had, whatever year that was 90 something or other, maybe it was in the 80s, I don't remember. And yeah, we were, we were just at that moment that you were calling to talk to me about Johnson v.

McIntosh. I was sitting in my office, reading Johnson v. McIntosh, I don't know, for the umpteenth time, and you said you was the umpteenth plus one time.

And so we from the very start, we started with efforts to figure out a problem, rather than efforts to say, now I've got my theory of Johnson, now you want to hear my theory? Well, yeah, I want to hear what you think about that case. But you know, it was a mutual undertaking, I guess it's like what a real conversation is, is an endless interchange and discussion.

It's not just, oh, here's my opinion about that. Here's your opinion about that. And that's the end of it.

[Steve] (19:53 - 21:13)

Well, that was our second conversation. And our first one you were, I was on the east coast with we were traveling. And I was investigating a particular book, The International Law of John Marshall by Benjamin Moon Ziegler.

And I got a hold of Amherst College, I thought there's a long shot chance that the Ziegler is still alive. So let me see if I can track this guy down. And, and so Barry O'Connell, I got a hold of him because he taught at Amherst.

And then he suggested that I call you, which I did. We had that initial conversation, and a couple of years went by. And I just got suddenly I thought, you know, I should call that that guy again.

And when I did, you said it was so funny, you should call I just happened to be sitting down reading the Johnson versus McIntosh ruling again. And I've decided if I don't figure it out this time, I'm never going to read it again. It was a joke.

How many thousands of times ever read that darn decision, you know, but I wanted to come back to another reference that that you used. And one government, one world, one does that the other. And there's also the idea of one solution.

[Peter] (21:14 - 21:14)

Yes.

[Steve] (21:14 - 22:11)

Okay. But, but there's also an interesting play on words with the word solution. If you take the idea of sugar and water, you put some sugar in some water, or maybe salt in water, and you stir it, then that sugar or that salt dissolves.

And now it's one solution. So, the assimilation process was to take all that diversity, all of that multiplicity of realities and cultures and traditions and so forth, and stir them into the melting pot of the United States and make them be individual Americans, as citizens within one nation under God, that type of thing. And that was the one solution.

So it's just kind of funny how these words in English can be used in such an interesting manner.

[Peter] (22:12 - 24:41)

Yeah, yeah. Well, yes, exactly. And it's the other day, I don't know exactly where this fits in.

But the not just the words as they're written, but the sound of the word. So if I say knows, what am I talking about the thing on the front of my face? Am I thinking about how many times somebody said no to me?

Am I thinking about what somebody knows in their cognitive realm? And if I'm speaking, you don't know what I'm saying, unless I have some more words packed around it. So part of the problem of excavating, part of the problem of understanding is excavating every single word.

And another part, this is where you get into, let's say, philology, in addition to etymology, how the words are put in a given sentence, even the order of the sentence and, and particularly in a language like English, where there's subject, verb, object, what does the subject mean? And then what does the word subject mean? Somebody is subject to something, or somebody is the subject of something, right?

And so it's like an endless, if you don't enjoy it, you should just give up and don't even start going down this way. Because as you said, it's tremendously frustrating at times to say, Oh, my God, this is just so incredibly complex. But if it's interesting to you, you're going to keep going.

And if you're curious, you're going to keep going. So if I can say one more thing about Johnson v. McIntosh, so we have pulled that those sentences apart, so many times, trying to actually clarify what actually is being said in this sentence, or in this paragraph, all right.

But beyond that, so we've got now you can say, okay, the US claim of a right of domination, or John Marshall's claim, whatever you want to call it, claim right of domination, but that's not really satisfying enough to us. Because what we're after is we're really trying to see what world is he living in? What world does he imagine is the world?

What world has he come from? And this is why it's such a huge advance to see that the whole development of Christendom is behind this. It's not just the development of the US and the so called discovery.

What cognitive world is revealed by his language? What political world is revealed by his language? What economic world is revealed by his language?

All of those things are in play in just trying to understand the sentences that he wrote down in that decision.

[Steve] (24:43 - 27:16)

Yeah, you know, it's interesting that Marshall was a Freemason. Mm hmm. And we went to the Supreme Court one time, they had Marshall's number of items of his personal items, including his Masonic apron, there displayed in the Supreme Court.

I thought that was really interesting. And then you look at the use of the basically, it's the pattern of a chessboard, the black and white squares and so forth. And you look at the symbology and the use of symbolism, and the way in which, because it is considered an occult type of fellowship, I guess you might say, right?

The G and the compass and the square and all these. And so, the G stands for not God, but geometry. And then the GEO in geometry stands for earth.

That's a word meaning or term meaning earth. Meter is measurement. So, the measurement of the earth, it's the science and art of measuring the earth.

That's why you had so many of the surveyors that were also Freemasons. And they were people that had expertise in geometry. Then I one time went to the science library at the University of Oregon, stumbled upon a science dictionary.

I never knew they had a different dictionary for science than for other areas of scholarship. So, I started looking in that dictionary, and I came across the term georgic, georgic, which basically goes back to colonization. So, isn't that interesting?

George Washington, right? And georgic, meaning colonization, and all these ways in which GEO and these different terms are used. And if I didn't have the kind of mind that I have,

and the kind of determination and persistence that I have used in this effort, I wouldn't have stumbled upon any of this stuff.

And so, it's these kind of funny ways in which life arranges certain insights and understandings. If you walk on that path, if you continue on the path, just because you're going on the path, you're going to have certain things revealed to you. That's the nature of colonization.

[Peter] (27:16 - 28:26)

Okay. So, now think about this for a second. You talk about George Washington.

Well, you know, the father of the country, the great hero, etc. But for many, many, many people, George Washington is like the evil guy, the slave owner, the richest man, you know, all of the negative things that can be put together. The problem is that whichever view you take, that's hardly even scratching the surface of what's going on.

When you say, just a little bit of teasing a part of his name right there that you just did, and going into geometry and surveying and so on and so forth, you'd say, well, there's a lot more packed in here. But there are people who it's enough for them to say, well, George Washington said that, so it's wrong. Well, what did he say?

How do you unpack what he said? What world? What does he express?

In what context? You know, all of that sort of thing. That would be the hard work.

But the easy work is, it's like, I've got a villain I can name. And so, by just naming the villain, I don't have to do any analysis. And I'm assuming that if you don't think he's a villain, then you're just wrong.

You know, there's nothing to talk about here.

[Steve] (28:27 - 31:19)

Well, and he was also referred to by the Haudenosaunee as town destroyer. So, washing, that's an interesting term. And then town, T-O-N, which is town.

It's a term meaning town. So, actually, washing in that context is an expunger. It's the one who expunges, who destroys a town.

So, actually, it was a translation from English into Haudenosaunee language and then back into English from their perspective. Because also through Clinton, the historic figure, I forget his first name, but probably General Clinton or whatever his rank was, they engaged in the destroying of entire towns, massive amounts of corn supplies of the people, and so forth, as a scorched earth policy that Washington initiated. And so, it fits.

And I think that all of these kinds of details are just so fascinating to look at. Okay, that's wild. So, then I look in the papal bull and the one from 1452 that's embedded, a little bit of it that's embedded in the papal bull from 1455.

And then I come across this term expunatio in Latin. Wow, that's really close to expunge. So, is that part of what's going on here?

And then you have to investigate that. I mean, the amount of effort to excavate or investigate all these different terms and all these different documents, then going back to the term treaty. Why is it that a book published by the Carnegie Institute and our institution in 1917 is titled European Treaties Bearing on the History of the United States and its Dependencies, which indicates an empire with dependencies, but that term European treaties is inclusive of these Vatican papal documents.

Well, how are those treaties? They're a single institution issuing documents. That's not really a treaty.

So, but what it's doing is it's setting up the context for the piece of between the different empires or states of Christendom, as it was, right? Yeah. So, all of these details, and then if you ask somebody like a very prominent historian, I one time said, now, why do you suppose that it's titled European Treaties?

And then they don't give you any kind of, they've never thought of it before. So, they're kind of caught off guard. They don't have any meaningful response, you know.

[Peter] (31:20 - 31:29)

They're academics, so they're not going to say, geez, I don't know, I never thought about it. And especially to a non-academic, they're not going to admit that.

[Steve] (31:30 - 31:41)

Exactly. So, and then, or they might say, well, perhaps it was customary. So, you get a non-answer to your question.

[Peter] (31:41 - 31:41)

Yeah.

[Steve] (31:42 - 31:44)

And anyway, it's just fascinating.

[Peter] (31:44 - 32:38)

Yeah. In fact, the word answer, I've been thinking about that. What does answer mean?

I don't want to go into it today, but how is that different from response? I asked him, is there any coffee on the menu? And he answered, yes.

Or he responded, yes. Do they mean the same thing? Or are they something different?

You ask the scholar, what about these European treaties? It has an answer. The answer might be informed or uninformed.

But how is it different from saying his response was? Is the response, in a way, just hinting at something, the response is like hitting a ball back in a tennis game or something like that. It's a counter move.

Now, I gave you something. Now, you're going to have a chance to respond to him. An answer has this aura about it.

It's just, it's the end. It's like he answered you. Next question, I answered that one.

[Steve] (32:39 - 33:00)

Yeah. And oftentimes, in that kind of a setting, the answer is just whatever gets you by, gets you through that moment. It doesn't have to be very responsive, but it just has to fill the air with something.

And especially if you never really thought about it, you're not going to say, you know, that's a really good question. I never even thought about that.

[Peter] (33:00 - 33:11)

Exactly, which would be the most profound and productive statement of all for the guy to make, especially if he had actually had thought about other things related to it, then you could have had a serious discussion.

[Steve] (33:11 - 34:40)

Well, and that shows a degree of humility. Yeah. That is important as well.

We have to maintain humility. And that's one of the seven laws of the uchachi shikoi. But the other thing with regard to, oh, there was a term that I wanted to come back to.

It had to do with, oh, I guess I'm not recalling what it was. It'll come back. It'll come back to me.

But going to the way in which people are comfortable using different themes or memes or slogans, such as the doctrine of discovery, and then that becomes habitualized. But I'm not even sure to the extent to which people reflect back upon their own use of language. I do that a lot.

I tend to say, now, okay, I'm using that. But what are the implications of me continuing to use that? And I have to reflect back on, I have to critique my own use of language to say, well, am I really accomplishing what I believe I'm trying to accomplish or what I'm attempting to accomplish by using my phrasing in that way?

And I'm always looking for new ways of phrasing and working through the terminology.

[Peter] (34:41 - 36:33)

Yeah, I do that all the time also. A dictionary is always open while I'm writing. I mean, it's open right now.

I'll just leave it because I go to it so often as just the initial touch point of saying, this word occurs to me, but what is actually behind this word? Let's take the word sanction occurs to me right now. Sanction.

So many words that are worth digging at have double meanings. So I sanctioned, that means I permitted it. But I could also, I sanctioned, that means I prohibited it.

So the word sanction has a complete diametrically opposed meanings in it. Well, that's one example, but there are many examples where I'm using the word, maybe even the adjective. I say, this is wonderful.

What does that really mean? It's full of wonder, or am I full of, what am I getting at here when I use that word? And then I'll do a little bit of etymology.

If there's any kind of inkling, like there's something more in this word, then I look a little bit at the etymology, which almost always involves going to Latin, at least one of the major stepping stones. And what did the Latin speakers mean by this word? So it may take me several minutes.

Sometimes it's not even resolved after that time. And I just kind of, I know I have to come back and cogitate about that a little bit more. And so I'm just saying, I'm doing the same thing.

It's like, when we're doing this work, it's no bullshit to say we're constantly working on the words that we use. We're not just picking at the words, oh, when John Marshall said that. It's like, well, when DeRico said that, DeRico asked himself a question.

Well, what did DeRico mean? Well, maybe DeRico better think a little bit more about this. And maybe it means another hour worth of work to get three more sentences out that I feel more like this is what I'm really trying to say.

Right.

[Steve] (36:33 - 36:33)

Yeah.

[Peter] (36:33 - 36:34)

And I think that's what you're saying.

[Steve] (36:35 - 37:41)

Well, I remember when you said the word dictionary, that was actually the word I was trying to say. That's how we work. The, it had to do with a statement that I've seen, and I don't quite remember how to state it in the manner that it was said or written, but it had to do with, it's foolish to think that you can resolve an argument by simply defining your terms.

And I think, okay, well, yeah. But at the same time, if you don't really investigate those terms and get a very clear understanding of what those mean in a given context, you're probably also not going to resolve any argument. Right.

You're just going to go further into confusion. And so I think it's kind of weird because in a sense, it sounds dismissive of the type of effort that we're engaged in most of the time. Does that make sense?

[Peter] (37:41 - 37:43)

How does it sound dismissive?

[Steve] (37:44 - 37:57)

Well, if they're making fun of defining your terms, if they're saying, oh, well, that's not going to really resolve anything, you're never going to resolve an argument just by defining your terms.

[Peter] (37:57 - 37:57)

Yeah.

[Steve] (37:57 - 38:09)

In one sense, that's correct. But at the same time, you better really truly understand those terms and work toward a mutual understanding of what you're really talking about. If you're going to try to get anywhere.

[Peter] (38:09 - 40:55)

Yeah. Two things I want to say. One is the most obvious one is one of the so-called treaties.

If there is only in one language, there's absolutely no way at all that you can say there was a meeting of the minds about the meaning of these words. Absolutely zero chance of that. Okay.

So then in the context where they are speaking the same language, you say, what's always been curious to me, people say, well, we have to define our terms before we go on and have a discussion. And I'm always saying, well, how do you define your terms if you don't have a discussion? So the defining of the terms is something that is in outgrowth and a part of the discussion itself.

And so there's no way that your definitions can be dismissed as like, oh, he just defined some terms. That's obviously crucial. But what did he do with those definitional, you know, those definitions?

Was it just like, oh, here's what this word means. The word conquest means this. Well, you got to some parallels between conquest and domination by a long and very interesting series of ruminations and cogitations.

And those are what counts. That's what goes back. What's the difference between a meme and an actual useful thought?

The meme just the word says, oh, this is domination. I hereby declare it. That's what this means.

And there's nothing has really been produced by that. No insight, no understanding. Right.

And so that's why when we belabor these points, it's not because we have one point that we keep saying over and over again, but we keep coming at certain points that overlap. And we're tracing the pathway, which is often like a maze. We're tracing the maze way of how that's why when we're looking at Marshall and we're saying, how did he get to that phrase, you know, retention, you know, et cetera, discovery.

And so we're saying, well, we're illuminating the world he came from. And what we have found, especially in the last few years is the world he came from was a world of domination. He did not, the world of domination did not emerge from Johnson v.

McIntosh, like out of the fount of the original thought that domination was in his mind, in his way of life, in his politics, in his economics, and really, and most importantly, in his religion. And not just Marshall, because once you see that you say, oh, there's a whole framework, politics, logic, language, religion, economics, all that all intertwined. That's what comes out in these few words in this opinion.

[Steve] (40:55 - 41:34)

I think I would, I would modify that a bit to say that from our perspective, based on our understanding at this moment, we are interpreting all of that as a phenomenon or outgrowth of a result of domination. I'm not convinced that he had a conscious thought. Yeah, I agree.

Oh, let me see how I can create the next domination pattern. I agree. Using the language in a way that we now understand to be domination.

Yes. But that's because of our interpretive framework and our perspective.

[Peter] (41:35 - 43:54)

Yes, exactly. Oh, I'm glad you said that because I don't want to be misunderstood here. I think that's exactly the case.

In fact, what he was willing to say, both in that print and probably in his conversations was probably the opposite. This is not, we know that this was how the, how Christendom worked. This is not domination.

This is freedom. This is salvation. This is progress.

This is enlightenment. I mean, the enlightenment thinkers, quote unquote, were the outcome of that was tons of domination in various forms, but this is not being proclaimed by them. This is being proclaimed as liberation, like revolution.

Look at what comes out of, how many revolutions can we think of where you say, boy, there's been a real change of affairs here? Well, there's been some shifting of chairs. That's about it.

And some of them have been quite brutally obvious, like the French Revolution, where they set up the guillotine in the public square, and they were just chopping heads off of people that they were like, these are bad people. These are dominators. This is the prince.

This is the Duke. You're going to get rid of them. Well, who was running the guillotine?

That was not domination after it didn't take too long before the French people said, these are the ones that we got to cut their heads off. We don't know what to do next, but we know that this is a, this is really the wrong road to go down. Years ago, I read the, I guess it was like a bio autobiography, some notes anyway, from the chief executioner of Paris during this time, because of all the people whose heads were being cut off, the executioner's head was not being cut off because he was the one in charge of cutting the heads.

And it was just a question of who was ordering to cut which heads. And the tortures that they had added to the beheadings became so gruesome that as I remember in reading his writings, he said he distanced himself from this and he passed it off to some of his assistants. It was too much for him to get into the things that he was being ordered to do.

So, you know, but that was a case where what we could now say, even with the most superficial analysis, domination running the guillotine was proclaimed as liberation.

[Steve] (43:55 - 47:32)

Well, and then there you get into the issue of ambiguity, right? Yeah. And the, what Loretta, a friend of her cook talked about the way in which the elders understood the ambiguous nature of English, but it enabled people to do, particularly the people from the dominating society, what they were able to do with the English and why you had to be very cautious in your interaction with English.

Now that's coming from a viewpoint of people that are in a whole different mental world of the Lakota language. And that's a very key insight, I think. The way in which we've been able to clarify so many things over the years, it's difficult to have a conversation sometimes with when you have this certain amount of understanding and insight based upon a tremendous amount of effort.

And then you have an interaction with people that are just not at that same place. Yeah. Their comprehension.

So you want to, you don't want to talk down to them. You don't want to have a sense of, oh, I'm superior to you because of this and that and the other. You have to have that humility.

But at the same time, it's important to figure out how to bring them along so that they have a deeper understanding. I had an interesting presentation that I gave the other day with regard to, well, it was at Windsor University, I think, in Windsor, Ontario. And a friend was listening to that.

And I included the word government, which I often don't do in my list of terms of domination. So I've added an eighth term government. And I said, so I used go over meant, M-E-N-T, M-E-N-T meaning a state or condition of going over others.

And then he went home and he said, well, honey, I learned a new term today. And government go over men. And then the T stands for today.

Go over men today. And I thought that was kind of, that was kind of cool. But when people begin to understand the way in which we're playfully interacting with some of these terms and allowing yourself to be very free in what you're investigating and how you're doing it and how you're using terminology.

I was fascinated to watch some of the clips of the Beatles and how they created their music. And it seemed that they had such a free flow. Everything, anything could go in the mix.

Anything. There was no real restriction. It's just very organic and flowing in this.

They could try all kinds of different things and look at the result. I think it's similar with what we've been doing over the years. We're always adding new insights and understandings.

And there's an enthusiasm that we share and an excitement and exhilaration that is part of the endorphins or whatever you want to call them. That type of exhilaration that we get from having a deep insight. And it's just a fun thing.

[Peter] (47:33 - 49:55)

Yeah, it is. I'm glad you think that I have some humor. Once in a while, I think I need to laugh more as we talk on these things.

I certainly laugh more away from the screen than on it. But ambiguity, another word that could be extra and we don't have time today, but just think about it for a minute is that I think you could say for both of us, we're not afraid of ambiguity. It doesn't unsettle us and make us run away.

If anything, it's like makes us more curious, like, hmm, what's really going on here? We're kind of attracted by ambiguity in a sense. And let's make a simple example.

You go into a room, maybe it's a dinner, maybe it's a party, maybe it's just a lobby, whatever. And you're not sure exactly what's going on. And you could be the kind of person who shies away, oh, I'm going to sit in the corner.

I don't know what's going on. And I'm not putting down somebody who's shy at all. That's totally fine with me.

On the other hand, you could be somebody who says, wow, this is like a wide open field. You could become the bull in the china shop and break it. On the other hand, you could just be able to say, I don't really know what's going on here, but I'm curious about it.

So I'm just going to pay attention. I'm not going to shy away. I'm not going to run in.

I'm just going to be present here. So at least at the moment, I'm thinking ambiguity itself is something that we play with, that we could also excavate and interrogate and so on and so forth. And one of the things that just, at least the last thing I want to say, because we're near the end of the hour, is if we talk about treaties, there's always going to be ambiguity in treaties.

I mean, this is the nature of people negotiating. It's like contracts. There's ambiguity.

Well, at some point, they come, they settle with it. They settle and say, okay, I'll sign this. And they may have thought they've banished all ambiguity.

And they may find out to their detriment that they hadn't, but they had that chance anyway, to work through in their own language, in their own head, what it is they're going to sign. And if somebody hands you something that you can't read, and obviously it can't make sense to you in that immediate sense, then there's no way that you have a chance to say you've explored the ambiguities to the best of your ability.

[Steve] (49:56 - 51:47)

Well, and because of that, I remember reading an article not that long ago, had to do with an Apple contract, I believe. And there was a placement of an apostrophe or comma, I think it was a comma, in a particular spot. And because of that comma, billions of dollars ended up going one way and not the other way.

So, we're talking about really minor types of grammatical marks, or diacritical marks that result in very massive amounts of real world consequences, right? Absolutely. And when you think about that, in terms of now, the effort to drive everybody into a digitized sense of what I call a digitized system of domination.

In other words, the use of domination techniques through digitization. And there was just an agreement, apparently, to buy some town to have a digital data center, the size of Manhattan or twice the size of Manhattan page read it to me the other day. And do these people even know what the heck they're agreeing to?

Okay, that you hear that sound data center, whatever the terms and agreements are and so forth. But did you ever live next to a data center of that sort and have the massive amount of noise that it generates, that people can't even hear themselves think, because of what's going on there? I think people are going in a very dangerous direction.

And that's one of the challenges that we face in dealing with the claim of a right of domination by very nefarious actors.

[Peter] (51:48 - 53:15)

Yeah. And I guess I have one more thing. Now you sparked it is the so called artificial intelligence is that it comes across it's presented as people accepted.

Oh, here, I have found the answer. We're back to that. I found the answer here.

All right. Instead of understanding, I mean, we can talk much more philosophical detail, different machine answer response, but there's no real awareness. You talked about the physical manifestation of the data center.

So there's no awareness that this is a machine. It's a set of machines. They're being operated in a way that machines are operated, they have to be programmed, so to speak, all of that.

So there's no way that it can't be interrogated as to what's really going on here. And instead, it's being accepted by many people, oh, how easy it is to find the answer now. And even worse, and more insidious, is there are people who say, Oh, I'm having a conversation, I have a relationship with this machine.

I mean, I must admit that I have a relationship with my vacuum cleaner, I had to learn, you know, you pull the core down, it goes back in, took me a lot of times pulling drill, oh, it doesn't start that way. That's not like a lawnmower. So ever since I got more used to my vacuum cleaner that I have to treat it appropriately, it works a lot better for me.

So I do appreciate that.

[Steve] (53:16 - 54:49)

Well, that's a whole nother direction to go in. And it is interesting to look at the extent to which people are going in a direction of, well, I prefer to call it artifice intelligence, meaning the use of deception and deceit and so forth, for a particular purpose. So the adjective is artificial is used, sounds like, okay, it's something that's, that's manmade.

It's been created by human beings. But you don't have that sense of the use of deception and, and so manipulation. Okay.

Yeah. And I think that's what's so crucial going back to the ambiguity again. To what extent do we know the intentions of the big players, the oligarchs and so forth that are controlling so much of the planet and knowing what that outcome is going to be?

How can you, how can you predict that without knowing the true intention? I'm not talking about the professed intention. I'm talking about in the heart of hearts, what they're really up to.

Can we even know that? And if we don't know that, we sure as hell better be careful in terms of how we allow them to take us in particular directions.

[Peter] (54:51 - 54:58)

Amen. Maybe we just leave it at that. Okay.

[Steve] Thank you, Peter.

[Peter] You too, Steve. Be well.

[Steve] (54:59 - 54:59)

Until next time.

[Peter] (55:00 - 55:00)

Yep.