Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts & Letters

Roots of Democracy

Turtle Island Confederacies, Relationships and Balance

February 22, 2021

CLOWES: Hello, everyone. Let's get started. Welcome to Turtle Island Confederacies: Relationships & Balance, the first of four sessions in our Roots of Democracy series. I'm Jody Clowes, director of the James Watrous Gallery at the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts & Letters. If you're new to the academy, welcome. We believe that ideas move the world forward. And we've been creating opportunities for people to connect with experts and learn from each other since 1870.

The Madison office of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts & Letters occupies ancestral Ho-Chunk land, a place their nation knows as Dejope, which translates to four lakes. We recognize and respect the sovereignty of the Ho-Chunk Nation, as well as the 11 other First Nations who are caretakers and stewards of the land we now call Wisconsin.

The Roots of Democracy series is sponsored in part by Wisconsin Humanities, with funds from the National Endowment for the Humanities in the state of Wisconsin, the D.B. Reinhart Center for Ethics in Leadership at Viterbo College, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and Wisconsin Public Radio, with additional support from the Center for the Study of the American Constitution at UW-Madison and the Department of American Indian Studies at the University of Minnesota-Duluth. And we're very grateful to all of them.

Roots of Democracy is an exploration of the cultural and philosophical roots of American democracy. Tonight's presentation will focus on two venerable indigenous traditions of governments, the Three Fires Confederacy of the Anishinaabe and the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, also known as the Iroquois Confederacy, which have been models of participatory democracy on Turtle Island for many generations. And I think we can learn a lot from both of them.

So we're honored to have with us today Rebecca Webster, who is an assistant professor in the American Indian Studies Department at University of Minnesota-Duluth and a citizen of the Oneida Nation of Wisconsin, Margaret Noodin of Anishinaabe descent, who is professor of American Indian Studies, associate dean of the humanities and director of the Electa Quinney Institute of the, for American Indian Education at UW-Milwaukee, and Richard Monette, professor of law at the UW-Madison Law School, director of the Great Lakes Indigenous Law Center, and former chairman of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa in North Dakota. So without further delay, I'm going to turn it over to Margaret Noodin who is going to get us started.

NOODIN: [Speaking in Anishinaabe]. I'm coming to you tonight from Milwaukee. We are all in different places. I hope you are safe and warm wherever you are. And I will start the conversation by sharing an overview of the place that we call Niswi Ishkodewan Anishinaabeg. And you'll see here, I think you can see this hopefully, a map of a place that we consider the home of the Three Fires people. We can see that it's centered within the white lines of the Great Lakes watershed. So you can see that thin white line there. That's actually the limits of the distribution of the water of the Great Lakes.

And the lakes themselves were for a long time known as one place, [speaking in Anishinaabe]. They came to have many names as different people lived in and around them. And many of the 148 nations in this area that all consider themselves Anishinaabeg have names that reflect this place. It's important to think about the roots of democracy here in North America as connected to these old indigenous confederacies. So the ideas that I wanted to introduce at the start of our talk today are ideas of ethnicity and identity in a relational system.

So you see on this map that it's not just humans who are together in this space. There's beings of many sorts. And there are three fires on there to indicate the confederacy being comprised of the Odawa, Ojibwe, and the Potawatomi people. These ideas of having three sort of fires, three centers of energy, three groups that work together, you could come up with many different metaphors for that.

Our word for fire is ishkode. But we think of many things as being, the months themselves have the word giizis, many of things have an idea of energy in them. And we think of connections as being active, focused on the way that we are in the world and the way we treat one other, the way we conduct ourselves.

There's a clan system. That's one more layer of understanding identity within this space. And that clan system recognizes further connections not just between the humans, but between all the other beings in this space. So many different nations have a wide range of clans in the North American area. Most of those clans are based on other beings in our region.

But you will find even among Ojibwe nations there's a lot of variation in the clans that folks have. There are some that are very common. And there's a code of understanding so that if someone says they're bear clan, or someone says they're loon clan or crane clan, there are ideas and expectations and old stories that define the way that that clan is keeper of certain knowledge, and someone that might have certain responsibilities within the group.

I wanted to note there, our clan ideas come from a system of odoodemi. The, you often hear of totem and totem poles, and that's one of the words here in North America that has a Anishinaabe tie-in. So doodam, or as we say it in English, a totem, it's something that connects you, but it connects you through responsibility. So odoodemi, [speaking in Anishinaabe], these ideas of being responsible not only for yourself but toward others and having duties in a group that you need to uphold.

You commit yourself to these ideas. And you spend often a lifetime living in a good way in this network. So understanding your place in the network is the task of living well. It, the way that, in this system, decisions are made is also very collective and very relational. So when you have a system where knowledge is not written down

or saved in one place, it's exchanged in some ways more freely than if you have a system of books and publications.

But in some ways, it's a little more precarious because if you don't pay attention each year, actually transmit that oral knowledge, it could be lost very quickly. So the idea about how we come to make decisions and find balance and understand truth, all of those things are very dependent on a, an old system of transferring knowledge from one generation to another.

I put a few words here to share with folks. Onaakonige is to make a decision. [Speaking in Anishinaabe] were the terms that people used for treaties when, early on, it became apparent that agreements need to be, needed to be made beyond the Anishinaabeg communities. And onaakonige is still used in many places as people are talking about enacting policies, understanding law, working within a system to ensure equal access and justice for all of its members.

Most of those decisions are made based on negotiating a balance, agoode. People want to be sure that there is balance in the way the decisions are made and in the outcome of the decisions. So regardless of what the issue might be at hand, agoode is a concept, a sort of framework that people use in making their decisions.

And the last one that I noted there, debwe, is the truth itself just without connection to any people. But debwe, that same word, is used when we talk about law, belief, honesty. All of those concepts we use the same variations of the very same word. So in Anishinaabe, when we're using our original language, we're understanding a way of being in the world and having a system of ethics and knowledge that help us to find our place among one another.

If you can switch to the next slide, I'll say a few more things and then turn it over to Rebecca. Within that larger landscape, everyone is responsible for their own balance as an individual and within this larger space. And a few of the concepts, some metaphorical ideas I would say, but also one could translate them into ways that you might form law practice, ways that you might practice what we might call now psychology, social services.

There are many branches of caring for our society in the modern world that have specific terms. And I think that when we look back into our language and practices that were used for many millennia before us, we can see that the language itself is, serves as a way for remembering the code of what was here.

So we're often thinking of that balance. And we think in different directions and try to find value across all of these different directions. Akiing is one of those ways we think about what's solid. The earth itself, akiing, but also all of the beings that depend on the earth, and how the earth and its own land as a structure is so much part of our life and essential for our living.

The balance to that, another half of that, or the other side of that I guess one could say, is water. And you hear all the time about people's, especially indigenous people's value of nature. And I think in some ways, when I was young and would hear those stories, it was almost too simplistic of a framework. It's not as if we are always saying, well, we just love nature. But these are very old, old ideas, recognition of science and dependency and concepts that helped us know that we were in a wider landscape, and that we were dependent on this landscape ourselves for our life, and that we had responsibility to contain it.

The idea of continuing, surviving, evolving, asakamik, being, going forward in the universe, having philosophies that tell us that there is a trajectory, that humans are not just existing in a moment of time that is unconnected to other moments. The idea of there being a concept of time, a sense of infinity, a desire to survive and move forward, that's another very important part of this. I think we talk a lot about the humanities and what is humanity, and how do we understand our humanity? Why do humans see themselves as different?

Understanding the way that we are in the universe, and the way that we want to move forward, I think is part of that. Sometimes, that comes out in things like religious studies, cultural studies. There are a lot of ceremonies and practices that connect us to the earth, to the water, and to ideas about where we are in time and how we continue.

And then the last concept that I would share is bizaan, this idea of peace. Which all of these are translations that are, you know, limited in some ways because no two languages are exactly alike. And I think that's the beauty of the diversity of different views, different terms across the globe.

And bizaan is a word that is used often for peace, but it means listening. So it recognizes that part of our being is to pause. Certainly, the other side, as I've got listed there, the other side of life is unconsciousness. You have consciousness for a time. And you move into a phase that is unconsciousness, and is that sleep? Eventually, the other spectrum there is death, unbeing.

So all of these really complicated philosophies were known to folks. They explored them. They understood all of these terms. And this was the infrastructure in which they made decisions. So when they talked about how to be in this space, how to be with one another, and why they valued their lives and the continuity of them, all of this would be taken into consideration. So when we decided to share concepts of roots of democracy, we thought this was one place that we would start. I will turn it over now to my colleague, Rebecca, and she can take it in another direction.

WEBSTER: All right. [Speaking in Haudenosaunee]. So what I said in English is, hello, everyone. My name is [speaking in Haudenosaunee], which means snow scattered here and there. My English name is Becky Webster. I'm wolf clan. I'm Oneida. And I grew up near Duck Creek in Wisconsin near the reservation.

So I have kind of a bit of a task here. I need to tell you in 15 minutes about a story that takes about 5 days to recite. So we're just going to really get the *Reader's Digest* version. And I'll try to hit the highlights to, so that we get the big picture of what's happening here.

I also want to let everyone know I'm still learning about this. I've been blessed to have some really phenomenal mentors who have been very patient with all of my questions and learning about this. So it's been a really great process to be able to get to know this story intimately.

So I'm going to start out with the conditions at the time. This is much prior to European contact, what was going on in the area of what is now the New York State. It wasn't a safe place. It wasn't a happy place. It wasn't good. There were a lot of murdering going on, men going from village to village killing each other, looting, kidnapping women and children. And there was a lot of cannibalism going on.

People were suspicious of each other. And they didn't even know their neighbors anymore. And during this time of trauma and time of chaos, a lot of the traditions and customs were being lost. So when we talk about things like colonialism and removal and assimilation, that this isn't the first time after European contact that we've had things happen to us that we've had to really overcome and try to figure out how to move forward from that. So that was the conditions at the time, what was going on.

There was a woman who had a young daughter. And she was very afraid for her young daughter. She luckily had escaped all of the issues that were going on. But she wasn't sure how long she would escape that, so she decided to flee. So her and her young daughter packed up what they could. And in the dark of night, they fled into the wilderness, and she raised her daughter there alone and isolated.

And as time went by, the young daughter grew into a woman and became pregnant. And like I said, this is just a 15-minute recap. We're not going into too much of it. But she, there was not a man in the picture. She gives birth to the child. And the grandmother repeatedly tries to kill the child, either out of shame because she was, the woman didn't have a husband, or because she thought that this must be an act of evil. In any event, she's unsuccessful with her attempts to try to kill the child.

A visitor comes to the grandmother in a dream and talks about how important he is and what his role is and that his name will be [speaking in Haudenosaunee]. And that that will be the only person from here on out who will carry that name. And what his role is, it's going to be very important because he looks around and talks about the things that are happening in the world today and says, this isn't how it was meant to be. [Speaking in Haudenosaunee] is going to be able to change that for people. He's been sent by the creator himself, [speaking in Haudenosaunee].

I'm going to take a little bit of a tangent and talk a little bit about our creation story. We had, part of the creation story talks about a sky woman, who is a pregnant woman, fell from the sky world onto the earth. She gave birth to a daughter. The daughter grows into a young woman and becomes pregnant without a man. Sounds a little bit similar, right? There's a few times in our stories where this type of thing happens.

Unfortunately, sky woman's daughter dies during childbirth, and she has, ends up having twins. The right-handed twin is born the normal way. The left-handed twin is in such a hurry, he comes out her side and kills her. And, of course, there's all kinds of other stuff happening here.

But the, at the end of the day, the right-handed twin ends up covering her with dirt. And from her body grows all of these plants and things that will end up sustaining people later someday after they're created. Out of her mind grows the tobacco. Out of her breasts grows the corn. Out of her heart grows the strawberries. Out of her hands grows the beans. Out of her stomach grows the squash. And out of her feet grows the potatoes.

So the reason I let you know about this is it's talking about the things that the right-handed twin is going to do later involving all of these things that are growing from his mother's body. He ends up going through and creating all kinds of different things in creation. And one of the things he creates is human beings. So he gives, he goes on

and gives us his breath, his blood, and a piece of his mind. And when he created people, he intended that we all care for and respect each other.

So this picture here is actually from [speaking in Haudenosaunee]. It's a rites of passage group where young women and young men are, you know, taught about their roles and responsibilities as they transition from childhood to adulthood. And we try to do this in a culturally responsible way to let them know about what they're going to expect when they come into adulthood. And it's also nice that they make a pact with each other that they're going to watch out for each other. They're going to care for each other. And they're going to respect each other the way that [speaking in Haudenosaunee] meant when he created us.

So some of these words here at the top, this is the message that the peacemaker carried with him, [speaking in Haudenosaunee] as he went throughout his travels. This is what [speaking in Haudenosaunee] put him here to bring to the people, [speaking in Haudenosaunee] and that's peace of mind. [Speaking in Haudenosaunee], that's love. And [speaking in Haudenosaunee], that's power.

So these three principles is what the peacemaker went and carried to the people, talking about how we're meant to care for each other, how we're meant to not hurt each other, how we are meant to respect each other, and how we have the power to be able to convince other people that this is the way that we should all treat each other. And that this is how [speaking in Haudenosaunee] had meant for us to carry on on the earth.

In the next slide, so here's a bit of a map to show how the peacemaker traveled through what is now New York to get the people to agree to follow this way of being, the way of treating each other. He kind of zigzags all over the place. And this is where a good chunk of the story lies, all of these different people he meets along his journey. [Speaking in Haudenosaunee], that's his grandmother and his mom. And then, of course, there's him, [speaking in Haudenosaunee].

But then, there's all kinds of other people. [Speaking in Haudenosaunee], that's the wizard that ends up being the last holdout before all of the confederacy can get pulled together. There's [speaking in Haudenosaunee]. This is a woman who is at the crossroads, so to speak, of different people traveling from here and there. And she's getting involved in matters of war and more bloodshed. And the peacemaker comes and convinces her that this isn't the way to be. That you're in a very powerful position for people to pass through here, and that you should use that position to be able to help spread the message of peace, love, and peace, and power.

And she agrees. And this role and her agreeing to be a help is why we have our clan mothers situated that, the way they are. And that will come into play in a little bit. And then [speaking in Haudenosaunee], a lot of you might know him as Hiawatha. So [speaking in Haudenosaunee] is, ends up being, you know, the peacemaker's right-hand man and helps him travel through all the different areas to try to bring all of these people together.

And he also plays a big role. He has some tragic things happen to him in his life. And the peacemaker comes and helps him through it, helps him through the loss of his daughters. And that becomes an important role in our protocols for later on how we conduct ourselves as a community, how we're there for each other, and how we care for each other.

So what we have here is these are the nations that end up joining the confederacy, who end up accepting the peacemaker's message. We have from east to west, we have the Mohawks, the Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga, and then the Seneca. So he, and this is the infamous Hiawatha belt that a lot of people are familiar with. When somebody talks about a wampum belt, this is often the one that people think about.

And actually, there was an advertisement, oh, it's probably going about 20 or 30 years ago, saying this is the first draft of the U.S. Constitution right here in the Hiawatha belt. And I know that kind of ruffled a bit of feathers. But one of the things that we're here to talk about and explain about is our influence in how we've been able to form comprehensive governing bodies prior to European contact, and how we were able to do so on a massive and inclusive scale.

And on the left-hand side right here, this is the circle wampum. And that is representing of all of the chiefs in the confederacy, talking about how they are joined at the arms, and that they're going to stand together against, you know, everything that comes against them. They have agreed to bury their weapons of war against each other, and that they are going to be peaceful. That they're going to extend the longhouse rafters to any other nation that wants to come in and join and accept the messages of [speaking in Haudenosaunee]. So anyone that wants to accept that will be welcomed in.

And that did happen, and that's the Tuscarora. So they joined and became what's known as the six, of the Sixth Nation. And then, there were others that came and accepted, but didn't necessarily become full members, but still accepted the protection of the Haudenosaunee.

And this slide right here is really, this is a graphic of how decisions are made. What does the decision-making process look like? Because that's a whole lot of people, right, to get together back prior to European contact to make decisions. So I want to start first at the local level, and that's the clan mothers. So clan mothers were the eldest woman in a longhouse, in a family, or in a clan. And clans had multiple clan mothers.

Like so, for example, in Oneida, or in Oneida in general, we have nine clans. We have three bear, three turtle, and three wolves. Each one of those has, you know, the clan mother. There are three wolf clan mothers and three wolf chiefs. The same thing for the bears and then the wolves. So there's differences in the different nations that are part of the confederacy as to how many they have. But what it is is each chief has a clan mother, and each clan mother has a chief.

So these decisions that are made at the local level are generally taken up by the clan mothers after input from everyone in the community. And that's where this direct democracy and this decision-making comes from on a local level where everyone has a voice. And then, the clan mothers will appoint the chiefs. They give directions to the chiefs. And if the chiefs don't listen to the clan mothers, and after warnings to the chiefs, they can take the title away from the chiefs. And this has happened in the past. So it's a way to, a checks and balances, so to speak, of the clan mothers and then the chiefs.

So at the confederacy level, and that's really what this main picture is about, that's where all of the chiefs from the different nations come together to make the

decisions. So we have here, on the left-hand side, we have the chiefs over here. We have the elder brothers over here, the Seneca and the Mohawk. And they'll take up an issue. And that's at the number one spot. They'll go back and forth with an issue that's brought before the council. And then when they've done that, they'll go ship it back over to the other side with the younger brothers. That's the Oneida and the Cayuga.

And they'll decide back and forth to an issue. And they'll come up with a thought, and they'll, you know, try to improve on it. And then, they'll send it back and forth. So that number three, they can kick the issue back and forth, back and forth. And they'll do that up to three times before an issue is laid to rest. If you don't understand, if you don't come to an agreement, then the issue is done, and it's not dealt with again.

When it comes back and forth, and they have a consensus on something, then they'll kick it up to the Onondaga, and those are up at the top. And then, they're kind of the final decisionmaker. They ratify the agreement, and they'll memorialize the agreement between all of the people there.

So this is kind of a way of to try to make sure, again, that these chiefs, when they come here, they're coming with the voice from all of the people in their communities, the directives from their clan mothers. And then, they have to try to work it out with each other to try to figure out how to make these decisions in this quite complex but yet way that could take a very long time. But they were willing to put in the time to try to make sure that they have these issues resolved in a way that everyone can agree with. And that's all I had on this part. I'll go ahead and turn it over to Richard.

MONETTE: Okay. Good evening, everyone. After hearing the first two presentations that had hardly a mention of Euro-America, appropriately enough, I guess I would add, my charge is going to be to start to build bridges between what has been said and sort of your world and what you might understand, in particular, in the context of democracy and governance, where it gets a little more tricky.

This presentation will go over the course of two nights. And so while the first two were relatively nicely well-contained, self-contained, this one will not be so much. Mine is going to spill over into both sessions. So this first night, I'm going to give you a history of the world in 15 minutes, like Becky said. And not just my world, but yours too.

So those of you who are familiar with indigeneity in America have heard two reoccurring themes. First, that all things are related, and second, that it's all about balance. And I realize when we say those things that we don't always, you know, say what we mean. And so my task in particular over these two sessions will be to explain what we mean by those things, particularly in the context of democracy and governance.

So I'm going to be running through some slides quickly just to sort of have some fun. The second night will be maybe less fun. But I intend to have a little bit of fun here tonight, so pay attention and hang on. Okay. So many indigenous peoples refer to North America as Turtle Island. The name represents the relationship between time and space.

The space element perhaps is a bit more obvious. You see the shape. And there's all kinds of art on, in and on this. You might take a, take some, a few minutes to have a look at them with some explanations. And you'll see that they're all different.

One of the teachings is to, you know, to learn the story in your own way, to add to it, to make it your story, and I intend to do that tonight.

So turtle is also time. Notice the 13 segments on the turtle's back. Those represent the 13 moons of the year, representing the time cycle when the moon draws on the water spirits of the earth and of our own bodies. In our stories, women and men and everybody has moons. And everybody being made of water, we are subject to the balancing forces of the cosmos of the moons just as the waters of the earth are.

Note also the 12 tabs on each side of the turtle. I numbered them on one side to see, making 24. And when you add the four legs, 28. Thirteen times 28 is 364. That's the year. Of course, it's missing a day. But that, the, you know, sort of the last day of the first year is one leg, and the same with the second leg and the third leg and the fourth leg. And so you make up that last day, plus you go through those four years until you get that year to adjust, which among some of the other stories, that's what that head is about.

It's a, so you can see all the mathematics in there. You can see that, in each quadrant, where there's a leg and then six days or six weeks or six years or six generations. And then the second leg and six days, six generations, seven, so seven with the leg, right, and the same with the third and the fourth. It's an absolutely accurate calendar.

Okay. So this slide shows several relations that must be kept right. For our purposes tonight, we'll focus on the collective and the individual, the public and the private. I'm going to post, pause at these truisms here upfront, that each society decides for itself the balance between public and private. Where a society places that balance is a defining marker of its culture. Without sovereignty, without self-governance, without self-determination, a society cannot make its own cultural balance between its government and its citizens.

This represents infinity to you, right? Fair enough. It also represents that without sort of proper relations between the two sides, and a proper balance among other things to keep that feather safe there, infinity cannot obtain. And so we're going to come back to this notion often, this session and next session. Incidentally, this rock sculpture was created by one of the well-known LaFountain brothers, native artists from Turtle Mountain. It sits at the entryway to the tribal leader's office in the tribal headquarters.

Okay. Here, we have the single most important slide that I'm going to show you. It's the clean slate, absolute freedom. I am free, all alone on the clean slate to liberty. And just a bit of a side thought, but has anyone ever seemed to be more free than Christopher Columbus? Well, it doesn't last forever.

Here, we have more persons. The sage once wrote that all men are created equal. Perhaps he didn't have the courage to add, but as soon as that creation thing-y is over and done with. So with the inevitable loss of absolute freedom, a new freedom is born. Perhaps the most important freedom for democracy and governance, the freedom of association.

So these newcomers here, these six, are bestowed with this freedom. They haven't associated yet, but that too doesn't last very long. This person and the corn both have the freedom of association. And so the first relationship formed is not that between human beings, this relationship between human and the earth. Here the

human and the corn causes many good things. And in the spirit of balance, it causes some bad things. Most importantly for our purposes, this relationship shifts the societal forces of balance. Or put another way, it's just a balance of power between all of these people in their fledgling society.

This person, perhaps sensing the shifting balance, decides to form her own relationship with squash. Again, the forces of balance shift. Maybe she's counterbalancing the relationship that, with that other person and corn, which is also certainly shifting and affecting the balance of power with everybody else there.

Okay. So you're getting the idea. So this stick person has beans. The same dynamic, corn, squash, and beans. Now here at the bottom, we have two persons that exercise their freedom of association with each other and with the beans. And they end up producing twice as much, noticeably shifting the balance of power in society between them and their fellow society people.

At the lower left, these persons form what will become perhaps the most ubiquitous exercise of the freedom of association. They form an institution too, a union, a marriage. The roots of a family that will someday dramatically shift the force of the balance in society.

On the upper right, these people do the same, and they do it with their corn. We can see the imbalances and the distortions and some of the dissonance. Not all bad, maybe not all good, but it becomes pretty plain. And these couple of characters in the lower right, they kind of look like suspicious-looking characters, don't they? Hmm.

So at the top, this person forms a relationship with weeds. I wonder if they did that on purpose. Well, importantly for our purposes, the relationship between the weeds and the corn, squash, and beans shifted the relationship between the respective persons as well. As a result of this kind of happenstance, disputes arose and rules evolved, and rules that had to be enforced. So enforcement processes were involved.

So I'd like to read these to you quickly as well then. All societies had norms and made rules, or they would not have survived as a society in Europe or here on Turtle Island. All societies enforced and executed their norms and rules, or they would not have survived as a society anywhere. All societies being made of humans as they are, they resolved disputes using their norms and rules, or they would not have survived as a society.

And so institutions are born to develop and influence the rules, the enforcement, the resolution of disputes. Freedom of association forms families, with children dramatically shifting the balance of power. After all, these kids get to work for free in mom and pop's pizza shop. We have the freedom of association forms a church with members who make rules that, among other things, sometimes limit their members' freedom of association.

Persons at the top, look what they did. They formed a corporation. They aggregated their monies to take advantage of the weed problem, by the way, building weed control, a problem that they, in part, created, dramatically shifting the balance of power. And in the process, maybe limiting the freedom of association with others as well with maybe noncompete clauses and nondisclosure agreements.

Importantly, as noted above, the balance is internal. Some balance is internal, and some is external. For example, the corporation not only shifted the balance of power externally in society at large, but it did so internally inside the corporation. And

so these persons who bear the brunt of that power, the workers, exercise their own freedom of association or what they had left of it.

And they too formed an association, an institution, a union, which they used to counterbalance the corporate proprietors. For better or worse, both the proprietors and the union set out to impact the balance of power within the corporation against each other, and also outside the corporation, with society at large. Even the church became plural churches. Look at that, counterbalancing society, counterbalancing other institutions, counterbalancing even each other.

Here are some of the more interesting perhaps associations, including some not necessarily born of freedom, such as the military and police, or one more external and one more internal. One getting outside of society, doing its job outside of society, the other doing its job inside society, which is what we'll talk about next time. Either way, both dramatically shifting the balance of power.

So here's the press doing the same. People exercising their freedom of association and forming the press as a corporation or some other institution and dramatically shifting the balance of power. Importantly, this concept starts to creep in here with a few of these institutions. Just important to recognize that there's a private sort of persona in the press, and there's a public sort of persona. Like the examples I gave here, the private one, *The Capital Times*, and the public, Wisconsin Public Radio, for example.

Here's a soldier, one of those old soldiers I pulled off the earlier slide. Notice the private persona here as well written into the second amendment, just to make a point, the right to bear arms, but the public persona also written into that second amendment, which has caused sort of endless, a haggling, the well-regulated militia. We'll talk about that some more when we get to the second part.

So too the corporation, some public, some private, some more public than private, some more private than public, each of them balance within themselves. And each of them balance against society in different ways. And so we'll talk more about that next time as well.

Here's an important point at this stage. When a society gets to this stage and determines its own culture and identity with its own norms and values, especially regarding relations and balances, buoyed by common mores and principles, customs and traditions, discernible from within and from without, generally accepted or imposed, that society has attained the constituted state whether or not that constitution is written. So here perhaps is one of the most important ideas for tonight. It's not only important what we separate in government, but what we separate from government.

Now I'm sure you've all heard the Native American stories of the three sisters, the corn, squash, and beans that all grow separately. But we the humans with the gift of reason from the creator recognized their relations. And we brought them together for the cornstalk to provide a trellis for the beans, for the beans to make the corn grow taller, for the squash to keep the sun out and the moisture in for them all to grow together to flourish. Likewise, societal rules, enforcement, and dispute resolution built into the norms and customs and values of the society, also beginning out there in society separately, are brought together by us, using the gift of reason.

We recognized their relations, their balances and their imbalances, their checks and balances, and we brought them together like corn, squash, and beans under one

roof to flourish. So this then for tonight is government, democracy in government. This photo was taken in the reservation, Turtle Mountain, at the center of North America, a place we call Turtle's Heart, on a hilltop outside the home where my dad lived out his last days.

When I was young and cajoled to pick berries with Auntie Sweetheart, she said in her always playful way, these trees are related underground. Sometimes, their roots fight with each other. Sometimes, their roots party with each other. I smiled and took it all in.

Years later, when I graduated from law school, I had a conversation with my dad about government. He walked me out to these same trees, and here's what he said. These are chokecherry trees growing across the bottom here. And this is an oak tree behind them, one single oak. If they were separate, this oak and these chokecherry trees would grow tall and strong.

But when they're together like this, the little chokecherry trees steal the food from the soil faster than the oak tree can get to it. And so the oak tree's growth is stunted. But this also causes the oak to grow outward, extending its wingspan, and in the meantime blocking the sun's path to the chokecherry trees, which also stunts their growth.

So like corn, squash, and beans, we purposely bring oak and chokecherry trees together. But why would we want stunted oak trees? Here's why, to stunt the chokecherry trees. But why would we want stunted chokecherry trees? Simple. So we can reach them, pick them, eat them, and live. We are all related. And so this is government of us and of nature, rightly related and properly balanced toward infinity. And the roots underground, according to Auntie Sweetheart, fighting and partying are the people, the roots of democracy.

Here's a picture of Auntie Sweetheart, by the way. I couldn't tell a story with, about her without finding a picture, and thankfully my sister did at the last moment. This is her in all her glory, holding a blond baby doll, wearing a basket upside down on her head for good effect. And she was a wonderful, gracious character. So for tonight, that's the end and the beginning. Thank you.

NOODIN: So it turned out different the way it looks on here. And I realize it might be a little harder for you to read, but to share a line that means something to the signatories of this Treaty of Greenville from 1795. You can see faintly on the side there in the margins that this was [speaking in Anishinaabe], a treaty between a number of nations. But for what we're talking about tonight, I focused on the section where you see the clan symbols and the handwritten names of the leaders of the Chippewa, the Odawa, and the Potawatomi here in the Great Lakes region.

And when they signed this treaty, they were changing the way land and annuities would work for their people for many, many years to come. And also, they changed the line that was where the edge of the United States was defined. They did all this knowing that change was inevitable. But I think that when we look now at equality and democracy, we sometimes need to look backward and see, what were the hopes and the visions of the people who were shaping this place at that early time?

There's a, in the writing there, a translation of the line, we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all those alive are created equal. In the translation, you have just one

switch of one word. So that thinking about who are the beings, who are equal, it's more actually than just the humans, so in Anishinaabe, when we'll end this line, [speaking in Anishinaabe]. And we hope that we've given you a lot to think about. You can see the way our ideas of balance and democracy differ, but the ways that they are fundamentally the core of the space here in North America.

CLOWES: Thank you, Margaret. So we'll bring up all of the panelists now. And I wanted to invite John Greenler to tell us whether there are, let's unmute all of the panelists and make everybody visible and ask John Greenler if there are any questions that have come up in the Q&A.

GREENLER: One question that we did receive for Rebecca was, can you tell us about the dates, approximations of the timeline that you were sharing during your, with your presentation?

WEBSTER: Yeah. So that's an interesting question. And it, people always want to measure time in, you know, 1900s, 1800s. This all happened before contact. So it's not something that, we didn't measure time the same way.

And when I asked, you know, one of my mentors about this, so how do we know, and sure, scientists will talk about, you know, an eclipse and looking back at the calendar when that actually happened. For us, it doesn't really matter to pinpoint an exact date of when this happened. That this is the stories that our ancestors carried with them. They recited it, and they continue to hold it with them and pass it on to subsequent generations. So time is a different construct as far as the story goes.

CLOWES: Margaret or Richard, do you want to add anything to that?

NOODIN: I would say something very much the same. That, you know, when we talk about time, it's a matter of accounting for events but not necessarily measuring the distance between them in the same way. So I think it's, we can talk about millennium, and we can say it was maybe three or four millennia ago. I mean, when I'm talking about the Treaty of Greenville, that has a date fixed now. But when I'm talking about clan systems and the ways that people decide it, that's definitely thousands and thousands of years ago.

CLOWES: One of the things I thought about while listening to Richard talk about relationships was the movement in many places to recognize the sovereignty of rivers or of, you know, land bodies in particular. And I'd love to hear any of you address that from your own perspective.

MONETTE: Becky, either of you?

WEBSTER: Can you repeat that?

CLOWES: Yeah. Did you not hear me? I'm thinking about . . .

WEBSTER: No.

CLOWES: . . . I don't know where exactly I'm remembering this from, but I know that there are places, I believe in Australia, where they're recognizing the, there are proposals to recognize the sovereignty, you know, by a western government or a national government to recognize the sovereignty of a river or of a body of land, a mountain, to protect it, but also just really thinking about it in that sense of relationship, it seems to me. And I wondered if any of you had thoughts about that.

MONETTE: Yeah.

NOODIN: I . . .

MONETTE: That's, yeah.

NOODIN: Go ahead, Richard. Yeah.

MONETTE: It's an interesting movement. That's actually New Zealand that has declared one of its rivers to be a person. We've had a couple of tribes do the same. I think the Yurok tribe in California has done that. The Ho-Chunk has been sort of toying with the idea. At least, I don't think they've gotten it done yet as they anticipate.

You know, it, that's going to be a complicated one. And I hope that's what we, what I have to say next time. Not to put too much on what we say next time, but I hope it comes to bear in that a bit because, you know, we, all things are related, including the rivers. We don't have to be rivers. They don't have to be us. What we have to recognize is that if we think we have a right to exist, that they have a right to exist.

Our system, on the other hand, affects them, right? And we're not going to get a river file a lawsuit in court and have its own standing. There's no way that's going to happen. So if we start to, you know, make it technical in a way that Americans can understand that, it's going to be difficult. It's all going to come back really to whether we understand that they too and everything else has a right to exist.

CLOWES: Mm-hmm.

MONETTE: Yeah.

CLOWES: John, is there anything else from the Q&A?

GREENLER: Yeah. We have several good questions coming forward, and please make additions. Here's one, what is known about the issues that the confederation resolved?

WEBSTER: So there's all kinds of issues. One of them that comes to mind right away is during post-contact. And we had tried to try to keep a lot of what we're talking about today prior to European contact, but I think this is an example that will really put things into perspective. And it's an important part of our history is that during the revolutionary

war, the Oneidas and the Tuscaroras sided with the Americans. And the other members of the confederacy decide, sided with the British. And that was, it, again, like so much here, it's a really long story.

But so during these council meetings, they tried to find some type of a common ground, some type of a resolution. And at first, we all just decided, we're going to be neutral. We're not going to get involved in somebody else's war. And that worked for a little while. But it eventually came down to there really wasn't going to be avoiding this issue. The issue was tossed back and forth, back and forth. And when it finally came back up to the Onondaga to make a decision, it was decided that we're just, can't make a decision. So we're going to cover the council fire until this issue passes.

So if you read in European mindset, historians will write in books about how the confederacy died. But if you talk to any Haudenosaunee person, we'll tell you the confederacy didn't die. Simmer down. We covered the council fire because we knew we couldn't resolve the issue right now. So what happened is, then the war happened. All kinds of terrible, tragic, awful things happened during that war. But afterward, after the war was done, the confederacy came back together. We relit the embers of that council fire.

And actually, the Oneida belt, it memorializes the coming back together of the confederacy. That's another one of our wampum belts. And it carries the Oneida name. An Oneida chief introduced that to recognize again that the Haudenosaunee Confederacy has not been defeated. And we're still here. And actually, even today, we are still here as a governing body making decisions that affect all of our member tribes.

GREENLER: Thank you. That's a powerful story. Another question for Professor Rebecca Webster, how did the inclusion of the Tuscarora people into the confederacy change the deliberative process?

WEBSTER: So my understanding of how this works is the Tuscarora sit with the Oneidas. They don't necessarily have the chiefs the same way, but their voices are taken up along with the Oneidas. So the Oneidas would carry some of their messages along with them as part of the, that unit that sits there.

So and in changing the deliberative process, it didn't really, you know, we didn't create a sixth set within how that all works together. Rather, it was just more voices. And we don't see more voices as a bad thing. We see it as a good thing because everyone comes to the table with a different perspective. And we value those differences. And we value those ideas that people come, and they help us make better decisions.

CLOWES: You want to go to the next question, John?

GREENLER: Yeah. Actually, the next one is a comment and not a question, but I just thought it would be wonderful to pass it along. It was a lot of information. Thank you. I feel humble. I like how you explain history. Next question, can you say more about how the drafters of the U.S. Constitution may have learned from the Haudenosaunee Confederation?

WEBSTER: Next time. That's why you guys got to stay tuned. And in two sessions, we're going to cover that very topic.

CLOWES: Yeah. That's on March 25th. The March 4th one, we'll look at classical Greece and Rome and some of the Enlightenment philosophers that influenced the framers. But then, we'll have all three of these wonderful presenters back on March 25th to address that very specifically.

GREENLER: This question may fit into that same category, but I want to pass it along. The modern American approach to democracy places too much value on individualism. Can you speak to that balance of individualism and community in your traditions?

MONETTE: Yeah. You know, balance comes to bear on everybody in America. And it's a question of whether you are trying to balance other things, or whether other things are trying to balance you. And but we'll all be subject to the balance whether or not we do it purposefully or not. Our, the teaching is to do it purposefully, to engage the balance, and to discern where the differences between, you know, the collective and the individual, between public and private.

And so interestingly enough, I mean, we're still here today. People still talk this way. You might have to cajole, at least where I'm from, some of the older folks to talk this way. But if you raise issues like, well, let's say the one we hear about all the time, the so-called public/private partnership over data, right, and whether we use data for homeland security as a public matter, as a collective interest, or whether we are using data and violating people's privacy as an individual liberty interest. And how do we find the right sort of balance there?

And it's one question if the government, let's say, is being the custodian of that data. It's another thing perhaps if another private entity is being the custodian of that data, your church, a corporation, right, maybe nobody, maybe yourself. Although, we can all stick our heads in the sand if we think that's still a possibility. So we're stuck with some of these other options.

And the way, our way that we're taught to think about what are the right relationships here, and set them on the table, and find the proper balances between them, still applies to these issues today, and I think helps us think them through. And I wish the rest of America would follow along. We might all learn something.

GREENLER: Here's a question with a different tact. What will come of a Native American being appointed secretary of the interior?

CLOWES: Anyone want to tackle that?

NOODIN: Now how we're taking turns, I'll, I can give my thoughts. I mean, we'll have to see. She will think for herself, right? I think that one of the things that I think will come of that is people will recognize there are other ways of thinking and being. And a lot of Native Americans, and especially young Native Americans, will see that they could grow up to do that.

So I think that sometimes we're talking about operating within indigenous frameworks and ways of thinking. And I can think of many times a day where just applying a relational model of success is slightly different than the way that we might be encouraged by American society to think.

But most importantly, I think what, you know, Dr. Webster mentioned, that the diversity, all, and honoring of all the different ways, it's the same thing really, you know, that Dr. Monette mentioned too. All of the ways of identifying, being recognized and respected, that value I think is, you know, buried in the older teachings. But it's also very much needed today. So we hope that what comes of this is that she stands in that space and is able to reflect values about the land that are broader than, you know, what might just be dictated by a profit model that's maybe shorter lived.

GREENLER: Definitely something to look forward to.

MONETTE: Can I jump in? There's just a lot of fun with that question. I won't get . . .

GREENLER: Please.

MONETTE: . . . too complicated like a law professor. But the Supreme Court explained a hiring preference in that department for Indians based on the fact that according to the court, that was our representation in the federal government. That was Native American tribes' representation in the federal government, which is, you know, that's something short of a couple senators and a few representatives. But we'll take it.

And I think she will, in fact, be a, more of a representative for Native Americans than someone who's not Native American. And I think in particular, you know, we have different gender types with different ideas and different ways of dealing with things. And I think that it's high time to get back to what I think she'll bring to the table.

But just another thought by the way, though. The Supreme Court also is hard pressed to ever say that the Indian tribes have jurisdiction over non-Indians. And I'm just thinking if this Bureau of Indian Affairs gives us representation in the federal government and justifies its jurisdiction over us, maybe every tribe should start a bureau of non-Indian affairs. What do you think? And we could hold their property in trust and lease it for them and things. Okay, just having fun.

CLOWES: Rebecca Webster just noted that someone is raising their hand. So please, if you have a question, put it in the Q&A. I think the raised hand function is not going to work for us very well tonight. John, what else is on the slate there?

GREENLER: Yeah. There's a real wealth of questions here. This is wonderful. Thank you, folks. Another one, the U.S. Constitution begins with the words, we the people. Is there a similar concept in native thought?

WEBSTER: Sure. I know in our [speaking in Haudenosaunee], that's, some people call it our thanksgiving address, it's how we open up a lot of our ceremonies or meetings where we go around and give thanks to everything in creation because we're just one small humble part of all of creation. And at the end of each section, where we talk

about each different thing, we say in the language, and so it be our minds. So we're bringing our minds together. So we're agreeing that all of this is important, and we're thankful for everything around us.

MONETTE: You know, to this day, you can't have an election back on the reservation without hearing at least 1,000 times the people, the people, the people. What I find interesting about that though, and a bit of addressing that question, is you can never quite tell if they're talking about the people as individuals, like persons, or the people itself as the collective, right?

GREENLER: Yeah.

MONETTE: And I think that is wholly appropriate that the balance is maintained there.

GREENLER: Also not a question, but a good comment possibly worth consideration. Not a question, but along with recognizing that rivers have a right to exist as with the oak and the chokecherry, we depend on rivers. And they take care of us if we take care of them. Thank you.

MONETTE: That's better than I said it. Can I add something else, unless Margaret and Becky are going to jump in? Yeah? No?

NOODIN: Go ahead.

MONETTE: So, you know, the people of Wisconsin, where I'm assuming most of you are from, we had, at one time, the idea almost that the rivers had their own being and rights as well. Now again, they weren't walking into the courtroom and filing their own lawsuits. But we had a public intervener that would file lawsuits on behalf of the resources themselves. And they called it the Public Trust Doctrine and called the resources Public Trust Resources.

And it was a constitutional and legal way of recognizing their existence, independent of us as individual property owners and others. That basically, that idea got under their skin. Or the collective, they had a, they had their own existence, and we should not downplay that. And we should recognize that, at one point, our laws tilted in that direction and unfortunately, recently have tilted away.

GREENLER: Next question, how institutionalized, self-conscious, were the governmental systems that you each talked about? Was it viewed as a system, or was it more properly a part of culture? We view government as an institution somewhat separate from culture, though I know that this is a false distinction.

WEBSTER: Is this like the separation of church and state kind of stuff? I'm not sure. Yeah. They're, the decision-making process was purely governmental. But in that same buildings is where we held our ceremonies. But if you look at the confederacy as a whole, I'm sure with the Three Fires too, there were distinct peoples with different languages. Sure, you could understand each other to an extent, but a lot of people

were multilingual at that time. So there were different cultures coming together with different ceremonies to have a government and function together and make decisions that affected the entire confederacy.

NOODIN: Let me say, that's the same . . .

CLOWES: Margaret, do you want to add to that?

NOODIN: Yeah. I mean, I would add that that is very much the same. So that you have, if you think of the separation of church and state, we talk about that in modern terms as separating ceremony from the court. Or we separate, you know, celebration from law or something. I don't know. I mean, I've heard people talk about it different ways.

But you talk about these old ways that the clans came together. And when they came together, there would be decision-making. And there are all kinds of stories that document and explain the decisions that they made and the impact those decisions had. But then, there were ceremonies that brought them together in other ways. And those often happened in the very same place, at the same gatherings, at the same time.

And so there are some documented, like in the Sault Ste. Marie area, back to, you know, where we now have Sault Ste. Marie in Michigan and Ontario. There were gatherings that went on for at least 800 years when people came together and made decisions together.

The same would be true for the confluence of rivers in Milwaukee. That was another space that people came together. And there are stories that talk about coming together to make decisions, but then also coming together to celebrate and to often forge alliances and work across some of those, you know, distinctions that we mentioned, you know, whether it's language or culture, sharing of differences.

MONETTE: So to suggest even the terms church and state and that they might be separate is sometimes to suggest that we are alleviating ourselves and our leaders from the responsibilities that church and religion might impose. I, now I understand if we're talking about church as a church and government, and the person used the word institutions, those are institutions that we do keep separate. And we keep them separate for reasons that I talked about.

And we'll talk about some more when we aggregate the power of a corporation with the government, or the press with the government, or a church with a government. They can co-op the government, each of them, or the government can in turn co-op either one of them. And so we keep them separate.

So that's why my slide, it's not only important what we separate in government, legislative, executive, and judicial, but it's important what we separate from government. Because even though they're separated from government, that's still all part of our society. And so we have to account for the societal forces that they impact and have to account for the balance between them. So and we don't separate from press because we don't believe in press. We separate from press because we do.

And we don't separate from corporations because we think they're not powerful. We separate them because we know they are powerful. We don't separate from

church, and let me even tease it out a little bit with religion and church, we don't, because we don't believe in it. Now it means a different thing there, right? But we separate it because we do believe it. Or at least we believe in the societal power of it and the way that the societal power can be aggregated with governmental public power, and the way that that can be thoroughly misused. So that's an important concept to sort of keep in mind. I appreciate that question and comment.

GREENLER: Next question, you talked about different aspects of governance. We seem good at making rules, but maybe not so good at enforcement. Can you address this?

CLOWES: Don't all speak at once.

MONETTE: Well, it depends on what you meant by, go ahead, Margaret. It sounds like, looks like you have something in mind.

NOODIN: My students often ask this, especially students that are learning the language, because it occurs to them, at some point, that this language is coming to them across time, from a point in time when there was no incarceration system. There was no court system. There were no tickets and laws and all of the things that they see as binding in their world and limiting and, you know, punishing in some ways.

And so then, they often have long conversations about what some of these core words are. And for the Anishinaabeg, often what will come up are the concept of seven grandfather teachings. So it's a little bit, you know, like each nation will have their own interpretation, but there were some core ways of behaving. And the way that it was maintained is everyone agreed and shared these values and actually called one another out and guided each other to better decisions.

When things went wrong, there was a system of restorative justice and not, you know, you had to work through. You had to find a way forward rather than just fine or remove or incarcerate someone. So I think there's, you know, again as Dr. Webster said, there's only so much you can say in a panel discussion like this. But to really think through how many thousands of years humans lived with one another and shared expectations and values, it's amazing to think how dependent modern people I think have become on some of the things we have now.

GREENLER: Here's a longer question. See if I can get it straight, get it right. For us at universities and in governments and orgs of all kinds, equity inclusion are all the rage for good reason. My students were struck in reading about the Camanche model and the idea that decolonization is not a metaphor this week, and there are certainly echoes of this tonight about the inclusiveness of traditional democratic processes from indigenous people.

And I wonder how the panelists view this current talk about and attention to equity and inclusion, and what key elements of these traditions they'd like to see applied in such efforts, parentheses e.g. to hire more professors of color, develop more inclusive policies, etc. Thank you. Very interesting session.

MONETTE: That sounds like a University of Milwaukee question.

NOODIN: We're never quick to jump in, the three of us. I think we all share a lot of these answers. I think I answer it from a University of Milwaukee perspective. I mean, we do know that Milwaukee, within our state, has a very unique place in the nation right now from Milwaukee to Kenosha. I mean, we're recognized as a place of great diversity but also a place of great binary division, and we have to get past that.

And, you know, one of the things that I've talked about is the fact that we have millennials coming to us, asking for direction, and I don't think they mean just for the next five or ten years or maybe even until they retire. I think they mean, how do we help them see toward the next millennium? How do we really help them imagine a way forward that's much bigger than the space that we're in right now?

So, you know, diversity means not only making space for voices and opinions that have not been, you know, regularly featured or heard, it also means really taking everyone into account as partners in doing that. So we can't just say, well, we've got a diversity office, they'll do it. I need my classics professors to help me do it. I need my philosophy professors to help do this, religious studies. I mean, I need to really, in many ways, in our biology classes, our math classes, invite everyone to feel equal in those spaces. And it's all of our work. So I, you know, obviously, we would have a lot of opinions on it, but I do think the time has come for us all to listen better to each other.

MONETTE: It's a balance between exclusion and inclusion.

NOODIN: Absolutely.

MONETTE: And I mean that really, and it would be nice for Americans to understand that. When they talk inclusivity, inclusion sometimes at the university, what it means is that they don't want to recognize that my nation of peoples is different and maybe separate. But my nation of peoples is not entirely separate. And whether we're going to agree with what the March of History has done or not, you know, remains to be seen. Of course, whether we have a choice to agree remains to be seen.

But, you know, Wisconsinites are Americans, and Minnesotans are Americans. But Wisconsinites are not Minnesotans. And there's nothing wrong with Wisconsinites being Americans and Oneidas being Americans, but Wisconsinites not being Oneidans, is that a word, Oneidans, right?

And so, yeah, we want to celebrate the diversity, but we want to celebrate the university. We want to celebrate the inclusion, but we, Native America especially, wants to celebrate and have understood the exclusion, not just the inclusion. And, you know, and all of that then is just, so let's just talk about the balance. It's so much easier to talk about and understand.

WEBSTER: I just want to make a comment about the inclusion part. And so I was just some scrubby little girl from the Oneida reservation, and I went to UW-Madison. That was kind of unheard of for anybody in our family. And I can't tell you how much that meant to me to have indigenous instructors. That really meant the world to me to be

able to relate to them, to see somebody else who was able to accomplish those things and is in a position to be able to share what they've learned with us.

And then, well, then I went to law school, and I didn't get any indigenous instructors there. That was a pretty, really sad three years. But that's because Richard was off being chairman of his tribe. So I guess I'll have to forgive him for that. But so now that I'm in a position to be an instructor, I do know that that means a lot to our students, especially when I teach in the Department of American Indian Studies. And we have a lot of native students. But then, you look at the numbers of how diverse our student population is and how diverse the faculty is or is not.

So what do we do about that? Because there are so many students, diverse students at our university and at other universities that aren't seeing people like them in the people that are teaching them. And sometimes, that can affect retention rates, their grades for sure. So it really is important to see someone like you in positions that are making a difference.

CLOWES: Let me just break in quickly and say that we have about four more minutes for questions. So if you've got something really burning, and you want to put it in there with an extra exclamation point, please do it now. And if we have too many questions that can't be answered, I'd be happy to post them on our Facebook group afterwards, and maybe we can get them, get you some answers that way. Go ahead, John.

GREENLER: Yeah. Thank you, Jody. I was just going to make the same, note the same thing. Here's one I think which is interesting. How did individual tribal members communicate their opinions to the decisionmakers? Were the chiefs the ones who discussed the issues? Tell us more about this process. I'm guessing that question could just be answered just as much in the present as in the past tense.

MONETTE: Yeah.

WEBSTER: Any time at, so one of the parts of the stories of the peacemaker going to the different communities is that before he would discuss a topic, he would tell people, he'd tell the men that they should go out hunting, tell the women and children to gather and harvest the food and to cook the food, and then they would all come together for a meal. And after the meal or during the meal is when they would discuss things.

So I don't think it's necessarily like a town hall meeting from 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. on a Thursday is when you get to talk to them. I think because the communities were smaller, everyone talked about these issues, and it was locally, really. The clan mothers gathered the information and made those local decisions, directed the chiefs on what messages to carry when they went to grand council for the whole confederacy-wide. So I think it was real more personable, and everyone had a voice. That doesn't mean that what they thought should happen was going to happen. But everyone had a say in how things were going to be developed moving forward.

GREENLER: Yeah. Jody, do we have time for one more quick question?

CLOWES: I think so.

GREENLER: I'll also just note, somebody was raising their hand. So once again, if you have a question, please put it in the Q&A box. This seems like a great closing question for our panelists who are educators. How can we integrate these ways of thinking into our education system?

MONETTE: Hmm. Well, I'll start because I know they'll have more to say than I have. Very carefully, you can imagine if I gave as a lecture what I talked about here in law school, how long it would take people to think that I'd flipped my lid, and it was time to lock me up, right? And but I try. And I, so I try to talk about like I did, mentioned earlier, let's say the, you know, data privacy and homeland security sort of thing. I try to raise things in this way to tell them, find the relations and find if how we're balancing them, or if we are, and it, without mentioning anything about Native America. But we, you know, we have to find a way to do that.

And, you know, I think it's coming. Well, I did go through some of those slides one time in a class. And when I got to a point about where I ended there, one of the, two of the students spoke up. One of them was a young woman, and she said, well, where is the room for capitalism? And I said to her, I said, I'm halfway through, but I thought that's all I was talking about was capitalism. I'm sorry if you found it tilting toward socialism more as it was lurching toward the middle.

Next time, we'll talk about socialism some. And now, I'm giving away what I'm going to talk about next time a little bit how it's going to work, but you'll find that socialism tilting toward capitalism. And that there is no 100% capitalist society, never was, never will be. There's no 100% socialist society, never was, never will be, certainly neither for very long. Instead, they are all balanced, and we should understand why. And we should understand that we make it our objective to do that, not just to be sort of random actors and to have it act upon us in a way that maybe is too late.

WEBSTER: One easy way to incorporate some of this into your classrooms is find indigenous authors. And have us tell our own story about something and use that as some of your curriculum.

CLOWES: Great suggestion. Margaret?

NOODIN: All global indigenous traditions, I mean, I think there's just so much people often completely underestimate not only the diversity of indigenous thought and ideas within our state, but, you know, across the nation. We have, you know, over 500 nations. Most people never learn that or pay attention to what's right here let alone, you know, other global intellectual traditions. So to just start including things, I think, is the best way to go about it.

CLOWES: Great. That's a wonderful place to end, I think. I really am so grateful to all three of you for sharing so much information and really giving us so much to think about. I'm grateful to all of our participants for joining us today, you know, maybe not

knowing exactly what you'd expect. And I hope you've learned something and have found something to take home with you and think about.

So as I mentioned earlier, in the next couple of days, we'll be sending you a recording of the presentation along with a short survey, asking for your feedback about how this went. And we'd really appreciate hearing your thoughts. It helps us prepare for the next one and for future events. And we'll also include a link, of course, as I've said several times, to the Facebook group where you can continue this conversation and possibly post some of those questions that John wasn't able to get to.

So I really hope many of you will be able to rejoin us on March 25th to hear more from Richard and Rebecca and Margaret to carry this conversation a little further. And we also have, of course, our next session on March 4th, where Adriana Brook and John Kaminski will be talking about the influence of classical Greek and Roman democracy and Enlightenment thought on the framers of the American constitution. And until then, thank you again. And we wish you all a very good evening. Good night.

MONETTE: Good night. Thank you.

WEBSTER: [Speaking in Anishinaabe].