

Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts & Letters

Roots of Democracy

Indigenous Governance

March 25, 2021

CLOWES: Good evening. Welcome to *Post-Contact Indigenous Governance*, the third session in our Roots of Democracy series. I'm Jody Clowes, the James Watrous Gallery Director at the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts & Letters. And as many of you know, if you've joined us before, the Wisconsin Academy has been creating opportunities for people to connect with experts and learn with each other since 1870. And we're really glad to welcome any of you who are new to our community.

So our Roots of Democracy series is sponsored in part by Wisconsin Humanities, with funds from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the State of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Public Radio, the D.B. Reinhart Center for Ethics in Leadership at Viterbo University, and UW-Milwaukee, which our presenter tonight, Margaret Noodin, Dr. Noodin, is, that's her academic home. And we have 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, which is the academic home of Dr. Rebecca Webster, another of our presenters tonight.

So Roots of Democracy is an exploration of the cultural and philosophical roots of American democracy. And tonight's presentation will bring back our three presenters from the February, beginning of our Roots series to focus on indigenous governance after white settlement on Turtle Island. So as is our practice, I'd like to recognize that 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 and the 11 other first nations who caretake and steward the land we now call Wisconsin.

So tonight, we're going to do something that we haven't done before. We'd like to invite all of you attendees to take a moment and use the chat function. My colleague, Nakita(?), is going to enable the chat function for you. And type in, if you know it, the name of the indigenous nation that's closest to your residence. And if you don't know the name of the indigenous nation, perhaps there are indigenous place names that you'd like to type in. And if you've had time to research the history of land transfer, add that as well. It would be really great to see that.

You may not be able to, I hope you can see the chat. If you can't, what we're going to do at the end of this presentation is create a Word Cloud. And when we send the recording of the, the link to the recording of this session, we will include a link to that Word Cloud. It should be pretty interesting to see what people write down and where you're all from. We have people from all over the nation with us today. Although many,

many of us are from Wisconsin, there are representatives from all around the country today.

So while you're entering those in the chat, let me go ahead and introduce tonight's presenters. Margaret Noodin, who's of Anishinaabe descent, is Professor of American Indian Studies and Associate Dean of the Humanities and Director of the Electa Quinney Institute for American Indian Education at the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee.

We also have Richard Monette, Professor of Law at the UW-Madison Law School, Director of the Great Lakes Indigenous Law Center, and a former chairman of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa.

And Rebecca Webster, who's an Assistant Professor in the American Indian Studies Department at the University of Minnesota-Duluth and a citizen of the Oneida Nation of Wisconsin. So at this point, while you all are still, feel free to continue to add things into the chat as we begin, but I'm going to turn it over to Margaret Noodin.

NOODIN: [Speaking in Anishinaabemowin] I'll be brief with my introduction. I'm originally from Minnesota. [Speaking in Anishinaabemowin] just by way of saying that I am now teaching in Milwaukee, and sharing some of these ideas with you tonight is a real pleasure. So thank you for joining us.

And I have a few images and one poem to share to set the stage for what we're talking about. Really, what I'm trying to do is show you some of the ways that we might have thought about laws and ways of making decisions, deciding what is real and what should be used as grounds for making ethics within our societies. And I am starting with this view here, which most people should recognize the Great Lakes from space. We would say, in Anishinaabemowin, when we would call this Anishinaabewakiing, the place where the Anishinaabe people reside, the Odawa, Potawatomie, and Ojibwe nations. And there are over 140 nations in Canada and the U.S. federally recognized at this present time who all consider Anishinaabe their heritage language.

So we have a cultural diaspora here. We are founded on either side by other large confederacies, the Haudenosaunee to our east and the . . . to our west. And all of these groups had ways of making decisions and understanding how they would combine individual values and community values. And that's really what I want to focus on at the start here.

So when we look at this space, we see a place where three billion years ago, liquid turned to ash. Water became clouds. Layers of land and life spun in space, and there was freezing and thawing and flooding. And after a while, glaciers receded. And in a little space where there was limestone, sandstone, shale, halite, gypsum, all of these things connected with a system of aquifers, rivers, and lakes. We . . . the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes themselves are only 10,000 to 12,000 years old. And this cycle of water and weather created a rhythm that was acknowledged by those who lived in this space. That reality, that change of season and that anchor to that space was what defined some of these cultures.

This distinct ecosystem, known as the Great Lakes Watershed in North America, includes many forms of life. If you flip to the next slide, you can see the actual outline that we use now to define how far this watershed reaches. For thousands of years, these interlocking lakes were simply referred to as one vast sea. [Speaking in

Anishinaabemowin] these are the Haudenosaunee . . . and Anishinaabe words for this place.

If you go to the next slide now, this is another way of looking at this place, right? So we might be here saying to ourselves, how do we decide what to do, how to govern ourselves, how to understand when the seasons are about to change? And we could look up, and we would see a map in the sky. So we might know how to define the directions. We might record history and stories. We might record important decisions by arranging narratives that align with the stars.

This is a map, the Ojibwe Giizhig Anung Masinaaigan, that was created by a number of people together. The Ojibwe Sky Star Map, Annette Lee at St. Cloud State University and Carl Gawboy did a lot of research to find the stories that were used in this place to pull people together and really teach one generation to the next ethics, ideas about social psychology, the ways that we might make decisions and work together to be in a shared space and steward that space.

So you see allusions to the four seasons there, and you see [speaking in Anishinaabemowin] you can see [speaking in Anishinaabemowin] you see different stories in the sky than we might learn if we look at some of the constellations in a beginning astronomy class today. Each culture has a way of recording their history differently.

I think knowing some of these fundamentals is important because embedded in these oral cultures are the science, the politics, the ways that people define themselves. Just knowing that these stories were here when you know that the word for giizhig is sky, and then day is giizhigat(?), you can see that people understood rotation to be part of what defines our day.

And so if you go to the next map, what you see is that these things started to change. Actually, maybe we'll come back to this. Maybe I'll go through the maps first, sorry. So if we go to this one, what you can see here is a map that is one of the earliest maps of the region. And it is Samuel de Champlain's Carte Geographique la Nouvelle France in 1612.

So when this map was made, Lake Superior was known as the Grand Lac(?) Continent, and these other lakes were known as [speaking in French]. So you can see in the tiny pictures there images of the ones that were here that people were learning from. De Champlain actually acknowledged, he said, I had many conversations with them regarding the source of the Great River and regarding their country and how they governed it. They spoke to me of these things in great detail, showing me by drawings the places they have visited and taking pleasure in telling me about them.

So you have a reference to people being here and being able to govern themselves and be very connected to the land. And so that was a time when this was all considered New France.

If you go to the next one, you see a map from 1688 when Pere Coronelli created a map and titled it, now ready? Brace yourself. This is a really long name for the map, Partie occidentale du Canada ou de la Nouvelle France ou sont les Nations des Illinois, de Tracy, les Iroquois, et plusieurs autres peuples; avec la Louisiane nouvellement decouverte. So basically, he's making the statement that this was a place discovered by people who had a French way of viewing the world. It's not to say that right now we would consider this way better or worse, but it is making clear that at a certain point in

time, the old ways of governing and being connected to this land were replaced by different ways of mapping this space.

And they were accordingly given new names. With Montreal and Fort Richelieu at the eastern entrance, his map describes what he knew as Western Canada. New France and the nations of Illinois, Iroquois, and Lake Superior people were all a part of this space. But you can see that with this renaming, there was a rethinking, and there was a new way of building nations and governing that was becoming clear.

Most of the lakes and cities at this point had several names. For example, he gave one of the lakes four names [speaking in French] and that name [speaking in French] was in memory of Louis(?) Devor(?), who was from Frontenac in France, and he was a governor. And so we start to see a trend where the ways that people were governing and the way they were ruling and creating hierarchies were evident in the maps. And we start understanding that different forms of democracy or different forms of aristocracy were coming into this space.

And the next map, if you go to that one, you now can see a little bit later in time, this was one of the maps made in the 1700s when you see the indigenous diversity begin to be erased, which is one of the things I really want to foreground here, that we see how this change was happening. And in some cases, the indigenous presence was remembered and remarked upon, and their ways of governing and understanding the space were transferred into new languages.

Even when we look in the Midwest, we have a lot of state names where we're remembering places having names and connections to other systems of, you know, other social systems. But at a certain point, they become less visible. After the French and Indian War in 1760, when the settlement at Montreal surrendered to British forces, French names for the lakes ceased to appear, and you see more British and Spanish names.

And then this 1775 map, created by Emon Bowen Gegr, is titled, here's another one of those classic really long map names, An Accurate Map of North America. Describing and Distinguishing the British, Spanish and French Dominions on the Great Continent; Exhibiting the Present Seat of War and the French Encroachments. Also the West India Islands Belonging to and Possessed by Several European Princes and States. That's the name of that particular map, which really summarizes how the people were coming into this space and either working with and recognizing old systems of governance or attempting simply to implant their own systems of governance.

You know, in this map, you see the lake names have been simplified to Lake Ontario or . . . or Lake Erie, Oswego, Lake Michigan or Illinois, and Lake Superior. You start seeing separate ideas of each lake and how they might be possessed, and certain areas begin to be owned by different people.

Some of the cities we still know are present on this map, but they have some interesting twists on this particular one. Montreal, Toronto, and Detroit are all in their correct positions. And the Sault Ste. Marie area is clearly labeled. But where Macinaw(?) should appear is a note Fort(?) and mission destroyed. So you see that things were being recorded that start to allude to the way the nation building is taking place.

I know that I will run up on my time here. So maybe if we can go back to the slide that I skipped earlier, I just wanted to show you the maps and then share with you

one poem that I felt sort of summarizes this time. It's based on some of the words from the journals of the folks who made these maps. And it's titled *A Time of Confusion*. And it just shares a sense of there being a law that was bigger than humans, which the humans understood and worked within, and then a time when that law was set aside, and other ways of governing came into play.

So I'll just read you this so you get your dose of hearing some Anishinaabemowin this evening. [Speaking in Anishinaabemowin] and folks can read the English on there. I mean, the point is just basically making, making here that we had a way of knowing this space. And there were people and animals here who followed the natural governing laws of the land and then formed their societies around that. When we got to a space later where things changed, you saw other systems taking over.

I think in the interest of time, I will stop there and turn it over. And we can always come back to any of these things, or I'll take questions later [speaking in Anishinaabemowin].

WEBSTER: All right [Speaking in Haudenosaunee] so in English, what I just said was, hello, everybody. My name is [Speaking in Haudenosaunee], which means snow scattered here and there trying to protect the land. My English name is Becky Webster. I'm Wolf Clan, I'm Oneida, and I grew up near Duck Creek that runs through the Oneida Reservation.

So I think it's appropriate too that we start off with this slide. It's a bit controversial. We'll get into that in a bit. But this is our version of a map. In the first session of this program, we had talked about the formation of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy. And this here is a wampum belt, and this symbolizes our Haudenosaunee Confederacy. Going from east to west, we have the Seneca, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga, and, whoa, sorry, the Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga, and the Seneca. So these are the original tribes that formed the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, the Tuscarora later joining in the 1700s.

But we talked about the principles upon which the Confederacy came together and formed this powerful alliance of nations to be able to lay down their weapons of war and be able to work together to be able to help each other out and to no longer live in a society that was filled with bloodshed.

So fast forward to, you know, the European contact and the formation of the American form of government. So there is a bit of controversy about whether or not the United States form of government is based on the Iroquois Confederacy. And there's, this is a poster made by the American Indian Institute at least a few decades ago, because I remember it, but I don't, I was unable to find out exactly when this was published.

It talks about the Haudenosaunee influence on the founding fathers. And we have to recognize that this is a polarizing issue because people who are, really don't support the notion that the Haudenosaunee Confederacy or other tribes helped form the Constitution or the form of government really have a different perspective of how tribes governed. Sometimes they mischaracterize our government. Sometimes they degrade our principles. And it's really unclear whether those misunderstandings are from lazy ignorance or from purposeful superiority.

So it's kind of like when you tell yourself to don't read the comments section on social media because you're just going to get yourself angry. Some of the comments that are opposed to the idea that the Haudenosaunee Confederacy helped form the federal form of government that we have in the United States are really quite awful. So I'm not going to get into them too much, but I do want to talk about the similarities between the two, some congressional actions that recognize the influence. And then I'm going to end with the differences.

So we have to recognize that we're not just saying it's a photocopy of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy. It's clearly not. And I'm going to talk about some of those differences too.

So I do also want to point out that when we talked about the Haudenosaunee Confederacy and the colonists befriending the different tribes, it's well known that Benjamin Franklin befriended the Haudenosaunee and met with them quite often to talk about the principles of governance. And I do need to let us know, if you don't already know, that Benjamin Franklin is known for commenting something along the lines of, if six nations of ignorant savages were capable of forming a scheme for such a union, then the new nation of European origin should be able to do so as well. So he was commenting, you know, looking down on our confederacy and saying that, you know, if these guys can figure it out, we should be able to figure it out too.

So if you want to go to the next slide, so we all recognize this, right, the symbol of our government, one of the symbols of our government. If you'll notice in the, on the right-hand side, what the eagle is holding in his hand are the arrows. So this has an interesting story directly related to Haudenosaunee Confederacy.

So in 1744, the Onondaga leader Canassatego gave a speech that urged the colonies to unite just like the Haudenosaunee had united. So it was really moving, and Benjamin Franklin later printed Canassatego's speech, of course, probably likely changing some of the words around. But this is just a small excerpt from Canassatego's speech.

He said, Our wise forefathers established union and amity between the Five Nations. This has made us formidable. This has given us great weight and authority with our neighboring nations. We are a powerful confederacy, and by your observing the same methods our wise forefathers have taken, you will acquire fresh strength and power. Therefore, whatever befalls you, never fall out with one another. And then he went on to discuss the metaphor that many arrows cannot be broken as easily as one can be broken. And this inspired those 13, the bundle of 13 arrows held in the great seal of the United States.

So there is at least some unquestionable proof that the Haudenosaunee have inspired some different parts of the formation of the United States way of government. So I'm going to talk more on the next slide about the different meetings.

So Franklin, he referenced the Haudenosaunee model as he presented his plan of the union at Albany Congress in 1754. And that's where the Haudenosaunee attended, and only seven of the colony representatives bothered to come though. He invited the Haudenosaunee chiefs to also address the Continental Congress in 1776. And then if you, but if you look at that Albany plan, in some ways, it mirrors the Haudenosaunee governing structure. It attempted to establish a division between the executive and legislative branches while establishing that common government

authority to deal with external relations, you know, that federalism aspect that our governing structure is well known for.

So also think that the Haudenosaunee government was also heard periodically during the debates of the, over the Constitution in the 1780s. So all of these delegates are representatives from the colonies. And even the colonists themselves were well aware of the Haudenosaunee and the different forms of government as they were part of regular conversations as this new country was trying to figure out how it was going to organize itself.

I'm going to go to the next slide. All right, so here's a depiction that's based off a little bit on one of the slides that we had at our first presentation. So if you weren't at the first one, I'll just give you a quick summary.

So on the left-hand side is essentially how the Haudenosaunee Confederacy operates during Grand Council if you just look at those top three circles. So you have the Elder Brothers on the left there, that's the Mohawk and the Seneca, and then the Younger Brothers on the right, the Oneida and the Cayuga. And so they would decide on an issue, and it would go back and forth between the two different groups. They would decide amongst themselves, come to a consensus, then toss the issue across to the other side. They would discuss it, come to a consensus, and toss it back.

And then eventually, it went up to the Fire Keepers, the Onondaga, to be able to make the final decision. So does this sound a little bit familiar? On the right-hand side, we have the, how the Senate and the House are going back and forth. And eventually, when they resolve something, it comes up to the President.

But also on the left-hand side, going back there, if there's an issue that they're unable to resolve, meaning they send it back and forth too many times, then the issue dies, and it doesn't go up to the Onondaga for any action.

So we also have, at the very bottom, the Clan Mothers. So they had a very important role. Women had an important role in the Confederacy, more so locally, but their role especially was regarding the chiefs. So the Clan Mothers were responsible for both raising up and pulling back chiefs if they had to.

So typically what would happen is when a chief would listen to what the Clan Mothers had to say and listen to what the community had to say, every individual in the community, from the youngest person to the oldest adult, had some say in what was happening to them and to their communities. And the Clan Mothers would give direction, so to speak, to these chiefs. And these chiefs would carry that, those thoughts and those mindsets when they went to meet in Grand Council with all the representatives, the chiefs from the other nations.

And if they didn't follow, if they didn't abide by what the Clan Mothers thought that they should be doing, and they were warned and didn't follow again, the Clan Mothers could, that particular Clan Mother could remove the title from that chief. So it serves as a check and a balance against what the chiefs are doing versus what the Clan Mothers are asking them to do.

Sort of the same way the Supreme Court here, if there's a question about an interpretation about what's happening, something will go to the courts to decide whether or not, whose side that they had decided on how that law should be interpreted.

So this is just looking at the systems themselves. So again, the Haudenosaunee system was really federal in nature with individual tribes handling their own affairs and

then coming together for overarching government issues to address confederacy-wide concerns.

And again, the separation of powers, we had that representative democracy with the clan having input in the decision making. From the youngest child to the oldest adult had a voice in the way that their government was run.

Some of the other similarities are individuals can only hold one position within a government. So that was something that was also part of the Great Law, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy. There's also a very specific removal process for leaders, specific procedures for enacting laws, and even specific procedures for declaring war. So those are some of the similarities in the government structures.

So if you want to go to the next slide, now here, Richard is going to talk more about this because he was actually here at the time, involved in how all this went down. So this is the, we have two different Congressional concurrent resolutions coming out of the Senate and the House. So just remember that they're employed to address sentiments of both chambers, but they're not really submitted to the President, and they don't really have the force of law.

So these were passed just to acknowledge both the influence that Haudenosaunee and other tribes had on the formation of the federal form of government and also just to reestablish or reaffirm the government-to-government relationship between the federal government and the different tribes throughout the United States.

So I'll just read the first two Whereas's of the House Congressional Resolution here. It says, Whereas the original framers of the Constitution, including, most notably, George Washington and Benjamin Franklin, are known to have greatly admired the concepts of the six nations of the Iroquois Confederacy. Whereas the confederation of the original 13 colonies into one republic was influenced by the political system developed by the Iroquois Confederacy, as were many of the democratic principles, which were incorporated into the Constitution itself. So those were a couple of the Whereas's.

Now here is the, therefore be it resolved, that the, is at the heart of this resolution. It's that the Congress, on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the signing of the United States Constitution acknowledges the contribution made by the Iroquois Confederacy and other Indian nations to the formation and development of the United States.

So now this isn't saying that, you know, they photocopied the principles of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy. Rather, it's acknowledging the contributions that Indian tribes had in the formation of that confederacy, which makes me really wonder why people get so upset when we try to recognize this and that they come back and, you know, have that attitude that Benjamin Franklin had about these savages being able to form a government, and it really wouldn't fit because it was too primitive, or what have you.

So if you want to go to the next slide, and this, I'm going to talk about the differences. So this is kind of a depiction about how we ran our government. Now this is outside, and it's not in a long house. But some of the things that I want you to look at in this picture is to know the differences. So here we have chiefs and clan mother positions are held by clans. And some people will say, well, that's one of the key

differences because it was a hereditary system. It's really not hereditary in the way that, you know, a father will pass something down to a son. They're kept in clan lines but not necessarily linear lines the way that you might think of something being hereditary.

We also had a consensus. And that wasn't being unanimous. It was, rather, trying to get to a decision that everybody can live with and that we can all try to agree on. And it wasn't simply by a majority rule, where there's some, a minority group of people that are being not heard or not having something not addressed.

The clan mothers chose the leaders. The leaders were not elected. But of course, the people had input in that because the clan mothers obviously discussed these things with each other and with the community. The women were always included. And also, everyone was encouraged to participate, like I mentioned before, from the youngest child to the oldest adult. So all of these people are here participating in the discussion and the decision making for things that are affecting them locally.

And I'm going to go ahead and stop there. And Richard, of course, is going to let you know a bit more about that resolution and a bunch of different stuff. So I'll turn it over to Richard. [Speaking in Haudenosaunee]

MONETTE: Good evening, everyone. I guess before I share my screen, I have to turn my camera on. So I learn something new every day. Good to see everybody again. Thank you for meeting us halfway. This is a fascinating topic.

During the original session in the series, you heard discussion about the role Turtle Island's native nations played, and you just heard a bunch more here again this evening and how they may have influenced the founders of this country and the founders and drafters of the American Constitution and constitutional system, frankly, especially the early context, with the Haudenosaunee, the Iroquois Confederacy, the Algonquian Confederacy, and perhaps other confederacies.

So this evening, maybe we'll turn our attention more to the developments in democracy and constitutionalism that perhaps are shared by both native nations and America.

So first, as sort of a quick review, last time I talked about right relations and proper balance a lot. And you see that infinity sign there, which we're going to see a couple more times.

I showed this picture last time that now seems to have been cut off just a bit. It's an oak tree in the background that is spread out very wide and chokecherry trees on the front side. And I explained how their roots sort of party and live together underground in ways we don't always get to see. But the trees above ground grow up and are in proper relationship with each other, carefully balanced. And so the oak tree is small, but it spreads out, keeps the chokecherry trees small, and, of course, we get to pick them, which is the idea.

And that little sort of configuration of trees and various other sorts of relationships like that are all over the land here and certainly where I'm from. So this is my family's hilltop at Turtle Mountain. There, by the way, are chokecherries. Those were some of the fruits of those trees last summer, in 2020. Chokecherries are really good, by the way.

So there's that infinity sign again. This, you know, let that sort of sear into your mind a bit, thinking about the two sides of it, thinking about the sort of motion that we

imply, either in time, space, otherwise, when we think about the word infinity. Think about that eagle feather at the top and all that the eagle has come to represent to Native America, including to America, as you saw in Becky's slide regarding the American Seal.

And here's a few things that sort of I said, so I just want to repeat them quickly. This is important because this is sort of the lasting lesson that Native America would like America to learn so that, certainly, so that Native America might survive, we think also so that America might survive.

Each society, you can say sovereignty, jurisdiction, each state, each tribe, each society decides for itself the balance between collective and individual and between public and private.

Where the society places that balance is a defining marker of its culture. Without sovereignty, self-governance, and self-determination, a society can't, you know, make its own cultural balance between its government and its citizens, or between its corporations and its citizens, or between its press and its citizens, or between its churches and religion and its citizens. All of those sort of things that Native America has always had to think about and that America has to think about.

So I showed this slide last time and said this is the most important slide of the whole bunch. This is the absolute freedom slide, this clean slate, right? And then I went on and showed this particular free stick person and calling it absolute freedom and liberty. I'm free.

Then I showed some increasing population quickly. And then I showed some of their relationships with the land and that it gave rise to corn, squash, and beans, and, of course, down at the bottom, even some relationships with each other. All of these relationships being important in ways that you've now heard, last time from our prior two speakers, as being truly meaningful. We just have to get that.

So then I went on to show sort of more socialization, more institutionalization. We've got families at the top. I explained, you know, this person formed a corporation. The workers at the bottom themselves formed their own sort of union. All of these entities, the lesson was exercising their freedom of association that they brought with them from that liberty sphere, and forming institutions, unions, marriages with the land, growing things, churches down in the corner. And every time they did, the point was they shifted the forces of balance in society, and they shifted the balance of power in society.

And so in particular, the one at the top was the illustration that was sort of suggesting, and, see, this was done often purposefully. It is done often purposely. We get, you know, a corporation, accumulates wealth. They put their wealth together and invest it, perhaps growing more wealth oftentimes on the backs of workers. And so the workers exercise their freedom of association, specifically to counterbalance the power that the corporate managers have over them. And so just even in that little internal sort of sub-sphere, we see the dynamics going on in the whole society.

So then I sort of, toward the end, put this picture up there. And I suggested that there's a little bit of a place here where we can segue into thinking about each other. I talked about those corn, squash, and beans and the way that they grew and grow out in society on their own. But I talked about how, with the gift of reason, that the Creator bestowed upon some of us, we brought corn, squash, and beans together. And instead

of separate crops and difficult to grow, they entered into relationships with each other, right relations, and they had flourished.

And so then I suggested purposefully then to sort of see that legislative power as maybe the beans and the executive power as the corn, the judicial power as the squash. And we did sort of the same thing there, that, you know, society made rules. Society enforced rules. Society resolved disputes all as a means of surviving and growing. And so very much, we brought those things together using that same gift of reason so that government, so that perhaps your society could flourish.

But there was a bit of a lesson here, just to make sure as well, just noticing the mountains and the oceans and the desert and rivers, and recognizing that perhaps the same sort of experience is happening on the other side of those things that maybe weren't entirely isolated from this particular society.

And so they maybe went through some similar things, ended up sharing norms and values and customs, languages, beliefs, religious practices. And they may be very similar to these ones, or they may be vastly different.

One of the perhaps maybe lasting then lessons from this one was to also to notice that the government here is not the entire society. In fact, this government is all sort of compacted into this one little building so that the rest of the society is still well representative of the liberty sphere from whence it came, from the freedom of association from whence it came.

So I said this last time. And so just to sort of repeat, right, all societies had laws. They all enforced their laws, and they all resolved disputes, or they wouldn't have survived.

I also said this last time, an important thing to carry forward, the idea of the Unwritten Constitution. It's that whole sort of thing that we went through last time and now that I just want to walk through again quickly. You know, when a society determines its own culture and identity using, growing its own norms and values, especially regarding various relationships, the various imbalances and counterbalances and balances, then that society has attained its own sort of constituted state. The word state, status, status quo or . . . in state. It just is, right? Whether or not that constitution is written or unwritten, the society, the state is constituted. That's an important idea to carry forward as well here.

So I repeat this, and I sort of pulled this forward from last time again just to make sure we're all seeing it again because we talk about separations of powers all the time. And we say, well, use the term, separation of powers. You can see I have them in quotation marks up there for a reason. And then we always talk about, you know, judicial, legislative, and executive.

Well, I showed those pictures and institutions growing in the liberty sphere, showed that they too impact each other's lives, other individuals' lives, other institutional lives. They shift the balance of power in society. And so it becomes important, you know, what we separate, not only important what we separate in government, but also what we separate from government and asking why we do it. What are their proper relations for doing it, and what are we balancing or counterbalancing?

Now part of, from that comes the lesson that I want to make sure we're hearing here. And I'm just going to put this out there. Maybe it sounds a bit argumentative. One of the distinctions that I, myself, feel when I read this stuff, when I get asked this

kind of question, is that Native America has a tendency to teach these ideas about right relations and keeping things in balance and that that should be the objective. We should deliberate on that objective all the time in everything we're doing.

Where it sometimes seems like in the American world, that's not necessarily the case. In fact, we might get to some balance or imbalances. We might survive, but it's not always because of matter of purpose.

So I wanted, here's three slides, in fact, as I've given these presentations to other people, a couple of remarks I've heard. Where is capitalism in this picture, one of my students asked in law school. It seems like your version of society has no room for capitalism. And I thought, well, when the whole thing started in this liberty sphere, we tried to keep government in this one little box in a little building, sort of leaving the liberty sphere open. But, you know, I got her point.

But then I got this from another law student that, of course, seemed to be the exact opposite. Apparently, your view of society begins with a libertarian ideology. There's another thing. And I provided my answer here, umm, no, or at least not necessarily.

And then I got this from a WisDOT trainee. So it sounds to me like you're saying our society also balances, so what is the unique teaching here? And so, again, perhaps if there was unique teaching, it was about the deliberate and purposefulness of finding right relations and balancing.

So when I address the student, in particular, the one who talked about libertarianism, I said, have a look at this slide here. And this is that infinity sign that we've seen earlier, and I had, of course, shown them as well. I said, and imagine that on one side is the indigenous world view, and on the other side is the western world view. I said to him, this student, what I walked through was my view of what the western tradition has been, what it was, what the experience was, and what the tradition has been. And in fact, what I was not showing at all was the other side of that balance, of that infinity sign, that was the indigenous world view.

So you're imagining the sort of libertarianism of this. And I'm saying perhaps imagine a world where the entire society doesn't believe that it came from one individual or a couple of individuals, but rather from the collective at the get-go. And it was very sort of interesting.

So I said to him, in the course of that conversation, you know how we hear that foreign language speakers, for example, have a difficult time, especially in university, because they have to translate our American English questions in their heads and then formulate their answers, usually in their language, and then translate that answer to English, and then tell it back to us. And we hear about, you know, how difficult that is. And I'm sure it is.

I said to him, just imagine if you had to undertake that complex translation exercise, not just because of the different language but because of an entirely different world view.

So I said to him then, and I now will share with you, one of the teachings that I think we get at this point to encapsulate where we've been but also to go forward. We don't separate press and government just because we don't like the press or government. Rather, we separate them because we do like them. Or at least if we don't like them, we know their powers, especially when their powers are combined.

Likewise, we don't separate corporations and government just because we think corporations or governments shouldn't exist. We separate them because we do think they exist, or we know they exist. And we know the force of their power even individually, let alone when their powers are aggregated in our society. So we separate them.

We don't separate churches and government because we don't like churches or government, most of us. Rather, we separate them because we do like them, or, as I said above, we separate them because we know their force individually or especially when they aggregate their power. In fact, on occasion, we have a revolution to separate them, a foundation of this country, right?

So it's not just important what we separate in government. It's important what we separate from government. And we think that we have played, and continue to play, native nations, that is, a role teaching that in America. And we think that we continue to have that influence in some ways. We also think, believe it or not, that America continues to influence how we govern.

So a slide, a quick note, you know, the indigenous founders, I mean, I just want to say, if you acknowledge the role, as Becky said there, I'm not going to say any of that better than she did. In some ways, I know Becky, she gets a little feisty sometimes. If you acknowledge the role that Native America played in the formation of America's version of federal democracy, thank you. But if you're one of those that doesn't, then we should talk.

So she went through a couple of things. I just thought I'd put a slide up here as well. If you have not seen these, you know, maybe get them, have a look. Donald Grinde has actually written a few things. This is one of the books. Bruce Johansen, and Johansen and Grinde have written some things together. Jack Weatherford's book on the side has wrote a couple of books. And they both had some section about, in particular, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy and its influence. This article was in *The Milwaukee Sentinel*, was very good. *Founding Fathers Learned of Democracy from the Indians*, right, is an excellent story.

So there's that relations balance and infinity again. So let me just try to provide an example here so that we can walk away with something a little more concrete. So what I would ask is, and you could do this for three or four seconds. But normally, at this point, I'll say, everybody pretend like you're holding some sticks, some long sticks, like about four feet long. And then just follow the contours of that infinity sign a few times. And I ask, you know, so what are you doing, other than driving in downtown Madison or something?

You're harvesting wild rice. And you take a swing at the rice reeds and knock rice into your canoe, and then you go around and leave some in the lake, leave some on the stalks, or actually, you know, knock some of the seeds into the water. And in that sort of world view sort of dichotomy, the western world view and the indigenous world view, and the students sort of thinking, well, where's the capitalism here, or which side do we start with?

You know, I would want to ask sort of, well, why would anybody do that if we're trying to make money and trying to maximize our profit? Why would we only take half and leave half? And the answers are really quite simple, aren't they? If we take it all,

nobody else will have any. And if we don't put some back in the water, it won't grow next year for anybody else or even for me.

So we see in that sort of exercise, there's a dichotomy of my individual interest in self and my collective interest in self, a little bit of an individual identity and a bit of a collective identity. So I put those in the infinity sign themselves just so we can get that image in our minds, the collective and the individual. Or another way to state this, the public and the private.

Now I want to give you this concrete example here. Hopefully, this will help some. The bundle of rights of property, we always hear this in law schools, and so I pulled this off the Internet, the bundle of rights in real estate. And this is a picture we almost always draw. It's private property. And this is sort of this thing called property with all these strands of rights, which you might start to hear in Native America, might be less called rights and more sort of like values, maybe even social values and maybe even economic values.

Now there's a problem with this picture though. And even though this is the first thing we do with American law students, there's a huge couple of problems here. First is that notice how they're all the same size. So if this is the state of Wisconsin, and this is private property in Wisconsin, we suggest in here that all of these strands in the property bundle are the same size. And so we might have the right to rent, the right to use resources for profit, the right to exclude others, the right to sell, you know, the right to commit waste on it. And we've got all these sort of rights. And even within one property, even within one in the same state, they are not the same size.

And more importantly, when it comes to thinking about our relations between Native America and America today, they are also not the same size from polity to polity, from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, from state to state, or imagine from state to tribe.

So here's an example, right? And I apologize if you're from Texas, but it fits so well. This one is, you know, we hear regularly, it seems, somebody gets shot in Texas for trespassing cross country, I'm sorry, across their property. And sort of we hear this, you know, shoot first and ask questions later sort of response. And I'm juxtaposing that with the state of Oregon, or you might say the state of Wisconsin as well, where we have a real robust public trust doctrine.

And in Oregon, one of the reasons you don't see, you didn't, especially until recently, see a lot of real fancy, you know, homes along the ocean in Oregon because people have a public right to access the ocean, including if that means walking across your yard, your private property.

And so in Texas, that right to exclude is big. In Oregon, that right to exclude is small. And it also is, reflects their social values, also, by the way, reflects their economic values. Imagine trying to sell a piece of property in Texas if it has a line in there that said, oh, by the way, this property has lost the right to exclude, right? So it affects all of those and for a reason that word, values, applies to both.

So let's talk about how this sort of plays out in Wisconsin to give you an example that you might relate to if you're from Wisconsin especially. We have a long history of this robust public trust doctrine and its tensions with individual property owners. If you're from Wisconsin, you know it well. And we've had a lot of fights about it recently, up until, recently, those of us who really believed in it were rather proud of it. You could go around the country, and people would say, are you from Wisconsin with that public

trust doctrine? No wonder those kinds of things can happen. No wonder you can keep the rivers clean and things like that. But we, you get the collective versus individual readily.

Now that's the public trust doctrine. So what's been happening lately is this. We have instead been seeing the legislature, and then because of the legislative actions, the executive, not invoking the public trust doctrine against individual private property, but the police power doctrine against individual private property. And see how important it is to find the right relations there and then to determine the balance. And so now are these the balance? How are they the same? How are they different?

Well, here's how, okay. So that statement, here it is. So the public trust doctrine is constitutive. So if it takes property, there's no eminent domain. There's no vested property right. No money has to be paid. But if the legislature is exercising police power, and the executive is carrying it out, it might be eminent domain. There is a vested property right. There will be a taking, and there will be money paid. And so this is evolution that we're seeing now.

And what it's doing is it's making us have to choose between public trust and police power. And that's the way that the Wisconsin Supreme Court set it up in a recent case. And I'm going to say to you, a wrong relation, a false equivalency. And so to try to force ourselves to look at things in the simple way that the native nations do will help us understand government as well outside of native nations.

So okay, let me see if we have the right stuff here. Real quick then, I just want to make this point because I know I've taken too much time, talking too slowly. Here's, this was the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, yeah, 1934, at the height of the Depression. And so we had a bunch of corporations going broke for the first time. And what did we do? We did these Chapter 7 and Chapter 11, reorganizing corporations. So it's not really surprising that the Congress came up with, hey, let's allow them to reorganize. Let's call it that.

They passed a law, the Indian Reorganization Act. If you look at that picture, what you see is largely a corporate structure and not a governmental structure, the way America does it, right? And so this changed everything that native nations had done before, that you've heard from Margaret and Becky. And this was largely imposed, even though it had the semblance of being sort of voluntary. It was not.

And so we ended up with governments that were not used to, not structured like we want them to be, don't have the proper relations and kind of balance we want. And we hear of the problems.

This one I took of a drawing of the Cheyenne-Arapaho tribes, put together by one of their attorneys, Robert Little. This is how he drew it. You can see the Bureau of Indian Affairs. That's you all. That's your agency, you Americans, over the tribe's constitution, then over its business committee, and that's what it was called. It's governing body was called the business committee. Their tribal council was just the people meeting once a year.

Inside that business committee, a chairman and courts over everything. You can see that none of this reflects the balance and the relations that American government even uses to work. So this tribe rewrote their constitution, and they made it look more like American government. At least it had more of a reflection of checks and balances.

And even if it wasn't what they had before the Indian Reorganization Act, at least it's a step towards fixing what happened in the Indian Reorganization Act.

The main lesson of this is, yeah, they're not in control of balancing their relationships, determining the relationship between collective and individual, between public and private. We have imposed it on the tribes so far. And what is remarkable is that they struggle with it, and they survive with it, and largely because their culture is still between the cracks, filling the interstices, but it's been difficult, I'm sure. So we are all related. We're all dependent upon each other. We're all in this together, which reminds me of a joke, which I'll tell later. Thank you very much.

CLOWES: Thank you, Richard. I want to invite Margaret back for a moment.

NOODIN: So tying in with what's been said already, these ways of thinking, these were some ideas that I thought were worth looking at. When we talk about ways of structuring society, what have we lost? What is no longer able to be remembered and practiced? What remains? And how can decisions be made?

So I tend to look at everything through the lens of language. And these are some key ideas that I thought I would share that are driven by the language itself. So this idea of wani, which, if you remember the poem and thinking in Anishinaabemowin for a minute, part of the word for confusion comes from this idea of lost, not being able to find what is the right decision or find a way forward.

Bangi is something that's been set down, perhaps put down in a good way or perhaps put down in a way that is not retrievable. Mik is a little piece of a word used in a number of words I've got listed there, that talks about finding shape or including others, finding a way to remember, and keeping in mind knowledge that's been transferred from one generation to the next. And the last is this set of words that typically are used to describe judicial processes, to describe treaties or legislation. And they all come from the verb onaakonige, which is to make a decision.

So the idea of a document or a law is an echo of the idea of a collective decision. And I think that fits with what my colleagues have said here tonight. I will pass it to Becky to see if she's got any closing words as well.

WEBSTER: Thank you. Yeah, I didn't really have too much to say except just a reminder to keep, to understand that we come at this from a different world view. And our way of seeing things is that the human beings are not on top and meant to dominate and conquer the world, that we're only one small part of creation. And all of creation is interconnected like a web. Anything you impact on one part will have an impact on other parts. So we have a responsibility to that and to each other to make sure that we do things that are appropriate.

And so some of the, like just looking at the maps that Margaret had, it kind of grossed me out a little bit to see how everyone is just staking a claim and owning it and saying, this is mine, and, you know, this is theirs. And there's a dispute, instead of really kind of looking at who's going to care for this land. Who is going to be responsible for making sure that it's protected and it's safe? So if we approach things from that perspective, it's an entirely different world view. Thank you.

CLOWES: With that, I think we'd like to open it up for questions. I have a lot of different things buzzing around in my mind right now. But I know we also have quite a few good questions in the chat. That phrase, the unraveling has begun, is something that's going to resonate for me for some time. John Greenler, I'm going to invite you to share some of the questions.

GREENLER: I'll just start out by saying, you know, we have some questions. I would really encourage people at this point in time to add more to the Q&A box. I think we've got some good time for discussion, and we really want to base it on what people are interested in. So yeah, please take a few moments and think about what you've been pondering, what you've been hearing, and, yeah, what your questions might be for these three extraordinary folks that have been sharing I think some really thought-provoking ideas with us.

So yeah, right at the top, we have one that I think corresponds to when Margaret was presenting. What safeguards were available to first nation's governments to protect against military and violent faction-led coups(?)?

NOODIN: Well, this might be a question for the historians among us. I think it really, one of the things that I often remind my students, or people who are just coming into thinking about these types of histories, is it just is not one answer. So it depends on which community you were a part of, which leader your community was following. Most of the groups that we think of as even large nations had some members of the community that would side with, say, the British, others that would side with the French.

So it was a very, very complicated environment, must the way that we couldn't say right now, how do Americans think about X, Y, or Z? So we really have to look back on those times and know that for each family, whether or not they felt safe in their homes and whether they actually felt that they saw a future for their children really depended on their own situation. Some had different economic situations based on the trade that might have been done in their family. Others would not have had those advantages.

So it was as complicated as things are now, whether or not people felt safe and felt they had any recourse against the colonization that was happening. I don't know if others have things to add to that as well.

WEBSTER: Yeah. There's actually part of the Great Law that talks about this very same thing. In fact, when the Peacemaker was making his rounds throughout the different tribes in the area, one of the very first tribes he encountered, the Mohawk, one of the chiefs there had said, well, what is this, you want me to put my weapons away and adopt this philosophy of peace and love and respect for each other? What happens if somebody is going to come and try to kill us? I mean, how do you defend yourself if that's going to happen?

And the Peacemaker had a long, roundabout way of explaining that if somebody is going to do that to you, there's a root cause to that, to try to figure out what is causing the conflict and what has, is this person seeking revenge? Is there something going on? To try to talk to them and work out our differences instead of resorting to violence. So that's actually a significant part of the Great Law that talks about how to defend

ourselves. And it's, you know, with words and compassion and understanding and not with weapons.

MONETTE: I would add that, just that we all remember that war is a lot different when you have nuclear bombs than when you don't. And so if people were at war and you're talking about tomahawks and bows and arrows, if they even used that, we're talking about a far less deadly war, for one thing. And in fact, the questioner used the word, you know, coup. And there's this concept that you hear in a lot of native nations, particularly in the plains of counting coup.

And if you think about that, the whole objective of counting coup was to get close enough to your enemy to touch them without hurting them or without getting hurt yourself. The objective wasn't to kill them. The objective was to touch them, right? And you see that concept running throughout the literature. It's a fascinating concept that gets overlooked a lot.

But I think Margaret's points about the relations dictate it. And so I hate to get back to that, but the external relations between tribes, internal within the tribe, the separation of powers have played a role in that. And then when Haudenosaunee formed a confederacy, it played a role in it.

I meant to ask Becky because I remember John Mohawk(?) saying at one time that the ones that were given certain kinds of power, the tribes that were given certain kinds of power in the confederacy were, in fact, the smaller tribes. And that was a nod to the recognition that larger tribes would be more militarily strong. And so they agreed to have less kinds of power in the confederacy. I don't know if that's accurate, but I remember John explaining that to me one time.

GREENLER: Another question, I would like to hear more about how the clan mothers select a chief. This seems highly unusual.

WEBSTER: Highly unusual according to who? So this was our way of how we, and we still operate under this system to select the chiefs, even today. So the way it works is you look at small, tight-knit communities, and these women watch these young men grow up. And they see how they interact with other people. They see how they are with the adults. They see how they're fulfilling their responsibilities as a [speaking in Haudenosaunee] man.

And then when they reach a certain age, and if there happens to be an opening, maybe a previous chief has passed, it's time to fill a seat, then, because each tribe is only allocated a certain number of seats, and that's it. You don't just get to decide how many you want.

So when there's an opening, then the clan mother for that chief that has passed will put up a young man, or maybe he's an adult at that time. And that, and then he decides whether or not he wants to accept that responsibility. And the chief in our community, Bob Brown, if any of you know him, he's just, he's really amazing, and he's a phenomenal teacher. And he's very patient. And he was explaining the process of when he was put up for a chief.

And when the clan mother approached him and said, we would like you to be chief, he thought about it for a long time, I think almost a year, maybe even longer,

before, because he knew that his life would no longer be his own, that he would have to dedicate himself to the community and to what the people needed. And well, are we ever glad he decided yes so many years ago. So yeah, that's the way it works for the clan mother selecting the chiefs.

CLOWES: What's next, John? What else do you have on your list?

GREENLER: Yeah, another question. I'm interested in how we went from the public trust doctrine to the police power doctrine and how we get back to the former. What can we learn?

MONETTE: Yeah, so that was the concrete example to sort of try to touch base with the Wisconsin mind here, thinking about how native nations do it. So I don't want to say too much about it and take the time with Wisconsin law.

But I will say that, at the very least, to recognize that that's probably, as I said, a wrong relationship, certainly that they're checking and balancing each other. There is room appropriately for both of them, police power and the public trust doctrine. And it's very clear that the founders of Wisconsin, drafting the Wisconsin Constitution, fully understood that.

So part of it is to sort of think through the simplicity of what I've presented to you in asking these questions. Are these the right relations? Are these the right kinds of things to be counterbalancing each other? And if not, you know, sort of why not?

GREENLER: Here's an education-focused question. High school courses that include foundations of government usually focus on Hobbes and Locke. Are there native perspectives that could be referenced instead or in addition?

MONETTE: You can't read John Locke or Montesquieu or some of the others' writing at the time without reading into it, or sometimes even expressly, as Becky pointed out with a couple of the quips from Ben Franklin, that they very clearly were studying, through their own lens, through their own prism, but studying Native America, the natural world. I mean, you can't read those parts of John Locke's writings without seeing that. So if you're studying John Locke, you're at least through John Locke's prism. In fact, studying a bit of that, it would be good to look a little more deep.

GREENLER: Fascinating, that's a great perspective. You discussed how tribal governments were restructured under the Indian Reorganization Act. Do most of the tribes in Wisconsin still retain the same structure that was imposed at that time, or have they reclaimed other more traditional government structures that they have chosen for themselves?

MONETTE: So all the tribes in Wisconsin voted to adopt constitutions under the Indian Reorganization Act. And then subsequently, they all did. And they all were pretty much the . . . it's kind of hard to listen to the old folks because some of them were around then, increasingly not, of course, because we're getting old. But when I was younger, and I'm saying, you know, well, we sat around, and we talked about this stuff. And it's

interesting how the Bureau of Indian Affairs actually convinced them that they were writing those things back then.

I had them just argue with me, no, these provisions, so I'd go get a provision from the . . . tribe in the state of Washington and bring it back and say, here, pretty remarkable that you were doing this in Wisconsin, and they were doing this in, you know, the Olympic Peninsula in Washington. And it's kind of word for word, right?

So only one tribe, well, two tribes, have dramatically rewritten their constitutions. And that's . . . that was triggered largely by the termination and restoration status exercise that they went through, difficult, painful one. And Ho-Chunk redid theirs as well.

Interestingly enough, on quick quip, you know, some people will say, well, Ho-Chunk looks like the white guys won now. It's got the separation of powers and all that. Part of the exercise and lesson from these last couple of evenings is that's not the white guys. That's Native America's, you know. Native America had separations of powers. I'm sure the white guys did, you know. I mean, you read in history once in a while that a king got put on the guillotine, and they chopped off his head and, you know, separated powers. But other than that, right, separation of powers was here. And the Ho-Chunk adopted a constitution that works that way.

And then one last quip, sorry for taking so much, but in the context of redoing their constitution, I happened to be at the meeting when a Ho-Chunk elder stood up and gave one of the most impassioned speeches I have ever heard. And he said, I remember him saying, it doesn't matter if you're wearing a little curly, white wig and a black robe and sitting in a building with marble and all this stuff. He said, what matters is if what comes in the door and out the mouth and into our ears is Ho-Chunk and what goes out is Ho-Chunk, then it's Ho-Chunk. I never have forgotten that.

WEBSTER: I would like to add too, part of my courses I teach, I teach a graduate course in tribal operations. And one of the exercises is I have the students, they're predominantly tribal members from different tribes throughout the United States, to grab your constitution and share it with everybody. And then they're just amazed to see that, oh, wow, it's a boiler plate. We all have the same constitution.

And so in Oneida, in the 1930s, when the federal government was coming around to have these meetings, there was a faction of Oneidas that still operated under our traditional form of government. And they expressed concerns that, why would we need to redo anything when the government we have is perfectly fine?

And of course, the federal government didn't listen. They didn't really understand how that traditional form of government operated, even though, you know, that's how their government is based off of.

But skipping that part, they went ahead with the votes. And this, all of the members of this faction of traditional governance folks didn't come to the polls and vote. So because they didn't come and vote, they didn't have their voices heard, and we ended up with a new form of government.

GREENLER: Useful stories. Here's another question. Do you think different types of societal/governmental organizations are more conducive, or conducive, to right

relations? Could you touch on anarchy (mutual aide/community reliance) versus a more wealthy class/corporate influence/racist government that we currently have in the U.S.?

MONETTE: Yeah. That question didn't touch on it, so I don't know how an answer could touch on it, right? That's a lot. But thank you for thinking all that because I think that's important. Now I don't think that there ever was anarchy and ever will be anarchy. And I don't think that there ever was capitalism, is not now a capitalist country, and there never will be. There was never a socialist country, is not now, and there never will be. There's always going to be these forces having to counter each other and counterbalance each other.

And so, you know, government doesn't have to be a big, fancy building up at the other end of State Street. When we start to exercise our freedom of association and build institutions and unions, we are building the forces of government among us in various ways, in churches and corporations and things like that. So I think at the very least, with the question, I like it. I mean, you got it.

GREENLER: It really touches on that fundamental framing of governance that I think you put forward so well of constitution. Another question, when we discuss indigenous governance from a global perspective, how the governance of Native American nations and tribes in U.S. connect with indigenous governance of other nations and communities across the world, what would be the central platforms and themes?

WEBSTER: So with the Haudenosaunee government, we purposely left the rafters. We wanted to extend the rafters to any indigenous government that wanted to join. We wanted to offer shelter under our, the white roots of peace. So it was the idea that this notion of peace, love, and respect for each other would go global. I think that was the idea, is that everybody would embrace this, that we would all be decent human beings, that we would treat each other and our environment with respect. So I think that's really a lofty goal, but that was the idea, that peace is possible.

CLOWES: Margaret, do you have anything you want to add? I know we've had questions that are mostly directed toward, you know, government issues.

NOODIN: No, I think a lot of them resonate with what I was saying as well. I think of that Ho-Chunk story, where if we are speaking as Ho-Chunk and using our language and our frameworks and anthropological perspectives, then we are true to some of these things. And what Becky said as well, about there being a network, and, you know, Richard mentioning the right relations. I think they all resonate. So I'm actually often thinking of language as the backbone for those things that they're speaking of.

CLOWES: It's just about 7:26. John, maybe one long question or two very short ones.

GREENLER: Sure. So personally, I was interested, there was, you know, I can't remember, I think maybe, Rebecca, it was you who briefly mentioned the process of a consensus-like decision making and kind of a broader thinking. How, you know, how universal was that? And does that really continue on? It seems like, in some ways, a

fundamental difference from maybe much of what we experience in our United States government today.

WEBSTER: So in the confederacy, yeah, it still goes on. That's how the confederacy makes decisions is by consensus. And if you can't reach a decision, the decision is laid to rest. But like Richard was talking about, with our IRA governments, in Oneida, majority rules. We have elections. We sit in a room and vote, and if you have 51% or more, that's what's going to happen. Even if you discuss the issue for two minutes, it doesn't matter. So I think there's a difference between, you know, that deliberative part of democracy that we had before, where everyone is heard, and we all get to decide and talk and work through something, versus just jumping to a vote to see who has the most, what idea can garner the most votes.

GREENLER: That really resonates in terms of what you were sharing during the earlier presentation, talking about, at one point in time, how the fire, the council fire was kind of, you know, was covered, and then there was a return, rather than actually making that hasty decision, interesting.

CLOWES: Probably time to wrap it up. It's 7:29. I really thank you all, the three of you, so much for being part of the first presentation and this presentation, and then they'll be back again when we meet again on April 15th. So as I said before, we'll be sending a recording of the presentation along with the Word Cloud that we'll generation from those land recognitions. An awful lot of people, of course, Ho-Chunk, living on Ho-Chunk land, but there were many others represented as well.

And that message will include a short survey about your feedback about tonight's presentation. So we'd love to hear from you about that. And again, I want to invite you to join us on April 15th, our next session, when all of our panelists will return for a session called *Balancing Individual Interests and the Common Good*, something we've touched on quite a bit tonight. And that will be moderated by Rick Kyte of Viterbo University's DB Reinhart Center for Ethics and Leadership, one of the sponsors of this program. So I invite you all to have a beautiful evening. We have plenty to think about. Good night, everyone.

MONETTE: Thank you very much. Good night.