

# **Alpha Ontology and a Pathology of Social Dominance: Unearthing Western Civilization and Neo-Colonial, Neo-Liberal, Neo-Conservative Hegemony**

**Richard Arnold**

## **Prologue**

This paper was written for the student decolonization essay contest of the 15<sup>th</sup> Annual American Indian and Alaska Natives Conference co-hosted at Haskell Indian Nations University and the University of Kansas during the spring of 2005. At that time I was co-enrolled as an undergraduate and graduate student having almost finished one degree while simultaneously beginning another at the Center for Indigenous Nations Studies (CINS). In this article, I attempt to synthesize the different conceptual frameworks primarily introduced to me by three classes: Political Theory, Native American Oppression, and Evolutionary Psychology wherein their discourse was relevant to each other and to the issue of decolonization. In this respect the approach was in line with the CINS mission statement of addressing research from an interdisciplinary perspective for the purpose of arriving at organic and holistic solutions to the problems facing both Indigenous and immigrant communities.

On the issue of decolonization there are many varying issues at hand to consider, which include intellectual sovereignty, empowerment through cultural, legal, and political forms, a revitalization of community and self, a reconciliation with Western

society, a reconstruction of identity and so on.<sup>1</sup> This paper provides a discourse on decolonization that prescribes and acknowledges a pathological social process that has both corresponding biological and social dimensions that may be illuminated through an analysis of evolutionary frameworks and ideology that can be observed in both the spheres of public and private policy throughout history and broadly offers an explanatory framework for the unfolding of a colonial history. Additionally, the paper is written from a Chickamauga perspective, in that traditionally the Chickamauga polity exercised turgid independence in thought and action and still does today. While they recognize the validity of other cultural social forms, they do not rely on any authoritative external validation of its own definitive existence. The inquiry is characterized primarily through an inferred and speculative rationale that relied on intuition and observation as the initial guide. The paper does not consider a host of other possibilities which would add substantial new components to the dialogue. For example, I would liked to have integrated Jeremy Rifkin's thesis on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Industrial Revolution in which he theorizes that a new energy regime, along with new technology regime, will predictably displace the majority of the global workforce this century thus having profound implications for social organization and resource competition.<sup>2</sup> Further, Rifkin's work compels the reader to address some of the fundamental dilemmas associated with the current form of capitalism that is disseminated and practiced today.

### **Roman Mythology, an Evolution of Commonwealth Colonization**

Morality is the device of an animal of exceptional complexity, pursuing its interest in an exceptionally complex social universe.<sup>3</sup>

Following the rationale of the above quote, the political scientist would concur but with the alternate label of "primal politics," such that at the end of the day the leaders of the body politic after the failure of cumbersome deliberation are relegated to the old standby of coercion to achieve/secure state interests through the dominance and control of economic actors/resources. Significantly, in modern terms and ancient allegory, the providence of politics is the providence of the sort of power capacity to control, influence, and manipulate resources.<sup>4</sup> Also, in terms of modernity and the allegory of the ancients, political/social systems have often been shaped through the capacity of the *Alpha Type One Male* to exercise his faculty of ascendancy to instrumentally dominate; wielding the status of a man-God and extrapolating the assets of decadence to appease the appetites of a self-deified and often populace-deified immortal impressed upon the memories of generations not yet born. I hear Alexander calling, he and Caesar chuckling between erect pillars, seducing the imaginations of Washington and Jackson with the glorious embellishments of their forays.

Problematically, history is more often than not a process, I claim, significant of the conflict amongst Alpha Type One Males (hereafter, A1) themselves and between their antagonistic relation with the less frequent Alpha Type Two Males (hereafter, A2) in as such that the veracity of this conflict between these types of individuals has been and is more influential than the multitude of other factors that have shaped the historical

past. Germane factors include religion, a relationship to a remarkable origin without regards to linearity or possibly the origin itself; culture, or the shared experience and outlook by a common group of people; science, or the pursuit of determining the ultimate reality; the quagmires of ethnicity; and politics, the processes by which humankind resolves the dilemmas associated with power, resources, rights and responsibilities in decision making so that we may live effectively and meaningfully in our environment. Even here in regard to history and its factors the A1 individual within the confines of his constructed society is dominant, and to quote Howard Zinn's paraphrasing of George Orwell, "those who dominate our society are in a position to write our histories. And if they can do that they can decide our futures."<sup>5</sup> To the point, critics of Globalism observe that contemporary global politics are prefigured in the "mixed constitution" of the Roman Empire and in the various political modernities associated with Dutch mercantilism, British Imperialism, and cold war politics in the twentieth century.<sup>6</sup>

The point is that the social hierarchies created by A1 success indeed are the result of manipulating culture, religion, science, or ethnicity to create pseudo realities in which the very authentic factors that define human existence become perverted and distorted through the over-politicalization of their intent and purpose in order to achieve control. Ultimately, my claim will be that the A1 Male expression is a pathology of exploitative dominance highly similar to the standard prescribed by the field of psychology in regards to the anti-social personality disorder. Further, the A1 pathology institutes a "default" or uncritical and uncreative social system such that at the end of the day, so called new political/social systems in large part only appear as a fresh innovations from the old which are engineered with overly elaborate, sophisticated methods/philosophies that allow the A1 Male to retain his hierarchical position of dominance through 'soft' and 'hard' coercion so that he can thrive to the detriment of society at large or other society's rather than his, and most likely both.<sup>7</sup> For comprehensive examples of A1 typology manifested in social processes one might consider the cognitive coercion in social policy as offered by Murray and Herrnstein, or the process by which Western democracies are becoming the Western oligarchies as presented by Todd's comparative analysis of modern American democracy and Imperial Rome. Another example is Yellow Bird's coercion of colonized adaptation which prompted me to ask myself whether democracies based on simple majority decision making could become anything more than an expression of oligarchic social power.<sup>8</sup>

Prominently, A1 Male Role may have originated under conditions in an era of pre-history where a typology characterized by instrumental covert and overt aggression, coupled with multiplicit prosocial dexterity, may have aided the survival of sporadic, unstable populations groups that necessarily carried humankind as a species beyond the instability of pre-history in contrast to adaptive strategies that emphasized instrumental aggression within the broader stratagem of cooperation. More simply, there may have been multiple and differing biological adaptations present in human populations with implications for group dynamics to resolve the dilemmas associated

with the sustainment of the human species. Here the human intellectual, emotional, and spiritual faculties of early populations began the process of defining and distributing responsibilities and rights with a manifold of solutions for the mitigation of the public cheater or free rider problem. In line with determining the pathology of the human A1 Male behavior set, a multitude of perspectives exist for social organizational development to examine the A1 Male Typology in the standpoint of Evolutionary Psychology through Altruism Kin Selection Theory, Reciprocal Altruism Theory, Patrilineal Species Aggression Model, and Resource Control Theory.<sup>9</sup> In tandem, the Standard Social Science Model of Psychology (SSSM) also offers a number of perspectives beginning with the umbrella-like Social Group Theory that is fortified with Social Adjustment Theory, Social Comparison Theory, Social Exchange Theory, Social Facilitation Theory, and Social Learning Theory, to name a few.<sup>10</sup>

The Evolutionary standpoint approaches social organization in trying to reconcile human aggression, observing that aggression is most likely a species level psychological adaptation and so to some degree conflict within social groups is unavoidable and contextually precise.<sup>11</sup> In contrast, the SSSM commonly approaches the issue of social organization through the commonality of shared characteristics/behaviors/values that in turn are disseminated throughout the group through learned/modeled behavior and an active reinforcement of specific behaviors by group agents (Primary Modelers of Behavior) relative to the ‘blank slate’ approach to human development.<sup>12</sup> Both viewpoints accept a cohort of environmental influences upon behavior and social organization, while evolutionary psychology recognizes that these influences do not play themselves out on a blank slate of endless possibilities but rather through an evolved biological apparatus in that human behavior is ultimately not entirely malleable where indeed a unified human psyche does exist.

However, the human species has recently achieved a relatively unmitigated existence in a planetary context earmarked for its overly competitive discourse for place and position. Accordingly, the main threat to human species survival and species level quality of life is most assuredly the conflict fallout caused by the unchecked competition of A1 Male social/political hierarchies that necessarily coincides with an unstable and potentially unsustainable living condition. In applicable reiteration, Conflict Theory, another explanation for social/political organization derived from Sociology, is explicitly coherent in the ideological provisos of Analytical Anarchism: “Politics is best seen as competition or conflict over resources, power, or prestige.”<sup>13</sup> More to the point, politics historically and currently have been dominated by A1 Males especially at the forefront of public life where as A1 Females have also had a tremendous impact on social organization but only in a slightly differential modified niche than their A1 Male counterparts.

My contention is that most existing political realities/ideologies have been formulated as direct result of a pathology of A1 domination/supremacy in which the ideologies of Marxism (communism), Classical Liberalism (democracy), Totalitarianism/Authoritarianism (Nazism), and some forms of Traditional Conservatism are indifferent and thus preferentially neutral in application concerning the respect that they have all

proven themselves to be capable of blatant tyranny, oppression, and exploitation of their own societies while maintaining their differential status primarily through theoretical frameworks and intellectual critiques of each other. While the differential theoretical status of these ideologies do indeed offer outstanding dialogue and critique regarding substantial issues ranging from social justice to comprehensive citizenship, they fail to account for the existence of behavior pathologies that seemingly morph the theoretical impetus of ideology. One philosophy in particular seems to be tailored to buttress certain behavior pathologies, that of Classical Liberalism with its extreme individualistic underpinnings. Currently, the A1 pathology has driven the human species into an escalation from the Classical Liberalism-Marxist conflict of the Cold War into a consuming 'climax' ideology known as Globalism or Neo-Liberalism.<sup>14</sup> The propagation of Globalism is so unprecedentedly forthcoming that it threatens the genuine existence-expression of alternative ideologies such as Indigenism, Classical Anarchism, neo-Anarchism (indicative of feminism, environmentalism, anarchist libertarianism, and so on), Theocratism (Muslim or Buddhist nation-states, for example), Conservatism, and Socialism or any other alternative ideology such as a reformed Liberalism, which all, depending on the perception, can be classified as alternative viable ideologies in consideration of recent world history that is synonymous with overt neo-colonial inclusiveness or Neo-Liberal induced universalism.<sup>15</sup> Extraordinarily, Francis Fukuyama in 1992 reported to the world that "liberal democracy [as understood concerning its role in Globalism] may constitute the endpoint of mankind's ideological evolution and the final form of human government," and thus the end of history.<sup>16</sup> In this respect universalism within this conceptual framework does not acknowledge the right of other societies to choose their own mode of existence nor does it currently choose to co-exist with other types of societies, but rather its goal is to transform the world citizenry into a pluralistic guise in which authentic cultural value systems become consumed into a syncretic commercialism such that they exist in name and price only or as anachronistic tall tales.

On the contrary, I propose that presently as in the past, as always, the human species is at a crossroads of potential, a potential to evolve beyond the A1 Male social hierarchy and thus begin a new evolutionary expression or the revalidation of an old one in relation to some existing Indigenist political/social models. Fukuyama contends that "a remarkable consensus concerning the legitimacy of liberal democracy [a political system derived from the ideology of Classical Liberalism that again is emerging as Neo-Liberalism/Globalism] as a system of government had emerged throughout the world over the past few years, as it conquered rival ideologies like hereditary monarchy, fascism, and most recently communism."<sup>17</sup> However, the remarkable consensus is not at all convincing when one observes that Liberalism did not emerge on its merits alone, but as a result of a power struggle. At the risk of convoluting this investigation into a pathology of dominance beyond simple coherence, I find it essential to examine the A1 Male complex in the provisions of Aldous Huxley's conjecture in his work, *Brave New World*, the rationale of Dr. Hawley's Resource Control Theory and the typology of the "well-adapted Machiavellian," with the pretensions of Fukuyama's end-of-history

hypothesis. In ending, I will offer the philosophical bases of two ideologies, one noteworthy of A1 anti-sociality and one noteworthy of its potential to be an alternate non-A1 ideology augmented with a diagnosis commentary of current world conditions according to Huxley along with scholars Cavanagh and Barnet (hereafter, C&B).

### **Examining the Alpha Male**

Huxley's insights into human social organization suggests a 'brave new world' driven by a culturally homogenous one-world-state with the salient features of technocratic government, rampant technology-driven consumerism, and a social order of inequality where the discipline of social science is devoted to the application of techniques derived from the neo-primal religion of the experimental method to promulgate institutional control over society. Control in the world state is achieved two-fold. First, by biologically/genetically conditioning citizens prior to birth to become a member of one of five castes differentiated as the Alphas, Betas, Deltas, Epsilons, and Gammas. In this tiered caste system, the Alphas reign supreme enjoying all positions of status, assigned only to engage in intellectual activities while the remaining castes are assigned to lower/lesser duties according to their genetic programming. Secondly, plenary control is attained through various models of social conditioning that include behavior modeling/reinforcement and drug therapy. Conditioning, in Huxley's imagery, featured such methods aimed at exaggerating infantile/pedomorphic type traits in the castes through the strict observance of immediate sexual gratification coupled with the preference for promiscuity and the denial of personal/social responsibility to thwart the development of a moral conscious, which could potentially be dangerous to state interests or, more poignantly, A1 interests.<sup>18</sup>

However, the world state that Huxley offers for examination had been unable to perfect its machinations for social engineering, so rogue individuals were exiled and "reservations" still existed for the "savage" peoples. Further, Huxley reveals the true nature of the A1 Male, when "he points to an experiment in which an entire island was populated with Alphas, and wholesale civil war quickly ensued, because none of the citizens were ever happy with the distribution of tasks." He concluded that "Alphas are only happy doing Alpha work, the vast majority of the population has to be degraded and made stupid so that they will be happy with their place in life."<sup>19</sup> Equally important, one of Huxley's main characters is an Alpha male who is deeply disturbed, depressed, angry, and internally conflicted in relation to the world state and undertakes revolutionary action to effect a societal change. In effect, what Huxley has done with this character is give the audience a glimpse of what I refer to as the A2 Male. Significantly, Huxley declares that the stakes are high in the human drama in as such that a permanent change in human nature at the species level is becoming more probable resulting from the unmitigated proliferation of A1 Males in the population.<sup>20</sup>

In closing with Huxley, he stipulated that the goal of the world state is to civilize people into a homogenous culture.<sup>21</sup> The question then becomes "why?" I instruct that civilizing the masses as a methodology for an elite class of A1 individuals to live

an inflated material/grandiose conceptual existence of supremacy based on the controversial philosophical premise that "...man...[with no]...desire to be recognized as greater than others, and without such desire no excellence or achievement was possible. Content with his happiness and unable to feel any sense of shame for being unable to rise above those wants...man ceased to be human."<sup>22</sup> Therein lies the irony in that we all are the last man in the sense that we as individuals at times feel isolation, separation, and unique singularity from our group memberships.

Intriguingly, Fukuyama discusses liberal democracy in the terms of the German philosopher Hegel, as being the universal and homogenous state of Globalism.<sup>23</sup> Once more in Hegel's terms, Fukuyama asserts that, "the desire to be recognized as a human being with dignity drove man at the beginning of history into a bloody battle to the death for prestige. The outcome of this battle was a division of human society into a class of masters, who were willing to risk their lives, and a class of slaves, who gave in to their natural fear of death."<sup>24</sup> In contrast, it well may be fear of inadequacy amongst a multitude of other possibilities that has motivated the psyche of the A1 individual. Contextually though, Fukuyama's assertions are in line with the sort of historical pathology of dominance upon which I am speculating upon.

In an interesting parallel, Dr. Hawley, an Evolutionary Psychologist through adolescent studies in Berlin, has implicitly developed a model of social organization through the employment of individual resource control strategies. In this model two basic stratagems are utilized, direct strategies coercive in nature that include overt aggression features and indirect strategies that are prosocial in nature and include reciprocity/cooperation features for the purpose of yielding resources such as social status. Her research described five types of individuals according to their method or lack of method of employing the aforementioned stratagems. The types include Bistrategic Controllers or "Machiavellians" (A1), Coercive Controllers, Prosocial Controllers, Typical Controllers, and Non-Controllers. The Machiavellian or A1 emerges as the socially dominant resource controller through twin deployment of both stratagems. The Machiavellian or A1 profile features quite high aggressive behavior, social sophistication, and astute moral reasoning skills. Machiavellian-labeled subjects self-admitted to aggressive/hostile behavior, cheating, pursuing dominance, supremacy control, and the keen ability to read their effect on peers. Consequently, these children are perceived by peers to be among the most popular and socially central. Other incorporated observations include the presence of a motivational aspect that Machiavellians are driven by a very high need for recognition from others, and also that they operate in covert modes such that teachers report them as being no more aggressive than other children, they appear moral in their actions but don't incur the cost of behaving morally.<sup>25</sup> However, scholars from other disciplines take issue with Hawley's theory because it is not falsifiable or they take issue with her methods that rely heavily on self-reporting measures which they consider to be misleading and indicative of invalidity that produces error in data analysis.<sup>26</sup> More importantly though, Systems Living Theory advocates have recognized the relevancy of her work to evolutionary selection pressures on social organization and human processes.<sup>27</sup> In

this respect, Hawley's research is addressing the evolutionary selection for aggression in group behavior in relation to the method in which resources are administered through group dynamics.<sup>28</sup>

With riveting surprise, there exists a "controversial child" who does not fit into the theoretical framework of the clinical approach of the SSSM that considers aggression as maladaptive and considers the controversial child an abhorration; nor is the controversial child suited to the framework of the Evolutionary perspective, which reports the possibility that aggression is a psychological adaptation, and engages academia with the alternative view that aggression is not necessarily maladaptive.<sup>29</sup> Typically, the controversial child is ignored by research guidelines because the category/classification of the controversial child is unstable and infrequent in sample populations. The child has been described as being sociable, aggressive, disruptive, having friendship skills, and is reported to be liked and disliked by peers.<sup>30</sup> Additionally, the controversial child may potentially be described as predominantly male.<sup>31</sup> I intuitively contend that the controversial child is the conflicted child, by which I mean morally conflicted. Like the Bistrategic, Machiavellian A1, I suspect the controversial child is equally, if not more adept at moral reasoning and social sophistication but actually differentially incurs the cost of behaving morally, though a pathology of his confliction may result in social judgments correctly discernible as immoral in nature and deed. I contravene the point of view that the A2 is disruptive not because of motivated maladaptive behavior but rather initiates appealingly disruptive behavior in his maturation process that illuminates his own nature, which compels him to challenge the social order of A1 Machiavellians. In challenging the social order, the controversial child remains in conflict and realizes he is different from his peers and may experience feelings of isolation and despondency. Thus, the "controversial child" is in actuality the A2 Male who most likely remains in a flux of internal conflict throughout his lifetime and may fail to achieve his potential as a result of this internalized conflict. To credibly discern between the A1 and the A2 Types, research must be conducted that can distinguish between the motivational nature of the two types and their psychological outcomes, among other factors.

For an example of the A2 Male, I offer the Native American leader of the 1800s, the Shawnee patriot Tecumseh, who challenged the A1 social order that became the United States of America. "Even as a lad Tecumseh possessed the generosity which was to endear him to his warriors when he rose to power. At a time when some of the other chiefs were founding fortunes and the Miami sachem Richardville was creating an estate worth a million dollars, Tecumseh was giving away everything he acquired with a munificence that showed his utter lack of selfishness."<sup>32</sup> Obviously, Tecumseh was trying to convey with his actions that the arbitrary resource hoarding of the antagonistic colonial culture, once acclimated into his culture distinguished by its ethic of cooperation within his ethnicity, would result in the potentially incontrovertible transformation of his culture. He understood that a society primarily driven by a production/consumption ethic would agentically morph into a synthetic social expression noted for its oppression, tyranny, and exploitation. But make no mistake, he did not follow this ethic because of

any inferiority of skills to A1 Males as reported by former president William Henry Harrison: "The implicit obedience and respect which the followers of Tecumseh pay him is really astonishing and more than any other circumstance bespeaks him one of those uncommon geniuses, which spring up occasionally to produce revolutions and overturn the established order of things."<sup>33</sup> And with his genius he attempted to preserve his peoples' territorial integrity and way of life but instead achieved his efforts with "little more than a handful of poorly armed people against a great nation. . . He and Isaac Brock achieved the preservation of Canada."<sup>34</sup> Tecumseh's legacy is not an atavistic return to a cultural yesteryear but rather an attempt to modernize independent of coercive forces by a man who would not doubt nor abandon his culture as his society faced the grave external threat of a polity whose organizing principle was substantially orchestrated around the goal of displacing and eradicating whole population groups; nor would he give in to the internal threats associated with alcoholism and the weakening of cultural sovereignty through the pacifying devices of a foreign religion. In many respects Tecumseh walked in the footsteps of Dragging Canoe and Blue Jacket.

### **Liberalism in Contrast**

Up to this point, I have made a stark distinction between two types of individual expressions: one of supremacy/domination and one of liberation/cooperation, whose differential modes have been the engines transforming historical development and concurrently, ideological development. In contrasting the philosophical bases of two different ideologies, I ask the reader to critically address the reading and prescribe their own labels as to which social ideology is plainly anti-social and which is observantly humanely social. To help clarify the criteria of the anti-social individual that I infer from both biological disposition and environmental socialization, the scholar Reavis reports a definition noted for its parsimonious description.

The essential descriptive features of (antisocial) disorder are 'reserved for individuals who are basically unsocialized [unreconciled] and whose behavior pattern brings them repeatedly into conflict with society. They are incapable of significant loyalty to individuals, groups, or social values. They are grossly selfish, callous, irresponsible, impulsive, and unable to feel guilt or to learn from experience and punishment. Frustration tolerance is low. They tend to blame others or offer plausible rationalization for their behavior.'<sup>35</sup>

Further, Reavis reassures us that the anti-social pathology is not limited to the criminally obvious individual and may include such persons as "businessmen, politicians, and administrators"<sup>36</sup> Additionally the anti-social individual is noted for instrumental or planned goal oriented aggression where, "theft and robbery are distinctive examples of instrumental (predatory) offenses."<sup>37</sup> Here two factors are pertinent, the anti-social person's "remorseless use of others" linked with a failure to

act responsibly with others.<sup>38</sup> What I am proposing is that the A1 personality complex highly correlates with that of the anti-social individual and that the two may just be variations of a same general pathological strain. Implications for individuals and society include a theoretical case that is beginning to offer underlying explanatory frameworks for such social-cultural-political events (phenomenon) like genocide, colonization, slavery, subjugation, rigid class social hierarchies, and so on, for these events are distinguishable for poor, shallow, and unstable relationship management. The study by Reavis does clearly indicate that individualist societies do have significantly higher reported rates of intra-societal instrumental aggression and higher frequency rates of individuals associated with the anti-social label.<sup>39</sup>

### **Classical Liberalism**

*Ontology* - Classical Liberal tradition is fundamentally humanistic, patriarchal, and material. When void of cultural/political preconceptions, humanity is a “blank slate” deduced to an existence “composed of physical objects set in motion and thus subject to change, according to the natural laws of causation” without any possibility of achieving a conception of an ultimate reality. In other words, history is a natural process without metaphysical influence, where history is the result of human motivations and capacities driven by the unchecked forces of competition. This process is known as ontological materialism in which survival of the fittest is the salient value.<sup>40</sup> Huxley observed from the world state that the “colonizers effectively separated peoples from their own history and culture, making it more difficult for the latter to rebel against the new implanted culture that had become their own,” to serve the culture of consumerism, an ethos for an A1 pathology of dominance.<sup>41</sup> More so, I infer that the blank slate is the mere invention of the A1 predatory pathology to establish a more efficient means to his preferential ontology du jure. Authors C&B in *Global Dreams* theorize that the corporate world state is currently differentiated as four distinguished spheres: the Global Cultural Bazaar, Global Shopping Mall, Global Workplace, and the Global Financial Network. They conclude that “these worldwide webs of economic activity have already achieved a degree of global integration never before achieved by any world empire or nation-state.”<sup>42</sup> Huxley’s conceptual “world state” has not manifested itself as one world government overriding the globe but rather as a uniform cultural process that marginalizes and undermines traditional culture systems while in turn promoting its own agenda and norm for human behavior and in many cases marginalizing the traditional roles of government and simultaneously producing a profound effect on public policy.

*Human Nature* - The Classical Liberal perspective conceives of humans as representations of physical matter with no inherent commonality for sacredness where individuals are psychologically alienated apart from each other.<sup>43</sup> Huxley reflects on the norms of the world state when he quotes, “personal connections of all sorts are discouraged... [And]...modernity is developing in a direction that will ultimately change human nature itself.”<sup>44</sup> Huxley continues in that, “The [social] conditioning also drives

the population to support the capitalist economic system. Because the World State wants children to be loyal consumers as adults, the importance of the individual is diminished in order to further the interests of the larger community.”<sup>45</sup> A pedomorphic change, I think, that diminishes the human experience to a sort of Pavlov’s Dog Market existence of consumption and production. Observantly, C&B report of the world today, “Most corporate leaders...do not accept responsibility for the social consequences of what they make or how they make it.”<sup>46</sup> In this aspect, the socialization process of globalization is not one that reinforces the ethics of civic responsibility and community investment but rather estranges the individual from the most normal of relationships such as family and local environment. Further, the irony of Classical Liberalism becomes apparent as it is grounded in the declaration of the individual’s rights that take precedence before public concerns in a manner that has disintegrated society in practice, while allowing for the wholesale exploitation of the individual.

*Society*- The Classical Liberal viewpoint on society is a senile outlook in which, “society is merely a collection of individuals who sometimes interact with each other to further their economic interests” while consenting to state sanctioned constraints on liberties to secure a network of protection over their properties.<sup>47</sup> More so, the individual is fundamentally the basic unit of society as opposed to a family or clan. Continuing along this rationale, individuals are commodities free of social instability created by the social divisions arising out of moral reasoning in as much that the citizen is indoctrinated to only have allegiance to the state, as Huxley confers.<sup>48</sup> In a similar account, C&B discuss the current global division of labor as, “armies of service providers of all sorts are employed by large global networks...any place producing a uniform product, without concern for individuality.”<sup>49</sup> Not only has the doctrines of Classical Liberalism defined an inept conceptualization for society but in effect also for the individual by its extreme separation of the individual from his/her organic parts, collectively known as society.

### **Classical Anarchism**

*Ontology* - The Anarchist reality is grounded in its own view of a natural world with a natural god rather than a supernatural god. Relevantly, god is an essential power within all that is, and man is thus interconnected to other men and nature itself. Consequently, each person’s consciousness is but an integral component of an aggregate collective species consciousness. In this manner, the perceptual laws of energy and matter intrinsically limit human appetites. Centrally, humans are social beings and when unimpeded by modern institutional authority structures that are de facto artificial power constructs, humans can form societies by cooperation and mutual aid.<sup>50</sup> In-line with anarchist criticisms, “The global economic system prizes the efficient production of goods more than the dignity of human beings.”<sup>51</sup> Moreover, I scrutinize that the evolved human intellectual/emotional capacity is not primarily designed for the purpose of producing the most outrageous toaster oven or cup of coffee.

*Human Nature* - Unlike the view of Classical Liberalism of man as matter in motion, Anarchism accepts man for what he is: an egoist (individual) and a social entity (group). Biologist Peter Kropotkin models human nature on a mutual aid ethic based on an instinctual automatic response in respect to cries for help in which people often altruistically forfeit personal well-being to help other humans. Kropotkin stipulates, that "altruism thrived under more natural conditions... 'savages' living in a natural condition were not the self-interested aggressors depicted by Hobbes; instead savages practiced the motto 'each for all.'"<sup>52</sup> Lastly, Anarchism in general, similar to Huxley recognized human nature to be malleable, so that "if conditions are oppressive, the dark side of human nature will prevail. If conditions are natural and humane, the tendency of humans to exhibit mutual aid and to act justly will prevail."<sup>53</sup>

*Society* - In conjunction with Kropotkin's mutual aid ethic, Anarchism conceptualizes a society that is "a natural community...one in which individuals agree, through a continual series of face to face encounters, to respect and help each other. From these encounters arise norms of reciprocity and habits of sociability that are impressed into the consciousness of individuals." These individuals are proactively developing a conscious of morality through guiding cultural/social norms rather through the illogical, perversely abstract construct arising from the "rule of law."<sup>54</sup> Huxley conspires that the future world will be in need of "authentic local communities." Concurring, C&B discuss a "new sort of power vacuum," in terms of a "gridlock that traps public authority combined with the disclaimer of public responsibility by the private sector [that] guarantees a world economy out of control."<sup>55</sup> In ending this dialectical dialogue of ideology, I add some complexity: when given the choice of capitalism's utility laborer or communism's creative laborer, I would rather spend my days in a labor of practicality alongside my kindred rather than against them under the falsehood of a competitive demure or utopian directive arising from "Western" derivatives.

### **The Gamble of Western Civilization**

Succinctly, Hegel with his dialogue on the division of human society, a master-slave paradigm, just may have identified a potential origin of the A1 pathology of dominance. Analogously though, just as one cannot argue that exploitative pornography degrades the dignity of women without first acknowledging that it also degrades healthy conceptions of masculinity, one cannot argue that only the slave is captured in an undignified state without acknowledging the undignified master who, when perceived as the highest evolved representative of humanity, is nothing more than an unscrupulous, beastly savage who hunts and domineers his own kindred. The A1-Machvillian is akin to the undetected cheater who does not reciprocate benevolent social gestures as discussed in Social Game Theory.<sup>56</sup> The solution over this issue of human dignity rests in a reconsideration and reevaluation of the current order along with a rediscovery of alternative existences noted for their ethos of cooperation and mutual aid.

We are at the edge of Western Civilization; more specifically, we are at the edge of Western Civilization's gamble. Can Western Civilization's technology deliver the solutions to the global energy and population problems? Maybe, maybe not! "In the name of counterterrorism and [global level] democratization, the outcome [so far] has been greater instability and unsustainability... International capitalism, facilitated by the unwillingness - or honest unknowingness - of consumers to understand the effects of the ecological foot-prints of their behavior, provides a propulsive push for unsustainable development."<sup>57</sup> Either way, I am confidently assured that the Western Powers of Europe, the United States, and Japan will continue to engage in a policy of resource acquisition through coercion, while appealing to the rhetoric of civil order, in order to delay what some consider an inevitable resource crisis. Scholar Todd would argue that America alone acts as the global predator in a one-world Keynesian state where American consumption has become a structural component of the global economy, but to a lesser degree today than in previous decades.<sup>58</sup> This is your, the reader's, "brave new world." I can see Caesar on the western horizon, the blood in his cup runneth over, the blood of generations not yet born. The uncompromising vineyards of humanity have flourished without regards to the senses of emotion and reason. And why has Caesar been so successful? Because agents of control, those agents with the power to shape social discourse act through a veil of seemingly tangible structures such as institutions or governing councils and the apparently intangible forms associated with politics, culture, and religion in a manner that creates an inaccessible and often unidentifiable environment in which counter discourses fail to materialize in that the social discourse itself premeditates such overtures of the public or community intent in postmodern democracy.<sup>59</sup>

### **A Hegemonic Pathology of Organization**

[Section 2]

Friere discusses oppressive social conditions in the terms of a fluid world experience in which a "culture of silence" is disseminated through formal/informal education networks that pre-empt a successful formulation of a critical consciousness capable of transforming a less than optimal status quo experience indicative of fear and lacking a radical conscientization of being inherently creative while responsible in action.<sup>60</sup> Yellow Bird interprets Friere, stating that, "the more radical the person is, the more fully he or she enters into reality so that knowing it better, he or she can better transform it. The individual is not afraid to confront, to listen, and to see the world unveiled. The person is not afraid to meet the people or to enter into dialogue with them. This person does not consider himself or herself the proprietor of history of all people, or the liberator of the oppressed; but he or she does commit himself or herself, within history, to fight at their side."<sup>61</sup>

In lieu of the radical and my novice attempt at a discourse on liberation methodologies, I make no claim to a new theoretical framework of liberation but rather seek to discover the relevancy of established academic endeavors in relation to what

is possible under the current conditions for decolonizing our Indigenous communities. I do so with analytic regards to Fanon's conceptualization of decolonization as a general process aimed at reshaping the social order, and Thiopene's point of view that the process of decolonization is derived from the dichotomy of hegemonic social/economic/political polarity and the continual resistance of the hegemonic system at the peripheral boundaries of its spheres of influence.<sup>62</sup>

Extensively, Hegemonic Stability Theory arising out of the machinations of international economics and free trade as expressed by Kindleberger, in typical Western fashion, contains an internal contradiction. Succinctly, Kindleberger conveys that free trade preservation internationally rests on the necessary condition that a "benevolent despot" in the form of a single nation-state coercively provide the public services of systematic rule articulation and enforcement concerning the modes of conduct in which the international states engage each other in the deliberation of trade activity. In this manner international stability is achieved so that trade relations can be facilitated with relative ease and minimal disruption. The incentive/justification for the hegemonic state to uphold the system and bear the costs remains in its capacity to capture an advantageous market share that ensures a "net profit."<sup>63</sup>

In contradiction, the theory contravenes a nexus between free trade and a coercive international order. If international free trade is not a result of a consensus driven decision making in accords with political rationality among all states, then it is not a system of free trade, but rather a political/economic network organized in neo-colonial style such that, "subordinate states will accept their exploitation as long as the costs of being exploited are less than the costs of overthrowing the hegemonic power."<sup>64</sup> Consequently, Hegemonic Stability Theory is not so much a theory concerned with explaining the resolution of state security dilemmas, resource scarcity, or collective action problems as it is a theory that identifies a *Pathology of Organization* that can be historically observed beginning with Portugal in 1494 and currently observed with the ascension of the United States, who operates on the Classical Liberal assumption that collective action problems cannot be resolved through rational discourse but requires a hard power dissertation among the international body politic.<sup>65</sup> In non-Marxist terms, State-Primacy Theory deliberates on this *Pathology of Organization* that the current sum of history is not a product of emerging economic forces that ultimately determine social organization by choosing for appropriate political hierarchies, but rather,

...political relations select economic relations—these political forces stabilizing economic relations that provide them with the surplus they require...to oppress another national group and meet scarcity or to resist another national group threatening to impose greater scarcity...the actors dominant within the state will collectively decide to stabilize specific economic relations that encourage the development of the productive forces and thus allow a surplus to be extracted that finances the development of the forces of coercion necessary for those state actors to protect or further their

interests...states select relations of production that are in their interests [in other words, government is an end unto itself] rather than egalitarian relations that are in the interests of the mass population...<sup>66</sup>

Relevantly, State-Primacy Theory identifies the true nature of the colonial hegemonic framework assigning the origins of oppressive force to a centralized political, institutional authority and not to the multiple vague polarities of “Marxist” production forces.<sup>67</sup> However, this author concedes that the condition does exist when centralized government institutions may become for a time nothing more than mere representatives of economic agents, consequently they no longer initiate their own agenda or the two become so convoluted that to distinguish between them becomes an exercise in futility other than that together they form a unique centralized single actor; not necessarily stable though. Nonetheless, State-Primacy Theory arising out of the discords of Analytical Anarchism allows an improved opportunity to diagnose the historical record to aid Indigenous communities in their attempts to develop counter-hegemonic strategies presently and in the future, and not necessarily to abandon the modern state structure but to transform it from its anachronistic condition.

### **Intra-Society Hegemonic Observations and Issues**

Suzanne Pharr with her *Common Elements of Oppression* claims that specific forms of oppression are indistinguishable and operate unilaterally because no oppressive hierarchies exist. She also elaborates that a successful end to oppression requires the eradication of them all, and to comprehend the nexus between specific oppressions we must understand how they operate according to a qualified norm. The norm is,

...a standard of rightness and often righteousness wherein all others are judged in relation to it. This norm must be backed up with institutional power, economic power, and both institutional and individual violence. In the United States, that norm is male, white, heterosexual, Christian, temporarily able-bodied, youthful, and has access to wealth and resources.<sup>68</sup>

Ironically, Pharr provides the hierarchy of oppression she claims doesn't exist beginning with the hegemonic status of white males within the current social organization of the United States in which the aggregation of white male prejudicial preferences once determined would distinguish differential hierarchies of oppressions according to frequency and veracity. However, she may be correct, oppression is oppression. Yet not so ironically, the social framework she provides beginning with institutional or political power is coherently in line with State-Primacy Theory but on a

reduced intra model scale in which the internal structure of the state reflects the grander external international scale of the state.<sup>69</sup>

The question becomes, how do we actualize the power of the state to either transform it into a non-oppressive expression of human social organization or abolish the state altogether and revisit older human social organizations? Pharr intercedes that a foremost problem to achieving the sort of solidarity among oppressed peoples in the United States that could potentially seize power is “horizontal hostility.” Essentially, horizontal hostility describes the process whereby dysfunctional aggression is promulgated against one’s own oppressed group and other oppressed groups originating from the learned behavior of self-hate that motivates individuals to identify with the oppressor.<sup>70</sup> Laterally, Rorty points out that, “long standing cross-cultural hostilities are likely to become inflamed as various groups compete for public funds and public attention, all within the bounds of what passes for mutual respect.”<sup>71</sup>

While I find Pharr’s rationale strikingly insightful, I also find it incomplete. Intra/ Inter cultural hostility has other origins arising out of cultural traditions and historical developments that pre-empt the self-hate hypothesis with the, “...rationale for separation, they [separatists] agree that cultural survival cannot be assured by respectful recognition: it also requires far-reaching political and economic self-determination.”<sup>72</sup> This is the American dilemma. Consequently, the American experiment is not one of democracy but one wherein every imaginable ethnic/cultural group has been allowed to develop a semi-autonomous existence within the same territorially governed boundary.

In addressing a *Hegemonic Pathology of Social Organization*, Pharr fails to see how immigration only further convolutes present and assuredly future attempts to resolve the issue of horizontal hostility. Current Census Bureau projections estimate the domestic U.S. population will increase to 404 million by 2050 and 571 million by the end of the century due to record levels of extremely culturally diverse immigration.<sup>73</sup> There exists a multitude of work on how immigration negatively affects existing minorities, especially African and Native Americans concerning the issues of employment, health care, education, and other scarce, contested public/private resources.<sup>74</sup> Because former hostilities remain intact it becomes unlikely that resolution will be achieved in light of the additional burdens placed on the process of resolute deliberation by new immigrant public/private agendas which are often oblivious to previous public/private agenda issues concerning the general welfare of domestic minority groups; accordingly the hegemonic order is only strengthened. In fact, a common argument against tribal sovereignty is the immigrant based argument, that “many groups have been mistreated in history—blacks, Jews, Asians, Poles, the Irish. Should each of these groups be given a sovereign land within the United States and allowed to govern as they choose, free from taxes that must be paid by others, and free to engage in activities denied to others?”<sup>75</sup> Coincidentally, the Hebrews were returned to their sovereign land based on claims of antiquity while the rest chose to abandon their native lands, though many did so under much duress.

## Social Organization and the Origins of a Hegemonic Pathology

DeMeo stipulates that the origins of social violence and warfare arise out of the extreme patrist warrior-caste societies from the desert regions of the Old World who exported their belligerent hegemonically oriented social organization through, “mass migrations, invasions and conquest, contact diffusion of culture, and long-distance voyages of exploration and colonization. Over the centuries, the more peaceful native peoples of nearly every world region were assimilated, displaced, or wiped out by the more violent invader-cultures.”<sup>76</sup> Therefore, the extreme patrist experience is imperative to the postmodern era because, Reich states, “the state structure was determined and predictable from family structure, where social institutions played a central role.”<sup>77</sup>

Taking into consideration colonization as a result of extreme patrist social initiatives coupled with Diamond’s “have technology will travel — and dominate hypothesis of colonization,” it appears we would have a solid explanation for colonization as a scientific phenomenon. I myself in an earlier work contested Diamond’s technology hypothesis of colonization by stating that the key to understanding unmitigated Western colonization was to comprehend the nexus between, “religious institutional development and political organizational development in the geographic area of the Mediterranean Rim nations in which the peoples of three continents collided with each other. This region is the ground floor for adversarial religious/political competition and conflict.”<sup>78</sup> In further contemplation the context which these sorts of institutions developed ultimately came under the plenary corrupting influence of the Roman Empire which indeed went about organizing resource assets to promulgate “state” interests. Under such government forms noted for their highly centralized authority in contest against regional counter interests a process emerged wherein Middle East religions/political institutions were disseminated globally; significantly in as both forms of institutions were spiritually/morally bankrupt and presently place humanity in a quagmire paradox of unsustainable development.<sup>79</sup> Or in Chomsky’s words, our global choice is hegemony or survival.<sup>80</sup> DeMeo explicitly declares, and I clarify, that extreme patrist societies seemingly emerge when resource scarcity constrains population growth and thus warfare/migration becomes the mode to acquire the resources not of survival but of population dominance. Along these lines, Richard Wrangham’s research into primate social organization reveals that patrilineal societies apparently are the origins to human violence, in which coalitional male bonding instigates war raiding, murder, territorial defense/expansion, and a monopolization of women by high status males.<sup>81</sup>

DeMeo in “black and white” analysis contrasts the extreme patrist social societies of the Old World with the matrilineal societies of the Americas. He describes these American societies as, “truly civilized ones. . . matrilineal, overwhelmingly peaceful, yet creative, artful, productive (and) sexually free.”<sup>82</sup> In general, I tend to agree that there are marked differences between matrilineal/patrist systems but I feel DeMeo confounds the issue with shallow discrimination and prescriptive statements about Native American tribes. For DeMeo describes the historical migration of Europeans across the North American continent as one in which more often than not Native

inhabitants provided assistance rather than resistance to European migrants; he highlights the Lewis and Clark expedition as evidence of his proposition that the "... The New World was the ultimate example of isolation from... warrior cultures."<sup>83</sup>

Again, I think DeMeo has oversimplified the issue and drawn arbitrarily trivial conclusions. In reference to Lewis and Clark; two Europeans crossing the continent was a novelty that most likely invoked curious cooperation from Natives, and they were not perceived as a threat. Further, he overlooks the fact that some of the most resistant tribes had weighty matrilineal traits such as those involved in the Chickamauga Confederacy, Iroquois League, etc., who often refused the white man's edict of removal or acclimation. More exactly, it was in fact matrilineal tribal elements who became patrilineal in orientation that actually aided colonial forces in the subjugation of those tribal elements who refused to abandon organically grounded cultural precepts - matrilineal in nature ranging from the female gender of their Creator/God or a clan system of social organization indicative of female leadership.<sup>84</sup> Native males were not servile eunuchs; they didn't stop being men, but rather eluded a nature wherein masculinity was balanced with the acknowledgement/recognition of the equally relevant qualities of the other half of the species.

Secondly, his paradigm of peace and violence according to the condition of patrilineal influence in a society follows the illogical rationale of the Myth of the Alpha Male - the myth being a Darwinian concept of evolution in which males are aggressive, agentic, socially dominant, and competitive while females are communal, reciprocal, subordinate, and so on. This outlook undermines the observation that evolution also selected for cooperation as well as competition without regards to a gender bias, in turn women were just as exposed to the same selective pressures as men and therefore are just as likely to be aggressive and socially dominant.<sup>85</sup> Hawley contends in her Resource Control Theory that within the context of group life in which access to resources is facilitated that aggression and competition are normally unavoidable. Sequentially, highly effective resource controllers utilize both coercive and prosocial strategies to become socially central and dominant. Her adolescent studies reveal an approximately equal frequency of both male and female subjects who fit the criteria for bistrategic resource controllers that were in fact both observed to be socially central and dominant.<sup>86</sup> Again though, as mentioned in Section 1, Hawley's theory of resource facilitation is highly controversial as to whether aggression is a result of an evolved psychological adaptation, a product of socially reinforced behavior, or a mode of behavior derived primarily through bio/chemical devices and it is controversial in regards to whether aggression is viewed as dysfunctionally maladaptive or benevolently adaptive.<sup>87</sup>

Poignantly, in reference to Native American tribal social organization, often it was the females who motivated the men to take to war with other tribes and/or European immigrants. "Richter writes that 'the thousands of deaths from disease led women to demand continual mourning-wars and inspired young men to seize even more captives to requicken the dead.' As many as two-thirds of the people in some Iroquois villages were adoptees." Adoption was purposeful to replace lost relatives, not to ingratiate

the whims of non-Natives.<sup>88</sup> Tucker also writes that it was the widowed mother of Tecumseh who obliged her son to avenge his father's murder, which he did. Tucker describes Tecumseh and his intertribal compatriots as the finest warriors to have walked the continent.<sup>89</sup> So, in contrast to DeMeo's claim, warrior culture did exist in the Americas and Native women had a significant role of influence. In reference to decolonization in the context of DeMeo's dialogue on the origins of violence, we must remain critical about historical interpretations about Native culture, for they have the unwarranted effect of disseminating a misconceived self-image among future generations, thus drawing Natives towards a hollow understanding of self. Necessarily, to undermine hegemonic imperatives some marginalized advocate groups demonstrate a germane method of challenging the status quo system:

By refusing the call to coalesce into clear identities, individuals engaged in an aesthetics of self and groups engaged in non-identity politics refuse to be told the truth about who they are, showing through their activities that there is no static truth to be found. At the same time they undermine the idea that particular collections of practices are right or empowering.<sup>90</sup>

In developing models of liberation we cannot become complacent in our analysis of historical ontology or the present conditions under which we endure, we must remain resolute in our convictions to not fulfill the legacy of prescriptive frameworks that disillusion the truth of self.<sup>91</sup> In error, "the Indigenous identity continuously confronts the colonial/imperial order, and it is through such a perpetual confrontation that a sense of indigenouness is acquired."<sup>92</sup> On the contrary, a sense of comprehensive, elevated indigenouness becomes inherit in the self through the lucid development of a sense of people-hood achieved by a complete community experience.

### **Conclusion: Social Interventions: What is Possible?**

... we talk about our responsibility as First Nations intellectuals and the microassaults we experience from everyday colonial society or about our teaching and research in the academy and the effects that resistant students and colleagues have on our attempts to decolonize their thinking and our academic disciplines. Inevitably, our conversation always turns to how American colonialism has damaged our reservation communities... and the brain drain (the exodus of our most talented tribal members from our communities due to a lack of opportunity or challenge, being from the wrong family, or jealousy). It seems we frequently imagine how we might return home to help our people. But this dream usually ends at about 9:55pm when I am saying good-bye and getting in my car to go home.<sup>93</sup>

The question is, "how do we help our communities?" More specifically, how do we help our communities decolonize themselves? Rothman provides a multi-polarity

model of social intervention in which the modes of locality development, social planning/policy, and social action are integrated into the community experience to achieve “progressive development” grounded in the rationale that “what humans have been able to capture cognitively, they often have been able to master behaviorally—which is a reason for persisting in the endeavor.”<sup>94</sup> Rothman’s dialogue would be lost in my community and he loses my attention because I feel from his text as though I am reading straight out of “Government Manual X-1T3C: On How to be a Good Government Autocrat and create the benevolent Government community.” Further, his text does not address the specific problems incurred in decolonization processes.

Decolonization requires reorganization, not progressive development. When recognizing Indigenous communities in the terms established by an inclusive living systems theoretical framework or any community for that matter, reorganization is differentially dynamic in contrast such that, “reorganization is an operation on a system, not by a system... the creation and reorganization of an action [social discourse] hierarchy results in a unique way of seeing the world and acting on it.”<sup>95</sup> Indigenists, using their reorganized social hierarchies can re-establish/affirm lost cultural values, concepts, and self/universal truth that derive from historically antiquated organic social modes and integrate relevant modern constructs.<sup>96</sup> By reorganizing a tribal social system, I mean re-instituting clan and consensus decision making and dissolving colonized models of governance as discussed by Porter, which are indicative of corruption, crime, ineptness to serve constituents, and in-fighting. Hence, Porter concludes, “As things are going, our destruction will come from our failure to act.”<sup>97</sup> Reorganization of the social hierarchy through clan institutions and consensus driven leadership addresses the central problem of decolonization, that problem being change. I claim that people resist change even when it is for their benefit, because change usually occurs through coercive measures that in response ignite a resistance mechanism within people similar to that of denial mechanisms. Decolonization can be a very painful and humiliating experience and in my opinion, Natives do not like to be reminded of their colonized behavior, traits, and features. This leads Natives to ‘out-Indian each other’ and to seek external validation of their Native identity to no successful end.

When discussing clan institutions, I am discussing them from a Chickamauga perspective, in which a clan serves as a family unit primarily inherited through matrilineal descent, whereas clans organize social activity through clan specific associational duties, responsibilities, tasks, and organically provide appropriate forms of engagement with other tribal elements to arrive at an inclusive social discourse which binds the people together who then have the opportunity to enjoy a complete community experience that emphasizes intra-tribal cooperation and not extreme adversarial competition.<sup>98</sup> In this manner, the clan system of social organization provides the community and “First Nations intellectuals” with a traditional framework to address decolonization and change. Within the superstructure of clan systems the intellectual can begin an interaction with the people in Friere’s conceptualization of communion with the advantage of operating free of colonial governance hierarchies that almost

certainly produce pronounced and exaggerated antagonistic discourses in tribal social processes.<sup>99</sup>

The dialogue between the people and the intellectual should be voluntary and open ended, not linear such that the intellectual's role never exceeds the tone of an ordinary citizen. In this context, the intellectual can provide literature, dialogue, etc. . . . and let the community absorb the content at their own pace according to their willful preferences and in utilizing this approach the integrity of the people/tribal process is not circumvented nor compromised. This soft approach is nothing more than a continual face-to-face communication that is responsive to the sensitivity of the community which allows the community to develop their own subjective norms/standards from the ground up that will eventually be integrated into the ideology of tribal leadership elements. In due course, lasting social norms will develop originating from a voluntary internalization of information that will actualize into sound, coherent social value systems.<sup>100</sup> I consider this method to be truly revolutionary, because its measures operate outside of the colonial framework in which the people become authorities unto themselves while their leaders' positions rests upon the esteem of the people and not in title, authority, or wealth.<sup>101</sup> Revolution in itself as a concept does not necessarily require overnight deliberation but a well organized, comprehensive, systematic, malleable plan grounded in strategic methods applied over time to overcome that which destroys us. In this manner we may succeed according to our commitment, dedication, tenacity and ability to harness binding cooperation from each other as to alleviate the weight of the burdens each of us carry. However, let us not leave the issue in naivety, as fundamental political differences, within and between Native communities, have historically not been successfully resolved through consensus driven decision making (as the process was circumvented or severely undermined) but rather through less desirable means that have led to the permanent fragmentation of whole tribal ethnicities. In consideration, the sort of intellectual revolution that I have discussed in social interventions is facing a daunting task of prevailing without using coercive hard power resolutions which are typical of most if not all politically tumultuous events historically and presently. Nonetheless, in the end, Caesar had to settle for a salad for when there is nothing left to steal the thief goes by the way side.

### Notes

1. Groden, M., Martin Kreiswirth, and Imre Szeman. *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism, 2nd Ed.*(The Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, Maryland.2005)
2. Rifkin, J., *The End of Work the Decline of the Global Labor Force and the Dawn of the Post-Market Era.* (Penguin Group Inc: New York, New York.1995)
3. Hawley, P., *Strategies of control, aggression, and morality in preschoolers: An evolutionary perspective.* Journal of Experimental Psychology 85 (2003) : 232.
4. Carter, A., *Analytical Anarchism: Some Conceptual Foundations.* Political Theory 28, no.2 (2000) 230-253.
5. Zinn, H., *Howard Zinn on History.* (Seven Stories Press: New York, New York. 2001): 97-98.
6. Groden, M., Martin Kreiswirth, and Imre Szeman. *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism: 460.*

7. Washingtonpost.com, Wrangham, R., and Dale Peterson. *Demonic Males and Apes and the Origins of Human Violence, Chapter One: Paradise Lost*. 2004: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/syle/longterm/books/chap1/demonicmales.htm>.
8. Herrnstein, R., and Charles Murray. *The Bell Curve Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life with a New Afterword by Charles Murray*. (Simon & Schuster: New York, New York. 1994). See also, 1st discussion Todd, E., *After the Empire*. (Columbia University Press: New York, New York. 2003); See also, Yellow Bird, M., *A Model of the Effects of Colonialism*. (Class Materials for INS 804 Native American Oppression, Class attended by Richard Arnold, University of Kansas, Kansas Union, Lawrence, Kansas, Fall 2004)
9. Hawley, P., *Evolutionary Psychology Lecture*. (Lecture attended by Richard Arnold, University of Kansas, Frazer Hall, Lawrence, Kansas, Fall 2004)
10. Bothamley, J., *Dictionary of Theories/One Stop to More than 5000 Theories*. (Visible Ink Press: Canton, M. 2002)
11. Hawley, P., *Evolutionary Psychology Lecture*.
12. Bothamley, J., *Dictionary of Theories/One Stop to More than 5000 Theories*.
13. *Id.* 109. See also, Carter, A., *Analytical Anarchism: Some Conceptual Foundations*.
14. Barnett, R.J., and John Cavanagh. *Global Dreams/ Imperial Corporations and the New World Order*. (Simon and Schuster: New York, NY 1994). See also, Marxists Internet Archives, Fukuyama, F., *The End of History*. 2004: <http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/us/fukuyama.htm>
15. Hardt, M., and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts 2000). See also, Hardt, M., and Antonio Negri. *Multitude/War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. (Penguin Press: New York, NY 2004)
16. Marxists Internet Archives, Fukuyama, F., *The End of History*. [www.marxists.org](http://www.marxists.org).
17. *Id.*
18. Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. Edited by, Aglietti, B., John Crowthe, and Justin Kestler, (Spark Notes: New York, NY 2002)
19. *Id.*, p. 48.
20. *Id.*
21. *Id.*
22. Marxists Internet Archives, Fukuyama, F., *The End of History*.
23. *Id.*
24. *Id.*
25. Hawley, P., *Prosocial and Coercive Configurations of Resource Control in Early Adolescence: A Case for the Well-Adapted Machiavellian*. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly 49, no.3 (2003) 279-309. See also, Hawley, Patricia. *Strategies of control, aggression, and morality in preschoolers: An evolutionary perspective*.
26. Underwood, K.M., *The Comity of Modest Manipulation, the Importance of Distinguishing Among Bad Behaviors*. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 49, no. 3 (2003) 373-389. See also, van Honk, J., Dennis J.L.G. Schutter, Erno J. Hermans, and Peter Putman. *Testosterone, cortisol, dominance, and submission/ Biologically prepared motivation, no psychological mechanisms involved*. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 27 (2004) 160-162.
27. Vancouver, J.B., *Living System Theory as a paradigm for organizational behavior/ understanding humans, organizations, and social processes*. Behavioral Science, 41 (July 1996) 165-204.
28. Hawley, P., *Evolutionary Psychology Lecture*.
29. *Id.*
30. Hawley, P., *Prosocial and Coercive Configurations of Resource Control in Early Adolescence: A Case for the Well-Adapted Machiavellian*. See also, Hawley, Patricia. *Strategies of control, aggression, and morality in preschoolers: An evolutionary perspective*.
31. Hawley, P., *Evolutionary Psychology Lecture*.
32. Tucker, G., *Tecumseh/Vision of Glory*. (Russell and Russell: New York, NY 1956):
- 36.
33. *Id.*, p. 327.

34. *Id.*, p. 327.
35. Reavis, James. *Individualist-Collectivist Cultures and Psychopathy*, Phd. Thesis. (United States International University: San Diego, California. 1998): 28.
36. *Id.*, pp. 21-22.
37. *Id.*, pp. 97-98.
38. *Id.*, pp. 33-34.
39. *Id.*
40. Schumaker P., Dwight Kiel, and Thomas Heilke. *Great Ideas/Grand Schemes Political Ideologies in the 19th and 20th Centuries*. ( The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc: New York, NY 1996)
41. Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*: 28.
42. Barnett, R.J., and John Cavanagh. *Global Dreams/ Imperial Corporations and the New World Order*: 15.
43. Schumaker P., Dwight Kiel, and Thomas Heilke. *Great Ideas/Grand Schemes Political Ideologies in the 19th and 20th Centuries*: 50.
44. Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*: 31.
45. *Id.*, p. 28.
46. Barnett, R.J., and John Cavanagh. *Global Dreams/ Imperial Corporations and the New World Order*: 422-423.
47. Schumaker P., Dwight Kiel, and Thomas Heilke. *Great Ideas/Grand Schemes Political Ideologies in the 19th and 20th Centuries*: 55.
48. Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*.
49. Barnett, R.J., and John Cavanagh. *Global Dreams/ Imperial Corporations and the New World Order*: 260.
50. Schumaker P., Dwight Kiel, and Thomas Heilke. *Great Ideas/Grand Schemes Political Ideologies in the 19th and 20th Centuries*.
51. Barnett, R.J., and John Cavanagh. *Global Dreams/ Imperial Corporations and the New World Order*: 426.
52. Schumaker P., Dwight Kiel, and Thomas Heilke. *Great Ideas/Grand Schemes Political Ideologies in the 19th and 20th Centuries*: 117-118.
53. *Id.*, p. 118.
54. *Id.*, p. 119.
55. Barnett, R.J., and John Cavanagh. *Global Dreams/ Imperial Corporations and the New World Order*: 427.
56. Bothamley, J., *Dictionary of Theories/One Stop to More than 5000 Theories*.
57. O'Riordan, J., *The World is Watching*. Environment, 46, no. 8 (2004): Inside the Front Cover.
58. Todd, E., *After the Empire*.
59. Schutz, A., *Rethinking Domination and Resistance: Challenging Postmodernism*. Educational Researcher, 33, no. 1, (2004): 15.
60. Yellow Bird, M., *A Functional Classification of Paulo Friere's Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. (class handout for INS 804, Native American Oppression: University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 2004) 1-11.
61. *Id.*, p. 2.
62. Sefa Dei, J.G., and Alireza Asgharzadeh, *The Power of Social Theory: The Anti-Colonial Discursive Framework*. Journal of Educational Thought, 35, no. 3 (2001): 298.
63. Snidal, D., *The Limits of Hegemonic Stability Theory*. International Organization, 39, no. 4 (1985) 579-614. See also, Cogito, Ergo I.R. *The Theory of Hegemonic Stability/ Notes on Hegemonic Stability Theory*. 2004: <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/poll116/hegemony.htm>
64. Snidal, D., *The Limits of Hegemonic Stability Theory*: 588.
65. Schumaker, P., Dwight C. Kiel, and Thomas Heilke, *Great Ideas/Grand Schemes, political ideologies in the 19th and 20th centuries*. See also, Strange, S., *The Persistent Myth*

- of *Lost Hegemony*. International Organization, 41, no. 4, (1987) 551-574. *See also*, Cogito, Ergo I.R. *The Theory of Hegemonic Stability/Notes on Hegemonic Stability Theory*.
66. Carter, A., *Analytical Anarchism: Some Conceptual Foundations*: 247-249.
67. *Id. See also*, Sefa Dei, J.G., and Alireza Asgharzadeh. *The Power of Social Theory: The Anti-Colonial Discursive Framework*.
68. Pharr, S., *Homophobia, a weapon of sexism*. (Inverness, CA: Charden Press. 1988): 53.
69. Carter, A., *Analytical Anarchism: Some Conceptual Foundations*. *See also*, Pharr, S., *Homophobia, a weapon of sexism*; *See also*, Cogito, Ergo I.R. *The Theory of Hegemonic Stability/Notes on Hegemonic Stability Theory*.
70. Pharr, S., *Homophobia, a weapon of sexism*.
71. Rorty, O.A., *The Hidden Politics of Cultural Identification*. Political Theory, 22, no. 1 (1994): 160.
72. *Id.*, p. 156.
73. Federation for American Immigration Reform. *Doing Research? 2004*: <http://www.fairus.org>. *See also*, Pharr, S., *Homophobia, a weapon of sexism*.
74. Briggs, M.V., *Mass Immigration Worsens Plight of Urban Underclass*. Forum for Applied Research and Public Policy, 10 (1995) 45-50. *See also*, Chapman, J., and Jared Bernstein. *Immigration and Poverty, how are they linked?* Monthly Labor Review, 126, no.4 (2003) 10-15; *See also*, Green, A., and Jack Martin. *Uncontrolled Immigration and the U.S. Health Care System*. Journal of Social Political Economic Studies, 29, no. 2 (2004); *See also*, Matloff, N., *How Immigration Harms Minorities*. The Public Interest, 124, (1996) 61-71; *See also*, Wagner, G.C., *Another Great Migration*. The Futurist, 34, no. 2 (2000) 8-9; *See also*, *Who Left the Door Open?* Time, 164, no. 12, (2004) 51-56, 58-60, 62, 65-66; *See also*, FCNL. *Issues We Work On, Native American*. 2004: <http://www.fcnl.org>; *See also*, Indianz.com. *Poor Indian Health Blamed On Federal Failures*. 2002: file://c:\DOCUME~1\DIKTOL~LOCALS~1\Temp\triKOFGL.htm
75. Golab, J., *The Festering Problem of Indian Sovereignty: The Supreme Court Ducks Congress Sleeps. Indians Rule*. The American Enterprise, 15, no. 6 (2004): 131.
76. DeMeo, J., *Peaceful Versus Warlike Societies in Pre-Columbian America: What Does Archeology and Anthropology Tell Us?* In *Unlearning the Language of Conquest. Scholars Expose Anti-Indianism in America*, edited by Wahinkpe Topa, 134-152. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 2006: 141-142.
77. *Id.*, p. 143.
78. Arnold, K.R., *The Politics of Conquest: Origins and Identity Consequences* (Shawnee, Kansas: Beaty Enterprises)2003; *See also*, Diamond, J., *Guns, Germs, and Steel/The Fates of Human Societies*.(New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company 1997)
79. O'Riordan, J., *The World is Watching*.
80. Chomsky, N., *Hegemony or Survival/America's Quest for Global Dominance/ The American Empire Project*.(an Audio Renaissance Audio book, New York, NY: Holtzbrinck Publishers 2003)
81. Hawley, P., *Evolutionary Psychology Lecture*. *See also*, Wrangham, R., and Dale Peterson, *Demonic Males, Apes and the Origins of Human Violence, Chapter One, Paradise Lost*.
82. DeMeo, J., *Peaceful Versus Warlike Societies in Pre-Columbian America: What Does Archeology and Anthropology Tell Us?* : 145.
83. *Id.*, pp. 163-164.
84. Arnold, K.R., *The Chickamauga Legacy and the Indian Removal Act of 1830/ a Political Commentary*.(Lawrence, KS: Beaty Enterprises 2004). *See also*, Everett, Dianna. *The Texas Cherokees, A People Between Two Fires, 1819-1840*. (Norman, Oklahoma: The University of Oklahoma Press.1990); *See also*, Bates, S., Robert Francis, Richard Kracker, and Jerry Painter, (ongoing personal communication with Richard Arnold, Shawnee, Kansas, 2004).
85. Hawley, P., *Evolutionary Psychology Lecture* .

86. Hawley, P., *Prosocial and Coercive Configurations of Resource Control in Early Adolescence: A Case for the Well-Adapted Machiavellian*. See also, Hawley, P., *Strategies of control, aggression, and morality in preschoolers: An evolutionary perspective*.

87. Hawley, P., *Evolutionary Psychology Lecture*. See also, van Honk, v. J., Dennis J.L.G. Schutter, Erno J. Hermans, and Peter Putman. *Testosterone, cortisol, dominance, and submission: Biologically prepared motivation, no psychological mechanisms involved*. See also, Underwood, K.M., *The Comity of Modest Manipulation, the Importance of Distinguishing Among Bad Behaviors*.

88. Crawford, N.C., *A Security Regime among Democracies: Cooperation among Iroquois Nations*. International Organization, 48, no. 3 (1994): 363.

89. Tucker, G., *Tecumseh/Vision of Glory*.

90. Schutz, A., *Rethinking Domination and Resistance: Challenging Postmodernism*: 19.

91. Yellow Bird, M., *A Functional Classification of Paulo Friere's Pedagogy of the Oppressed*.

92. Sefa Dei, J.G., and Alireza Asgharzadeh, *The Power of Social Theory: The Anti-Colonial Discursive Framework*: 302.

93. Yellow Bird, M., *Cowboys and Indian/ Toys of Genocide/ Icons of American Colonialism*. Wicazo Sa Review, 19, no 2 (2004): 24.

94. Rothman, J., *Approaches to Community Intervention*. (F. E. Peacock: Itasca, Ill. 1995): 60.

95. Vancouver, B.J., *Living systems theory as a paradigm for organizational behavior: understanding humans, organizations, and social processes*: 170-172.

96. Schumaker, P., Dwight C. Kiel, and Thomas Heilke, *Great Ideas/Grand Schemes, political ideologies in the 19th and 20th centuries*. See also, Vancouver, B.J., *Living systems theory as a paradigm for organizational behavior: understanding humans, organizations, and social processes*.

97. Porter, Robert., *Strengthening Tribal Sovereignty Through Government Reform: What Are the Issues?* 7 Kansas Journal of Law & Public Policy 72 (1998): 97.

98. Bates, S., Robert Francis, Richard Kracker, and Jerry Painter, personal communication with Richard Arnold.

99. Yellow Bird, M., *A Functional Classification of Paulo Friere's Pedagogy of the Oppressed*.

100. Bates, S., Robert Francis, Richard Kracker, and Jerry Painter, personal communication with Richard Arnold. See also, Schumaker, P., Dwight C. Kiel, and Thomas Heilke. *Great Ideas/Grand Schemes, political ideologies in the 19th and 20th centuries*; See also, Vancouver, B.J., *Living systems theory as a paradigm for organizational behavior: understanding humans, organizations, and social processes*.

101. Crawford, N.C., *A Security Regime among Democracies: Cooperation among Iroquois Nations*.