

ON THE FUTURE OF THE EARTH: AN AMERICAN INDIAN PERSPECTIVE

In a speech given in South Dakota during the summer of 1979, Russell Means, co-founder of the American Indian Movement, spoke to several thousand people who had assembled from all over the world for the Black Hills International Survival Gathering. Held for ten days in July on the Pine Ridge Reservation, the gathering was a protest against the rape of American Indian lands throughout the West. Means' speech has been fiercely praised, condemned and talked about since it was given. It is a searing cry of protest against the desecration of American Indian lands and an affirmation of the native cultures whose survival is threatened. It was also a strong attack on the leftists of the world, who, he says, are just as complicit in all this destruction as the capitalists. Certain statements that he has made about the theory and practice of Marxism may not be very relevant any more in view of the momentous changes that have taken place in the (erstwhile) Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. However, his description of the American Indian perspective on Human Beings and their relationship to the Earth is vivid and moving. We feel that this would be of great interest to our readers in view of the striking similarity of this view, with the Traditional Indian viewpoint.

A member of the Ogalala Lakota tribe, Russell Means has for long been a major figure in the American Indian Movement. He has been shot, injured and jailed during the state of near war that has long existed between militant American Indians on the one side and government forces on the other.

-Editor

The only possible opening for a statement of this kind, is that I detest writing. The process itself epitomizes the European concept of legitimate thinking, what is written has an importance that is denied to the spoken. My culture, the Lakota culture, has an oral tradition, so I ordinarily reject writing. It is one of the white world's ways of destroying the cultures of non-European peoples, the imposing of an abstraction over the spoken relationship of a people. So what you read here is not what I've written. It's what I've said and someone else has written down. I will allow this because it seems that the only way to communicate with the white world is through the dead, dry leaves of a book. I don't really care whether my words reach whites or not. They have already demonstrated through their history that they cannot hear, cannot see; they can only read (of course, there are exceptions, but the exceptions only prove the rule) I'm more concerned with American Indian people, students and others, who have begun to be absorbed into the white world through universities and other institutions. But even then it's a marginal sort of concern. It's very possible to grow into a red face with a white mind; and if that's a person's individual choice, so be it, but I have no use for them. This is part of the process of cultural genocide being waged by Europeans against American Indian peoples today. My concern is with those American Indians who choose to resist this genocide, but who may be confused as to how to proceed.

It takes a strong effort on the part of each American Indian not to become Europeanised. The strength for this effort can only come from traditional ways, the traditional values that our elders retain. It must come from the hoop, the four directions, the relations; it cannot come from the pages of a book or a thousand books. No European can ever teach a Lakota to be Lakota, a Hopi to be Hopi. A master's degree in Indian Studies or in Education or in anything else cannot make a person into a human being

or provide knowledge into the traditional ways. It can only make you into a mental European, an outsider.

I should be clear about something here, because there seems to be some confusion about it. When I speak of European or mental Europeans, I'm not allowing for false distinctions. I'm not saying that on the one hand there are the by-products of a few thousand years of genocidal, reactionary, European intellectual development, which is bad and on the other hand there is some new revolutionary intellectual development which, is good. I'm referring here to the so-called theories of Marxism and anarchism and leftism in general. I don't believe these theories can be separated from the rest of the European intellectual tradition. It's really just the same old song.

The process began much earlier, Newton, for example, revolutionized physics and the so-called natural sciences by reducing the physical universe to a linear mathematical equation. Descartes did the same thing with culture. John Locke did it with politics, and Adam Smith did it with economics. Each one of these thinkers took a piece of the spirituality of human existence and converted it into a code, an abstraction. They picked up where Christianity ended; they secularised Christian religion, as the scholars like to say and in doing so they made Europe more able and ready to act as an expansionist culture. Each of these intellectual revolutions served to abstract the European mentality ever further, to remove the wonderful complexity and spirituality from the universe and replace it with a logical sequence: one, two, three Answer! This is what has come to be termed efficiency in the European mind. Whatever is mechanical is perfect; whatever seems to work at the moment that is, proves the mechanical model to be the right one- is considered correct, even when it is clearly untrue. This is why truth changes so fast in the European mind; the answers which result from such a process are only stop-gaps, only temporary, and must be continuously discarded in favour of new stop-gaps which support the mechanical models and keep them (the models) alive.

Hegel and Marx were heirs to the thinking of Newton, Descartes, Locke and Smith. Hegel finished the process of secularising theology and that is put in his own terms he secularised the religious thinking through which Europe understood the universe. Then Marx put Hegel's philosophy in terms of materialism, which is to say that Marx despiritualised Hegel's work altogether. Again, this is in Marx own terms. And this is now seen as the future revolutionary potential of Europe. Europeans may see this as revolutionary, but American Indians see it simply as still more of that same old European conflict between being and gaining. The intellectual roots of new Marxist form of European imperialism lie in Marx and his followers links to the tradition of Newton, Hegel and the others.

Being is a spiritual proposition. Gaining is a material act. Traditionally American Indians have always attempted to be the best people they could. Part of that spiritual process was and is to give away wealth, to discard wealth in order not to gain. Material gain is an indicator of false status among traditional people, while it is proof that the system works to Europeans. Clearly, there are two completely opposing views at issue here, and Marxism is very far over to the other side from the American Indian view. But let's look at major implication of this; it is not merely an intellectual debate.

The European materialist tradition of despiritualising the universe is very similar to the mental process, which goes into dehumanising another person. And who seems most expert at dehumanising other people? And why? Soldiers who have seen a lot of combat learn to do this to the enemy before going back into combat. Murderers do it before going out to commit murder. Nazi SS guards did it to the workers they send into uranium mines and steel mills. Politicians do it to everyone in sight. And what the process has in common for each group doing the dehumanising is that it makes it all right to kill and otherwise destroy other people. One of the Christian commandments says, Thou shalt not kill, at least not humans, so the trick is to mentally convert the victims into non-humans. Then you can proclaim violation of your own commandment a virtue.

In terms of the despiritualisation of the universe, the mental process works so that it becomes virtuous to destroy the planet. Terms like progress and development are used as cover words here, the way victory and freedom are used to justify butchery in the dehumanisation process. For example, a real-

estate speculator may refer to developing a parcel of ground by opening a gravel quarry; development here means total, permanent destruction, with the earth itself removed. But European logic has gained a few tons of gravel with which more land can be developed through the construction of road beds. Ultimately, the whole universe is open in the European view to this sort of insanity. Most important here, perhaps, is the fact that Europeans feel no sense of loss in all this. After all, their philosophers have, despiritualised reality, so there is no satisfaction (for them) to be gained in simply observing the wonder of a mountain or a lake or a people in being. No, satisfaction is measured in terms of gaining material. So the mountain becomes gravel, and the lake becomes coolant for a factory, and the people are rounded up for processing through the indoctrination mills Europeans like to call schools.

But each new piece of that progress ups the ante out in the real world. Take fuel for the industrial machine as an example. Little more than two centuries ago, nearly everyone used wood a replenishable, natural item- as fuel for the very human needs of cooking and staying warm. Along came the industrial Revolution and coal became the dominant fuel, as production became the social imperative for Europe. Pollution began to become a problem in the cities, and the earth was ripped open to provide coal, whereas wood had always simply been gathered or harvested at no great expense to the environment. Later, oil became the major fuel, as the technology of production was perfected through a series of scientific revolutions. Pollution increased dramatically, and nobody yet knows what the environmental costs of pumping all that oil out of the ground will really be in the long run. Now there s an energy crisis, and uranium is becoming the dominant fuel.

Capitalists, at least, can be relied upon to develop uranium as fuel only at the rate at which they can show a good profit. That s their ethic, and may be that will buy some time. Marxists, on the other hand, can be relied upon to develop uranium fuel as rapidly as possible simply because it s the most efficient production fuel available. That s their ethic, and I fail to see where it s preferable. Like I said, Marxism is right smack in the middle of the European tradition. It s the same old song.

There s a rule of thumb, which can be applied here. You cannot judge the real nature of a European revolutionary doctrine on the basis of the changes it proposes to make within the European power structure and society. You can only judge it by the effects it will have on non-European peoples. This is because every revolution in European history has served to reinforce Europe s tendencies and abilities to export destruction to other peoples, other cultures and the environment itself. I defy anyone to point out an example where this is not true. So now we, as American Indian people are asked to believe that a new European revolutionary doctrine such a Marxism will reverse the negative effects of European history on us. European power relations are to be adjusted once again, and that s supposed to make things better for all of us. But what does this really mean?

Right now, today, we who live on the Pine Ridge Reservation are living in what white society has designated a National Sacrifice Area. What this means is that we have a lot of uranium deposits here, and white culture (not us) needs this uranium as energy production material. The cheapest, most efficient way for industry to extract and deal with the processing of this uranium is to dump the waste by-products right here at the digging sites. Right here where we live. This waste is radioactive and will make the entire region uninhabitable forever. This is considered by industry and by the white society that created this industry, to be an acceptable price to pay for energy resource development. Along with this they also plan to drain the water table under this part of South Dakota as part of the industrial process, so the region becomes doubly uninhabitable. The same sort of thing is happening down in the land of the Navjo and Hopi, up in the land of the Northern Cheyenne and Crow, and elsewhere. Thirty percent of the coal in the West and half of the uranium deposits in the U.S. have been found to lie under reservation land; so there is no way this can be called a minor issue. We are resisting being turned into a National Sacrifice Area. We are resisting being turned into national sacrifice people. The costs of this industrial process are not acceptable to us. It is genocide to dig uranium here and drain the water table no more, no less.

Now let s suppose that in ;our resistance to extermination we begin to seek allies (we have). Let s suppose further that we were to take revolutionary Marxism at its word that it intends nothing less than

the complete overthrow of the European capitalist order which has presented this threat to our very existence. This would seem to be a natural alliance for American Indian people to enter into. After all, as the Marxists say, it is the capitalists who set us up to be a national sacrifice. This is true as far as it goes. But, as I've tried to point out, this truth is very deceptive. Revolutionary Marxism is committed to even further perpetuation and perfection of the very industrial process, which is destroying us all. It offers only to redistribute the results the money, may be of this industrialisation to wider section of the population. It offers to take wealth from the capitalists and pass it around; but in order to do so, Marxism must maintain the industrial system. Once again, the power relations within European society will have to be altered, but once again the effects upon American Indian peoples here and non-Europeans elsewhere will remain the same. This is much the same as when power was redistributed from the church to private business during the so-called bourgeois revolution. European society changed a bit, at least superficially, but its conduct toward non-Europeans continued as before, you can see what the American Revolution of 1776 did for American Indians. It's the same old song.

Revolutionary Marxism, like industrial society in other forms, seeks to rationalise all people in relation to industry maximum industry, maximum production. It is a materialist doctrine that despises the American Indian spiritual tradition, our cultures, our life ways. Marx himself called us pre-capitalists and primitive. Pre-capitalist simply means that, in his view, we would eventually discover capitalism and become capitalists we have always been economically retarded in Marxist terms. The only manner in which American Indian people could participate in a Marxist revolution would be to join the industrial system, to become factory workers, or proletarians as Marx called them. The man was very clear about the fact that his revolution could occur only through the struggle of the proletariat, that the existence of a massive industrial system is a precondition of a successful Marxist society.

I think there's problem with language here. Christians, Capitalists, Marxists. All of them have been revolutionary in their own minds, but none of them really mean revolution. What they really means is a continuation. They do what they do in order that European culture can continue to exist and develop according to its needs. So, in order for us to really join forces with Marxism, we American Indians would have to accept the national sacrifice of our homeland; we would have to commit cultural suicide and become industrialised and Europeanised. At this point, I've got to stop and ask myself whether I'm being too harsh. Marxism has something of a history. Does this history bear out my observations? I look to the process of industrialisation in the Soviet Union since 1920 and I see that these Marxists have done what it took the English industrial Revolution 300 years to do; and the Marxists did it in 60 years. I see that the territory of the USSR used to contain a number of tribal peoples and that they have been crushed to make way for the factories. The Soviets refer to this as The National question, the question of whether the tribal peoples had the right to exist as peoples; and they decided the tribal peoples were an acceptable sacrifice to industrial needs. I look to China and I see the same thing I look to Vietnam and I see Marxists imposing an industrial order and r5ooting out the indigenous tribal mountain people.

I hear a leading. Soviet scientist saying that when uranium is exhausted, then alternatives will be found. I see the Vietnamese taking over a nuclear power plant abandoned by the U.S. military. Have they dismantled and destroyed it? No, they are using it. I see China exploding nuclear bombs, developing uranium reactors and preparing a space program in order to colonise and exploit the planets the same as the Europeans colonised and exploited this hemisphere. It's the same old song, but may be with a faster tempo this time.

The statement of the Soviet scientist is very interesting. Does he know what this alternative energy source will be? No, he simply has faith. Science will find a way. I hear revolutionary Marxists saying that the destruction of the environment, pollution and radiation will all be controlled. And I see them act upon their5 words. Do they know how these things will be controlled? No, they simply have faith. Science will find a way. Industrialisation is fine and necessary. How do they know this? Faith. Science will find a way. Faith of this sort has always been known in Europe as religion. Science has become the new European religion for both capitalists and Marxists; they are truly inseparable; they are part and parcel of the same culture. So, in both theory and practice, Marxism demands that non-European

peoples give up their values, their traditions, their cultural existence altogether. We will all be industrialised science addicts in Marxist society.

I do not believe that capitalism itself is really responsible for the situation in which American Indians have been declared a national sacrifice. No, it is the European tradition; European culture itself is responsible. Marxism is just the latest continuation of this tradition, not a solution to it. To ally with Marxism is to ally with the very same forces that declare us an acceptable cost.

There is another way. There is the traditional Lakota way and the ways of the other American Indian peoples. It is the way that knows that humans do not have the right to degrade Mother Earth, that there are forces beyond anything the European mind has conceived, that humans must be in harmony with all relations or the relations will eventually eliminate the disharmony. A lopsided emphasis on humans by humans- the Europeans arrogance of acting as though they were beyond the nature of all related things can only result in a total disharmony and a readjustment which cuts arrogant humans down to size, gives them a taste of that reality beyond their grasp or control and restores the harmony. There is no need for a revolutionary theory to bring this about; it s beyond human control. The nature peoples of this planet know this and so they do not theorise about it. Theory is an abstract; our knowledge is real.

Distilled to its basic terms, European faith-including the new faith in science equals a belief that man is God. Europe has always sought a Messiah, whether that be the man Jesus Christ or the man Karl Marx or the Man Albert Einstein. American Indian knows this to be totally absurd. Humans are the weakest of all creatures, so weak that other creatures are willing to give up their flesh that we may live. Humans are able to survive only through the exercise of rationality since they lack the abilities of other creatures to gain food through he use to fang and claw. But rationality is a curse since it can cause humans to forget the natural order of things in ways other creatures do not. A wolf never forgets his or her place in the natural order. American Indians can. Europeans almost always do. We pray our thanks to the deer, our relations, for allowing us their flesh to eat; Europeans simply take the flesh for granted and consider the deer inferior. After all, Europeans consider themselves Godlike in their rationalism and science. God is the Supreme Being; all else must be inferior.

All European tradition, Marxism included, has conspired to defy the natural order of all things. Mother Earth has been abused, the powers have been abused, and this cannot go on forever. No theory can alter that simple fact. Mother Earth will retaliate, the whole environment will retaliate, and the abusers will be eliminated. Things come full circle, back to where they started. That s revolution. And that s a prophecy of my people, of the Hopi people and of other correct peoples.

American Indians have been trying to explain this to Europeans for centuries. But, as I said earlier, Europeans have proven themselves unable to hear. The natural order will win out, and the offenders will die out, the way deer die when they offend the harmony by over populating a given region. It s only a matter of time until what Europeans call a major catastrophe of global proportions will occur. It is the role of American Indian peoples, the role to all natural beings, to survive. A part of our survival is to resist. We resist not to overthrow a government or to take political power, but because it is natural to resist extermination, to survive. We don t want power over white institutions: we want white institutions to disappear. That s revolution. American Indians are still in touch with these realities the prophecies, the traditions of our ancestors. We learn from the elders, from nature, from the powers. And when the catastrophe is over, we American Indian peoples will still be here to inhabit the hemisphere. I don t care it it s only a handful living high in the Andes. American Indian people will survive; harmony will be re-established. That s revolution.

At this point, perhaps I should be very clear about another matter, one which should already be clear as a result of what I ve said. But confusion breeds easily these days so I want to hammer home this point. When I use the term European, I m not referring to a skin colour or a particular genetic structure. What I m referring to is a mind-set, a world view that is a product of the development of European culture. People are not genetically⁷ encoded to hold this outlook; they are acculturated to hold it. The same is true for American Indians or for the members of any other culture. It is possible for an American Indian

to share European values, a European world view. We have a term for these people; we call them apples red on the outside (genetics) and white on the inside (their values). Other groups have similar terms: Blacks have their oreos ; Hispanos have coconut and so on. And, as I said before, there are exceptions to the white norm; people who are white on the outside, but not white inside. I m not sure what term should be applied to them other than human beings .

What I m putting out here is not a racial proposition but a cultural proposition. Those who ultimately advocate and defend the realities of European culture and its industrialism are my enemies. Those who resist it, who struggle against it, are my allies, the allies of American Indian people. And I don t give a damn what their skin colour happens to be. Caucasian is the white term for the white race, European is an outlook I oppose. The Vietnamese Communists are not exactly what you might consider genetic Caucasians, but they are now functioning as mental Europeans. The same hold s true for Chinese Communists, for Japanese capitalists or Bantu Catholics. There is no racism involved in this, just an acknowledgement of the mind and spirit that make up culture.

In Marxist terms I suppose I m a cultural nationalist . I work first with my people, the traditional Lakota people, because we hold a common world view and share an immediate struggle. Beyond this, I work with other traditional American Indian peoples, again because of a certain commonalty in world view and form of struggle. Beyond that, I work with anyone who has experienced the colonial oppression of Europe and who resists its cultural and industrial totality. Obviously, this includes genetic Caucasians who struggle to resist the dominant norms of European culture. The Irish and the Basques come immediately to mind, but there are many others.

I work primarily with my own people, with my own community. Other people who hold non-European perspectives should do the same. I believe in the slogan, Trust your brother s vision , although I d like to add sisters into the bargain. I trust the community and the culturally based vision of all the races that naturally resist industrialisation and human extinction. Clearly, individual whites can share in this, given only that they have reached the awareness that continuation of the industrial imperatives of Europe is not a vision, but species suicide. White is one of the sacred colours of the Lakota people red, yellow, white and black. Four directions. The four seasons. The four periods of life and aging. The four races of humanity. Mix red, yellow, white and black together and you get brown, the colour of the fifth race. This is a natural ordering of things. It therefore seems natural to me to work with all races, each with its own special meaning, identity and message.

But there is a peculiar behaviour among most Caucasians. As soon as I become critical of Europe and its impact on other cultures, they become defensive. They begin to defend themselves. But I m not attacking them personally; I m attacking Europe, Impersonalising my observations on Europe they are personalising European culture, identifying themselves with it. By defending themselves in this context, they are ultimately defending the death culture. This is a confusion which must be overcome, and it must be over come in a hurry. None of us have energy to waste in such false struggles. Caucasians have a more positive vision to offer humanity than Europe culture. I believe this. But in order to attain this vision it is necessary for Caucasians to step outside European culture- alongside the rest of humanity to see Europe for what it is and what it does. To cling to capitalism and Marxism and all the other isms is simply to remain within European culture. There is no avoiding this basic fact. As a fact, this constitute a choice. Understand that the choice is based on culture, not race. Understand that to choose European culture and industrialism is to choose to be my enemy. And understand that the choice is yours, not mine.

This leads me back to address those American Indians who are drifting through the universities, the city slums and other European institutions. If you are there to learn to resist the oppressor in accordance with your traditional ways, so be it. I don t know how you manage to combine the two, but perhaps you will succeed. But retain your sense of reality. Beware of coming to believe the white world now offers solutions to the problems it confronts us with. Beware, too, of allowing the words of native people to be twisted to the advantage of our enemies. Europe invented the practice of turning words around on themselves. You need only look to the treaties between American Indian peoples and various European

This article from PPST Bulletin is made available on-line by Samanvaya (www.samanvaya.com). All the rights of the article rest with the authors and any enquiries and clarifications may be directed to them. These are made available in an as-is basis, please report any mistakes to knowledge@samanvaya.com.

governments to know that this is true. Draw your strength from who you are. A culture which regularly confuse revolution with continuation, which confuses science and religion, which confuses revolt with resistance, has nothing helpful to teach you and nothing to offer you as a way of life. Europeans have long since lost all touch with reality, if every they wee in touch with it. Feel sorry for them if you need to, but be comfortable with who you are as American Indians.

So, I suppose to conclude this, I should state clearly that leading anyone toward Marxism is the last thing on my mind. Marxism is as alien to my culture as capitalism and Christianity are. In fact, I can say I don t think I m trying to lead anyone toward anything. To some extent I tried to be a leader , in the sense that the white media like to use that term, when the American Indian Movement was a young organisation. This was a result of a confusion I no longer have. You cannot be everything to everyone. I do not propose to be used in such a fashion by my enemies; I am not a leader. I am an Oglala Lakota patriot. That is all I want and all I need to be. And I am very comfortable with who I am.

Russell Means