

# Journal of American Indian Education

Volume 39 Number 2  
Winter 2000  
Special Issue 3

## **THE NEW ASSIMILATION MOVEMENT: STANDARDS, TESTS, AND ANGLO-AMERICAN SUPREMACY**

Jack D. Forbes

### **The Movement to Collectivize Education**

This past decade has witnessed a growing interest, on the part of Anglo-Americans especially, in promoting English-language and Anglo-European perspectives, in spite of strong pressures in the direction of multiculturalism, globalism, and interethnic understanding and reconciliation. In fact, one can clearly see a very strong xenophobic movement that is very reminiscent of the assimilationist hysteria of the early part of the twentieth century and, for Native Americans, virtually the whole of the nineteenth century as well.

Part of this reaction against multiculturalism and bilingualism is reflected in the rapid push for so-called “standards” in the schools, a push that has seen statewide “standards” adopted in all but one state (Iowa). In fact, these “standards” are actually “national” in character because they seem to be designed by people with an Anglo-American bias but also because of the influence of the national testing and textbook industries and the desire of politicians to compare scores nationally. In any case, there is reason to believe that the push for “standards” is actually an attempt to destroy

multiculturalism, pluralism, and non-Anglo ethnic-specific curriculum by forcing all public schools to adhere to a curriculum approved by centralized agencies controlled by white people. The standards are to be enforced by means of constant testing of students (and often of teachers) based solely on the centrally approved curriculum.

As Barbara Miner notes:

Across the country, students, teachers, and schools are being rewarded or punished based on standardized test scores. Whether you are smart, stupid, lazy, or hardworking is being reduced to how fast and how accurately you can darken the circles on a multiple-choice test.<sup>2</sup>

What standardized tests surely do is to force upon states, localities, and regions a collectivist “testing culture” that negates the unique heritages, dialects, and values of a particular area. Native nations and the schools serving their pupils will most likely become as assimilationistic as the pre-1928 BIA boarding and mission schools.<sup>3</sup>

Uniform testing is a form of collectivization, creating “lock-step” training whether done at the state or national levels. For example, the rich regional heritage of northwest California based on salmon, redwoods, seafood, and unique Native American cultures will not be adequately represented in statewide or national-norm tests, which must also serve pupils from totally different eco-historical situations.

This facet of standardized testing has hardly been debated at all. It is ironic that Republicans (supposed advocates of state's rights these days) and centrist (conservative) Democrats are both promoting a collectivized approach to education, which, in fact, involves a process of nationalization. This is inherent in the manner in which California's new 1998 standards were prepared (by east coast consultants, based upon east coast standards or, as I was informed, those of Massachusetts and Virginia) but it involves more than that. It involves, in essence, the preparation of nationalized

tests geared towards nationalized textbooks and curricula. This nationalization process is inherently unfair to many racial and ethnic populations, whose representation in the country is uneven or undervalued in certain regions. It is doubly unfair to First Americans who wish to rebuild their heritages and languages.

Needless to state, however, it is in the interests of corporate producers of educational texts, materials, and tests to push for uniform national standards and content, at the expense, of course, of regional perspectives or controversial topics. As noted elsewhere, this undoubtedly ties in with the corporate push for increased computer-usage in schools and homes. All together, this is a multi-billion dollar project, supported by politicians receiving corporate donations.

During the 2000 presidential campaign Vice President Al Gore offered a \$16 billion plan to increase teacher pay, but at the price of closely linking educators' compensation with the test performance of their students. Such tests would, of course, have to be the same in Mississippi as in Hawaii or Alaska, states with vastly different cultural traditions and social values. Moreover, Gore proposed that all new teachers would have to pass "assessment tests, including tests of their subject matter knowledge." Again, this would mean that new teachers in Alabama and Arizona would be tested on the same nationalized subject matter. Gore's opponent, George W. Bush, also proposed to punish schools financially based upon "results." His slogan of "accountability" also would require nationalization, although Bush adopted a confusing position on requiring a "national test."<sup>4</sup>

California and other western states will suffer more than most states from nationalization because the east coast is typified by a long tradition of upper-class elitism and white dominance modified by an awareness of African-Americans being

present as an “issue.” Thus one finds that east coast people tend to be often obsessed by Black-white relations while being supremely ignorant of the Puerto Ricans, Native Americans, and other groups in their region. This characteristic: white hegemony challenged by Blacks as the “Other” bodes ill for all other ethnic groups. Tests, standards, and texts written by east coasters are apt to be completely unsuitable for use in California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, Alaska, Washington, Hawaii, and other western/southwestern states.

Moreover, any standards or tests that propose to include the deep southern states may well censor out any meaningful treatment of non-white perspectives, of racial mixture, of sexuality and gender issues, and other topics unpopular with fundamentalist Christian and racially conservative persons.

And this is precisely what one finds when one looks at the new California standards: a completely unsuitable ignoring of Asian Americans, Mexican-Americans, and other groups of great importance in the western United States. Tests based upon such distorted standards can only be grotesquely inappropriate for our youth.

In order to illustrate the dangers inherent in the collectivist movement, I wish to use California as an example. California is the most populous state in the USA and doubtless has the greatest number of Indigenous American pupils, including American Indians from Canada, Mexico, Central, and South America as well as from the United States. Probably well over half of the state's pupils now possess some degree of American racial ancestry (pre-Columbian American) and no single nationality has a majority (although persons of Mexican ancestry will soon be an absolute majority by themselves). One would expect that California would be seeking to include significant

multiethnic material in its curriculum standards, but such is far from the case, as we shall see.

In fall 1998 the Republican-controlled California State Board of Education adopted new standards for K-12 curriculum in social science, history and geography. I will argue that these standards are a disgrace to us as educators entering the new millennium, a time we might associate with progress and enlightenment. Rather, they represent, by and large, the prejudiced thinking of a half-century ago. They make little or no use of the wonderful scholarship of recent decades, especially the scholarship of women and non-whites. Anglo-American and other Caucasian males are generally given preferential treatment. Non-whites and women are discriminated against, along with several European nationalities that have contributed to the building of California, such as people of Armenian, Italian, Jewish, and Irish origin. The standards are illegal in my opinion, failing the tests of both Article I (7b) and I (31a) of the California Constitution. Moreover, it seems highly likely that the standards are in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, in that “equal protection” is clearly being denied to women and non-Anglo-American groups.

Article I, Section 31's strongly worded prohibitions against discrimination and preferential treatment on the basis of race, color, sex, ethnicity and national origin apply specifically to all levels of public education. In California's public education system (including private schools receiving any public funds) the history books and teaching units must logically now become absolutely plural in their treatment of Whites, African-Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, et cetera. No longer can the textbooks and units be basically a history of Anglo-Americans with a few pages inserted and with a paragraph or two on the First Americans, African-Americans, or other non-white

groups. I will argue that the history of the United States and of California must begin with the Ancient Americans of 30,000 years ago and move forward following all pertinent ethnic threads.

Similarly, the history of women (of all races) must be given equal treatment with that of males. No longer can texts be revised merely by inserting the picture or the name of a woman every few pages! To give equal status to the history of women (as is required now by law) means, of course, that our entire approach to history must be altered, must be shifted largely from the story of male politics and wars, to the story of society-building and cultural evolution. In the same way, courses in literature, reading, art, dramatic arts, economics, government, social studies, music, and so on must all be thoroughly revised so that no one ethnicity, race, color, national origin, or sex receives preferential treatment. This will mean a drastic reduction in the amount of attention focused upon Anglo-American (male) subjects and a radical increase in the focus upon other groups and upon women. Federal civil rights law and the Fourteenth Amendment support the above argument for a multi-ethnic and bi-gender approach to curricula. However, the California Constitution is so absolutely clear and unambiguous on this issue that it is shocking to find that a single ethnic group and the male gender continue to receive overwhelmingly favorable and dominant attention.

I will suggest that the ethnic and cultural composition of the California population should be directly related to the kind of curricula the schools should offer, since virtually all modern education theory would argue that curricula must be relevant and supportive of the values, culture, and history of the students for whom it is intended. Conversely, curricula that are not relevant to the backgrounds of the students are likely to lead to

alienation, boredom, anger, rejection, and anti-social behavior, and specifically to high “push-out” rates for the most vulnerable groups.

Unfortunately, the standards cannot, in fact, deal with the true history and contributions of the ancestors of our California students because of fundamental flaws in the design of the curriculum, which in turn is warped by a fixation with Anglo-Americans only, making other peoples insignificant in the American story. Nonetheless, the great changes in the racial and ethnic character of California must require a corresponding change in the way we teach history and social science. If we are to make education meaningful for the huge numbers of youth of American race, of African race, of Asian background, of mixed and other ancestries we must make our curriculum California-centered, Americas-centered, Pacific-centered, and world-centered. The old patterns of male-focused, European-focused, East Coast-focused, Atlantic-centered curricula must be replaced. If we do not, we can expect additional generations of troubled youth and gangs, contributing to social chaos and growing prison populations. I would aver that an irrelevant education is, in many ways, an education for gangs and alienation, since an education that ignores youngsters deprives them of the knowledge of who they are, what their ancestors have achieved, and what they can become.

The new California standards in history and social science, as well as those in English, can be seen as part of the “culture war” launched by conservative white males (and some women) against the inclusion of non-Anglo and female subjects, interpretations, viewpoints, authors, artists, musicians, et cetera, in the curricula of colleges and in some of the texts, films, and other media used in museum exhibits, educational television, and classrooms at all levels. The inclusion of non-European discourses, materials, and persons in the broader public life has led to a vigorous

counterattack to defend the “western canon,” to defend the white race, and/or to preserve “our traditional values.” Persons as apparently diverse as Arthur Schlessinger and David Duke have reacted very negatively to a multicultural society; and, in California, the attacks upon immigrants, bilingualism, and affirmative action can all be interpreted as part of the same desperate effort of some white Anglo-Americans to retain a hegemonic position in relation to public space. They may sometimes, unfortunately, be joined by some African-Unitedstatesians and even Spanish-surnamed persons who have embraced essentially an Anglo-American monolingual culture and who fear the numerical strength of Mexican, other Latin American, and Asian-origin populations (who are the majority now in the state, or at least a plurality, but not among voters yet).

In other words, the adoption of a distorted curriculum heavily favoring white males of U.S. origin is not simply a result of chance or of a historical legacy moving forward by its sheer momentum. Instead, it is a conscious effort to make sure that the Indigenous American, Latin American, Asian, and African-Caribbean-South American cultures and languages do not ever replace the dominant cultural position enjoyed since the 1850s-1880s by European-American culture of the Anglo variety and the Middle Western dialect of the English language.

A recent broadside attacking Oneida people in New York referred to “Americans and Indians,” thus denying that the Original Americans are, in fact, Americans. We find the same thing in numerous brochures and texts produced in relation to California, where it will commonly state that the “Americans first settled here in 1848 . . .” or similar words, thus denying that California was part of America before 1848 and that the Native Californians were Americans from the time when this hemisphere came to be called

America (by the early 1500s). This “tug of war” over the name “America” is at the heart of a struggle over whether or not the United States is a “white man's country” belonging especially to Anglo-Americans, or whether the United States is a land which, as a geographical region, has been evolving for millions of years with First Americans being here for 30,000 or more of those years; and with Africans, Spaniards, French people, people from Mexico, Asians, and others having been here for more years, or as many years, as any persons of British origin.

In the early nineteenth-century the so-called “Native American” Party (also known as the “Know-nothing” Party) developed to foster an anti-Irish and anti-Catholic policy based upon the notion that the USA belonged to white Protestants who spoke English. This concept of “WASP” supremacy was revived in the early part of the twentieth-century, as WASP dominance seemed threatened by Slavs, Jews, Italians, Greeks, and more Irish, as well as by the increasing northern presence of African-Americans. On the west coast, anti-Asian and anti-Mexican sentiment was felt off and on from the 1849 period through World War II.

Some Anglo-Americans felt obliged to wage “culture wars” against all of these non-Anglo populations, including, ironically, the First Americans, seeking to replace their languages, customs, and religions with Anglo practices. The Original Americans were, of course, the most heavily affected because Anglo officials and churches could completely dominate the schools established for Native American children. But other ethnic groups also came under severe pressure to forget their heritages and languages. The USA became a place where being able to speak a second language was not a virtue, but a sign of cultural inferiority or subversion.

I will argue that we currently face a similar effort by Anglo-Americans, now often joined by other European-Americans, to make sure that Anglo-American values, languages, and culture remain supreme even in the face of a non-white majority (in California) or near majorities (in most of the Southwest and many other regions). This desire to retain a hegemonic position is based not alone on fears that one might have to learn a little Spanish or Mandarin, but also on the concrete fact that culture means jobs. That is, as long as Anglo-Americans can retain control over educational content (courses offered et cetera), they can insure that white people will continue to dominate academic positions in colleges and universities. As long as we can all be convinced that white male authors should be studied in preference to female and non-white authors, then, of course, we guarantee the economic well-being of white male authors and, to some degree, teachers.

One could go into other examples, but here I merely wish to show that the struggle between mono-culturalism and multi-culturalism is often a struggle over jobs and economics as well as over culture per se.

### **The California Standards and the Theft of America**

The 1998 California standards possess a fundamental legal flaw, which cannot be corrected by changing a word here or there or adding a few additional lines. The structure itself is illegal because it is based upon ethnocentric, racist, and chauvinistic definitions of “America,” “Americans,” and the United States of America.

Standards that display ignorance can be condemned from a pedagogical perspective but when ignorance is combined with the falsification of major concepts in order to give preferential treatment to a particular ethnic and racial group, those of

Anglo-American Caucasians, then the standards are facially illegal, in my judgment. The preparers of the proposed standards use the term “America” to refer solely to the political territory occupied by Anglo-Americans who joined the rebellion against Britain (or their European-derived predecessors), even excluding there from those Anglo-Americans who remained loyal to Britain and who remained part of British America (later Canada, Bermuda, Barbados, etc.). “America” is an elastic concept in the proposed standards, an area that expands as Anglo-Americans expand their political area of dominance.

This misuse of the term “America,” which defies five centuries of geographical usage, is designed, I will argue, to allow the preparers to concentrate almost exclusive attention upon the adventures and accomplishments of a particular ethnic group and race. By identifying “America” solely with non-British Anglo-American areas of control they have been able to ignore virtually the entire history of North America prior to English settlement as well as such regions as Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Hawaii, Alaska, Samoa, Guam, and, in fact, most sections of the United States area when the latter were possessed primarily by First Americans, people of mixed races, or colonists from non-Anglo-American areas.

This racist and ahistorical use of the term “America” also allows the preparers to limit the very potent word “American” primarily to Anglo-Americans or to those other groups which have been incorporated with Anglo-Americans (even if of actual European birth). The terms “America” and “American” are extremely powerful, evocative and emotional terms. When an ethnic group is inaccurately given the exclusive use of these names, it gives them a privilege and preferential treatment of inestimable value. It also denigrates,

insults, alienates, and disadvantages those Americans who are denied the right to be known by the name of our continent and our hemisphere.

I have written several articles about the early use of the name “America,” which was first applied either to the Venezuela or Nicaragua areas.<sup>5</sup> Here let me simply cite two scholars, first Charles Maclaren, fellow of the Royal Society, Edinburgh, Scotland, who wrote a long British encyclopedia article on “America” in 1875 (which was reprinted in a U.S. encyclopedia as late as 1909, without change). Maclaren's America consists in the entire “American continent” including both North and South America. He includes a “Sketch Map of America” which shows our entire hemisphere. He writes:

The indigenous population of America presents man under many aspects . . . from . . . Mexico and Peru, to savage life. . . . The American race is distinguished by the form of the skull. . . . The color of the Americans . . . is more uniform than that of the inhabitants of Asia and Africa. . . . Of all the groups of American languages, the various dialects of the Algonquin stock furnish the most inviting field for the philologist.

A second scholar is Daniel G. Brinton who wrote his book *The American Race in 1891*. He writes:

The American race was that which was found occupying the whole of the New World when it first became revealed to Europeans. Its members are popularly known as “Indians,” or “American Indians,” because Columbus thought that the western islands . . . were part of India. . . . To the ethnographer, however, they are the only “Americans,” and their race is the “American Race.”<sup>6</sup>

Many other examples could be cited, but it should be crystal clear that the name “America” belongs to the entire continent and that people of indigenous American ancestry, such as Mexicans, have every right to be seen as and to be treated as “Americans.” Anglo-Americans do not have an exclusive right to the term any more than the Dutch have an exclusive right to the name of Europe. Moreover, the countries organized together as the European Community do not have an exclusive right to the

name of Europe since many Europeans are still outside of that political unit. In the same manner, the United States is “of America” but not all of America, as the name of the Organization of American States should tell us loud and clear.

Of course, we all know that Anglo-Americans have developed the habit of referring to themselves as Americans, a habit, which began innocently enough when they used the term in much the same way that someone in France might say “I am European.” But it becomes an ethnic weapon when other people who have equal (or better) claim upon the name are excluded from its embrace.

Popular or vulgar usage aside, one must expect the highest standards of impeccable scholarship and language usage in the preparation of curricula, since it has a powerful impact upon the sensitive and formative minds of children. Therefore, one cannot be casual about the use of “America” and “American.”

*Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary* defines the noun “American” as: “1: an Indian of No. America or So. America, 2: a native or inhabitant of No. America or So. America, 3: a citizen of the United States.” Let us examine how the preparers of the proposed standards use “American.”

The preparers make it very clear, on page 1 of their overview, which they intend to use “America” in a racist and ethnically biased manner. They state:

The standards proceed chronologically and call attention to the story of America as a noble experiment in constitutional democracy. They recognize that America's on-going struggle to realize the ideals of the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution. . . . While emphasizing Western civilizations as the source of American political institutions, laws, and ideology . . . .

The above statements show beyond any reasonable doubt that the preparers have defined “America” in an ethnically exclusivist manner so as to consist solely in the

political unit established by white Anglo-Americans who have rebelled against Great Britain, thus excluding any part of America existing beyond the boundaries of that political unit including areas belonging to independent American tribes or nations. Moreover, the preparers have chosen to openly assert that “western” civilizations (in practice, mostly England) are to be emphasized “as the source” of “American political institutions, laws, and ideology.”

This assertion (which negates all Native American influences on democracy, the love of nature, and ecological-mindedness, for example) makes it absolutely clear that the preparers believed that the political institutions, laws and ideology of First Americans are not “American” and certainly denies any non-European influences on United States institutions, law, and ideology, a rather contentious, partisan, and doubtful position.

The long struggles of African-Americans, for example, are precluded from being a source for any “American” institutions, law and ideology, and indeed the text of the standards is remarkable for ignoring the numerous Black rebellions, the significance of the Haitian War for Independence, and the influence of Black thinkers on the law of freedom and bondage.

The well-documented influence of the Iroquois confederacy on the United States Constitution is totally ignored, as are any Native American philosophical influences on European thinkers during the Enlightenment. Mexican and Spanish legal influences in the Southwest, and French influences in Louisiana, are ignored, as is any discussion of the Mexican Constitution of 1824 that set a standard for racial equality in the early nineteenth-century.

But what is especially significant is the absolute identification of “America” with Anglo-American (non-British) territory and “American” with the Anglo-American ethnic

group. Thus by this reasoning California was not part of America before 1848-50. In other words, the preparers take California out of the American continent and place it in a geographical no name land until soldiers and immigrants from the United States occupy it. The latter movement is referred to in the standards (p. 13) as “rapid American immigration” after 1850, thus denying American status to Native Californians and Mexican Californians even after Anglo-American conquest. (In many places in the proposed standards the term “American” is used in an ethnically exclusivist manner. For example, in Grade 1 “American ideals” and “American symbols” are referred to and in each case the examples are all connected primarily with the Anglo-American heritage. The opportunity existed to include Original American or Mexican-American examples, but that was not done.)

“America” and the United States are both used as ethnocentric, racist conceptions so as to exclude the actual in-depth history of our continent and our country. By ignoring our country's history, the history of our land, the preparers have sought to deal almost exclusively with the history of only the Anglo-American group and not with all the peoples who make up our country today.

In short, only white people who speak English count in these proposed standards and geographic sections of our land become worthy of study only after they pass under Anglo-American rule. This is a one-sided and ethnically biased way of teaching, one sure to tell non-white youth that they do not belong!<sup>7</sup>

The claim that the standards “proceed chronologically” is surprising in view of the fact that there is absolutely no historical coverage, chronological or topical, of the history of northern America from 30,000 or 40,000 BP to the recent period (depending on the area). When one ignores 30/40,000 years of chronology what does the term

*chronologically* mean? The treatment of California history in Grade 4, for example, is totally non-chronological prior to Spanish contact and remains basically thus until U.S. occupation. Likewise, the treatment in Grade 7 of ancient Meso-America and Peru are both essentially non-chronological. In conclusion, the fundamental flaw in the proposed standards is that they openly espouse an ethnically biased view of United States development. I argue that the preparers have the intent of providing preferential treatment to white Anglo-Americans by structuring the standards in such a manner as to focus exclusively on areas controlled by Anglo-Americans when United States history is being dealt with, by arbitrarily depriving Native Americans of a knowledge of their American heritage and contributions, by depriving all students of a knowledge of the great cultures and civilizations developed in North America before 1500, by refusing to deal seriously and chronologically with African-American, Asian-American, Pacific-American, and Meso-American history and contributions, and by using the term *American* in an exclusivist, biased, and inaccurate manner. Moreover, the proposed standards are also structured so as to provide preferential treatment to male figures and activities and to denigrate or ignore female figures and activities.

The proposed standards also have a strongly anti-Americas bias. The evolution of American civilizations from the great Louisiana mounds of 4,000-5,000 years ago, to the development of the world's largest cities in Peru and Mexico, to the fantastic urban centers of Cahokia in Illinois and Moundville in Alabama, to the intensely democratic and often matri-focused federations of the Hodenasaunee (Iroquois), Leni Lenápe (Delaware), and Muskogee (Creek), to the many rich artistic and architectural traditions of the Adena-Hopewell, Mochica, Chimu, and Totonaca, one finds a big glaring hole.

The tapestry of American history and political-social evolution is reduced to a few short units of study, all in the early grades.

As incredible as it may seem, the section in the standards dealing with the pre-500 CE period contains nothing about American origins; students are led to believe that all civilization commenced on other continents. Yet in my study of "The Urban Tradition Among Native Americans" I note that "the evidence seems to indicate that from about 1600-1700 BC until the 1519-1520 CE period the largest cities in the world were often located in the Americas."<sup>8</sup> The domestication of crops in Mexico now extends back to almost 10,000 years ago, and, of course, these crops are among the most important in the world, including maize, potatoes, sweet potatoes, squashes, beans, and tomatoes, among many others.

Very large cities began to appear as early as 2,000-1,600 BC along the coast of Peru at Aspero and Las Haldas. The latter may have been one of the largest cities for its time in the world. Subsequent great urban areas included many Olmec sites in Mexico, Kaminaljuyu in Guatemala, Mitla and Monte Alban in Oaxaca, Tikal in Guatemala, Tiahuanaco near Lake Titicaca, Huari farther north in Peru, and the great center of Teotihuacan in central Mexico, all flourishing before 500 CE. Teotihuacan was a contemporary of Rome and was probably the greatest urban center in the world, with seven square miles of ceremonial/educational areas and a vast population. That perhaps the greatest urban centers of the pre-500 CE period could be left out of the standards, centers which often directly influenced developments in our country, is astounding indeed! But we must also sadly note that many great cities and cultures of the post-500 CE era are also left out, including Chan Chan in Peru, Snaketown in Arizona, Yellowjacket in Colorado, and Tula and El Tajin in Mexico.

The proposed standards fundamentally neglect the 20,000 or 30,000 years of American history in favor of a few “snapshots” inserted without any understanding that over half of our pupils possess American racial ancestry (including, incidentally, a high percentage of African-American youth) and that they need in-depth exposure to the greatness of the indigenous American mind and to the wonderful intellectual, architectural, artistic, mathematical, scientific, and social accomplishments of the Original Americans.

“Aztecs are us” might be a good slogan to keep in mind. For the majority of our pupils have, or will soon have, some degree of Nahua ancestry in California. But “Aztecs are us” is best seen as a symbol that we must stop thinking of ourselves primarily as Europeans. Native American civilizations and historical experiences receive a total of 5.5 inches in the standards with virtually all of that in grades 3 to 7. First Americans simply do not exist in the high school curricula except that there is a brief mention of tribes in grade 12. The standards commission is clearly telling Native children to drop out after grade 7!

The neglect of American Indian subject matter must be seen within the context in which most Native children and their communities live. Indigenous children are generally not like European immigrant children who have experienced no racial denigration or denial of their right to be themselves. On the contrary, First Nations youth are the product of years of racist treatment and the victims of long-term propaganda directed against Native Americans and specifically against Native Californians.<sup>9</sup> Many Anglo-American writers have characterized the latter in truly horrible language; the negative stereotypes developed in the nineteenth-century have been perpetuated up to the present-day, especially in rural areas where Natives live side-by-side with the

descendants of those who attempted genocide in earlier years. The situation is made worse by the horrendous manner in which white academics have collected native skulls and body parts, even going so far as to rob graves, murder scouts of the US Army, boil down the bodies of Inuits to get their skeletons for study, and sending Ishi's brains to the Smithsonian Institution (only recently returned for burial). This pattern of treatment, reserved almost exclusively for First Americans, serves to reinforce the notion that the latter are not quite like other human beings, but are rather like animals whose destiny is to serve "science" or the sporting public as often caricatured mascots. The State of California, from the Constitutional Convention of 1850 onward, has actively discriminated against Native Americans, and while the newfound wealth of some casino-owning tribes may gradually change perceptions, the majority of First Americans in the state do not participate in gambling income.

Mexican-Americans of Indian race have also suffered from a century and a half of anti-Mexican propaganda, as well as sharing in negative images of all brown First Americans. Alternately pictured as "treacherous greasers" or slumbering "Gordos," Mexicanos have been warmly welcomed as laborers in the fields and sweatshops, but relegated to the edges of town or to temporary worker's huts, and resented in times of economic depression or when their numbers are seen as threatening Anglo dominance. More recently, persons of Mexican origin have risen to prominent positions in the legislature, but they are usually denominated as "Latinos" instead of Mexican-Americans or Chicanos. Is there significance in the avoidance of the term "Mexicano" or its derivatives? The schools of California seem to avoid teaching about the Mexicano presence in the state long before Anglo immigration, or about the ancient tradition of

Aztlán (which, according to early maps, was located in Utah or the Southwest, and is labeled on them as the homeland of the Azteca-Mexicanos).<sup>10</sup>

Ironically, Chicanos (and other persons of American Indian ancestry) are often taken for “illegals” or recent immigrants today, and are often harassed by the Border Patrol and the Immigration and Naturalization Service because their very appearance suggests a “foreigner” or a “suspect” in a manner very comparable to the police harassment of African-Americans. The propaganda against Indigenous Americans also includes offensive motion pictures with ugly caricatures of Aztec or Meso-American religion and culture, shown recently both on television and in theatres, as well as pseudo-scientific videos shown on public television stations. These motion pictures feature white archaeologists revealing “facts” about Native cultures of Peru, Guatemala, or Mexico while indigenous scholars are not given the opportunity to speak, thus giving the appearance of “backward folk societies” which still must have white people as their interpreters. Often such video productions present theories of baby sacrifice in Chiapas, mountain-top sacrifice in the Andes, warlike Maya city-states, or other negative concepts without any chance for refutation. These negative images are furthered by certain North American archaeologists who continue the tradition of attempting to portray First Americans in a negative light (as cannibals, for example), or, as in the recent case of Kennewick Man, attempting to create the impression that some non-Native was present in the Northwest some 9,000 years ago (ignoring the fact that Kennewick Man, if he had descendants, would be the Native American's ancestor and no one else's forefather !).

## **Anglo Ethno-Religious Myth Still Dominant**

Tragically, much of our school practice can be traced back to New England and the east coast, where a stratified society emerged with a distinct emphasis upon the Puritan-Calvinistic tradition of male domination, economic aggressiveness, competition, a belief in the virtue of having wealth (reflecting divine favor or approval), hostility to differences, cultural arrogance, and belief in a special, divinely-inspired destiny for white Anglo-Americans. The latter myth of “manifest destiny” has not disappeared, nor has the idea that “divine providence” favors the Anglo conquest of the country and even (for some) domination of the globe (and now, outer space). Such beliefs have now become secularized (outside of the “Bible Belt”), but they still form a core element in the epic ethnic myth of the Anglo-American people, as internalized by large numbers of persons. More importantly for this analysis, they form the substance of Anglo-oriented school culture and curricula.

As I have pointed out earlier, the view of “America” as a floating, westward-expanding territory identical with the area controlled by Anglo-Unitedstatesians is a racialized, politicized redefinition of the concept of our hemisphere, distorted to benefit the Anglo-American's sense of national destiny. It is, in essence, a secular masking of the old myth of Anglo manifest destiny as a people chosen by God. Thus a religious and ethnocentric doctrine has been revised in a secular mode, even though its basic Protestant character lies scarcely below the surface (and for many, it is still a basic tenet of Anglo-American Protestant belief).<sup>11</sup>

The 1998 standards of the State Board of Education embody explicitly the Puritan vision of divinely ordained imperialism moving from east to west. But the history-social science curriculum and the culture of the schools (generally) go far beyond that, in that

they are dominated by an often aggressive, competitive culture which, far from being universal, is part of a male tradition which has done tremendous harm to the earth, to less aggressive species, to women, and to pupils from different ethical traditions.<sup>12</sup>

But the California standards not only suffer from racial and ethnic blindness. They seem to also downgrade the historical experiences of the vast majority of Europeans and European-Americans who belong basically to the peasant-small farmer tradition, to the working class, or to the classes of artisans, small-shopkeepers, and so on. The focus on historical standards is on the kings, princes, elites, wealthy planters, presidents, and other well-known persons who are almost inevitably male and privileged. The standards would have us believe that the struggles of the peasants, factory workers, miners, and other common folk played small roles in the evolution of “democracy.” Instead, credit is usually extended to a document such as the “magna carta” or some elite empowerment such as the “Glorious Revolution.” Considerable space in several grade levels is devoted to the supposed evolution of democracy, individualism and freedom, but the focus is on the wealthy elites, and always on white people, preferably English. The well-documented influence of Native American democratic practice upon European thinkers such as Voltaire and Rousseau is ignored, as are the countless daily examples provided by Native People's contacts with their colonial neighbors. The specific contributions of the Great Binding Law of the Iroquois, superbly documented in the writings of Professor Donald Grinde (as well as by Benjamin Franklin) are left aside unmentioned.

In all fairness, it must be said that many sections of the standards appear, at first glance, to be ethnically, racially, class, and gender neutral; and, of course, a great deal might well depend upon how a given teacher or local school district might interpret a

particular section. On the other hand, California teachers are not tested for their competence in Native American, Black, or Chicano history, for example, nor are they required to take courses in women's history or women's economics. Thus the apparently neutral sections are not likely to be interpreted in culturally diverse fashion.

Moreover, many of the apparently neutral sections are not really neutral at all. In grade 12, for example (at 12.1), students are supposed to deal with the fundamental principles “and moral values” of “American” democracy. However, every subsection reflects only white European male ideas either explicitly or because no references to Native American, female, or non-European influences are included.

The standards are ideologically and class biased. Tragically, the sections of the standards that could be used to excite non-white and working-class students are designed instead to directly turn them off because they are so blatantly false or so obviously attempting to sell a particular ideology. The economics sections in grade 12 are not only boring, I would aver, but they are also anything but multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, and objective. For example, at 2 under 12.3, students are asked to “explain economic rights (e.g., right to acquire, use, transfer, and dispose of property; right to choose one's work, join labor unions, copyright, and patent), how they are secured, and their importance.” One can immediately think of a thousand ways in which poorer persons and non-whites have been systematically denied such “rights” and in which such “rights” do not exist at all. On the other hand, I am also concerned about such things as the creation of the “right” to “patent” since we are faced with huge corporations and avaricious scientists now attempting to “patent” genetic characteristics that they never created; or to “patent” traditional Native American herbs, medicines, and biophysical formulas and materials; or to gain control over the world's plant genetic

materials; or to copyright the works of creators who are forced by contracts to turn their creations over to corporations, et cetera.

The senior economics course is a rather strange mixture of some economics theory with some very ideological concepts favoring the wealthy investor class at the expense of ordinary Americans. What is largely left out are the kinds of knowledge which Native Americans, Latinos, African-Americans, and many Asian-American groups would want or need to know, along with women's economics. The so-called "free market" brand of economics is presented almost exclusively, but in a very naive or unrealistic manner that ignores actual state intervention, subsidies, and other non-market aspects of the way most countries run their economies. Concepts of "scarcity," "choice," "benefits," and "costs" are presented without reference to the values of Native Americans and others who place emphases upon sharing, simplicity, human relationships, extended families, the conduct of ceremonies, and other cultural considerations. Economic activity is presented as being distinct from other aspects of life, which may indeed be the ideological perspective of a certain school of economic theory. But alternative ways of looking at "incentives" and profit must be considered, along with concepts such as usury and excess profit. Students are asked to "explain the elements of the United States market economy in a global setting" at 12.15 but the question of whether we have ever had a "market economy" should be asked. Most industrialized states developed their economies behind high tariff barriers and with all kinds of government interventions and subsidies. The business sector of the U.S. even today receives massive subsidies; the government promotes the sales of company products overseas ranging from military weaponry to agricultural goods. Moreover, a good part of the U.S. economy is directly dependent upon government defense and space spending, and congresspersons

actively lobby for projects that even the Department of Defense does not desire. None of this is discussed.

The concept of how prices are set is extremely naive, since large mega-corporations have been setting prices for decades based upon market manipulation and collusion, coupled with advertising. The concept of monopoly or of concentration in a given industry or of the operation of inter-locking directorates, et cetera, are not discussed. And yet, the lessening of competition in many fields is a major concern of observers today.

The idea that an “entrepreneur” might value the personal satisfaction of producing an excellent product through the working together of a close-knit work-force has no place in the economic theory presented. “Profit” is the “incentive,” or so the students are to be told. The concept of “command economy” is applied to Marxian systems, while the U.S. is supposedly a “free market” (see 12.16 at 3). But from the perspective of most of us, the U.S. economy is largely a “command economy” with most activity being determined either by government (defense, energy, space, subsidies, giveaway of research results, etc.) or by huge corporations operating on a command principle. The actual “free” sector of the U.S. economy is not discussed because it involves such people as small farmers, small business people, small entrepreneurs, organic food, and manufacturers. Many constraints also exist on independent producers, of course.

Ideology is also expressed by statements like: “Explain the factors that may cause the costs of government actions to outweigh the benefits.” This is political unless placed within the context that a high percentage of the federal budget is used to subsidize business or defense/space spending supported by the most conservative sectors of Congress. Similarly, also in 12.17, we read, “Explain distribution of income . . . and

methods that federal, state, and local governments use to influence income distribution through transfer payments and taxes.” This again is very political unless “transfer payments” include agricultural subsidies for wealthy agribusiness corporations and other subsidies of the wealthy classes, and unless the analysis of the tax system honestly compares the types of deductions given to businesses (such as depreciation, transportation expenses, deductible ocean cruises, etc.) which are not given to workers who also use such things as aging vehicles. Moreover, many taxes, such as sales taxes and even income taxes often fall most heavily on workers.

But perhaps more important than these examples is the fact that students are not asked, “What kind of a society do we want? Do we want to live in a place where everyone has access to adequate health care, to a good education, to decent housing, to a good job, and to a safe and non-toxic environment, for example?” Do we want to have extremely rich people, and lots of very poor people as in Brazil, or do we want a huge middle-class, as in Netherlands or Scandinavia?

The teaching of economics in grade 12 should revolve around real world questions, ones that are not answered according to a particular ideology but rather are open-ended and studied in relation to ethics. But the subject must also be relevant to women, who as homemakers and caregivers have often been denied wages, benefits, or even any status in the economy. The fact that caregivers, whether men or women, often receive no recognition in economics is simply an indictment of a male bias. The so-called “welfare” system, which is really a misnomer, must be analyzed fully since it impacts a high percentage of our students.

But one of the key issues facing our society is completely left out, and that is the way in which technology is altering our economy faster than we can deal with the changes or

grasp their implications. One crucial example of this is the “downsizing” that has resulted from robotization and profit taking by management and major investors, a process threatening the job future of many of our students. Can we continue to robotize and still support the necessary numbers of workers? Who is studying this issue? What are their findings? So long as profit remains the only guiding principle, can anything be done?

Other issues relate to the future impact of the World Trade Organization and NAFTA on the removal of factories from the United States, proposals for shorter work weeks in order to share wealth gains with workers and to provide more jobs, and the question of who should own the labor-saving machines purchased with the contributions of both capital and labor. All of these questions seem to be avoided in the standards proposed for grade 12. In short, we seem to have an elitist, upper-class approach to U.S. history, politics, and economics—an approach that hides the history, politics, intellectual life, and struggles of the ethnically-different and of the oppressed and less fortunate of all colors beneath a curriculum designed to maintain preferential treatment and privileges for Anglo-Americans of upper economic status. For all of its pretense to be interested in individualism and freedom, these curriculum standards are also designed to help create (or maintain) a command society, a social system where commands come from wealthy elites through their corporate organizations and through their control of media and government.

I have not seen a section of curriculum that would seek to have students study changes that could be made to bring us a society where power is decentralized and where huge organizations are brought under democratic control. Thus a command society is what is being offered, not a democratic one.

## What Kind of Science?

Recently, I watched a program on public television called “Life Beyond Earth,” a show about the history of human concerns with possible extraterrestrial life and astronomy generally. A production of KCTS in Seattle, this video was wonderfully produced with delightful photography and all of the technical gimmicks one might expect. But missing was any interest in non-European peoples and their contributions to knowledge about the sky.

The ancient astronomy of the Maya, their systematic recording of the movements of many planets, and their absolutely fantastic invention of the concept of zero (without which all modern astronomy would be nonexistent) were ignored. Similarly, what Herodotus tells us about ancient Kemitic astronomy and math was totally left out, along with all scientific activities in Asia, from the Middle East to Turkestan to China. Now, I am not arguing that the video should have dwelled on these subjects; but when Galileo, Keppler, Copernicus, and Einstein were paraded before us, the impression was created that science is white and that all scientific knowledge is of European origin.

In thinking about the “science” part of the educational curriculum we must keep in mind that many persons are indeed under the illusion that “science” is a peculiarly modern phenomenon, and one which is purely of European creation. Indeed, science is often taught in a Eurocentric manner. Generally, white science is often trapped in a very naive and limited view of its own history.<sup>13</sup> The extreme significance of indigenous people's classification and then domestication and improvement of plants and animals; their use of intensive methods of experimentation, observation, and selection; and invention of many processes to utilize toxic materials, initially indigestible items; and to improve the quality and variety of plants is simply amazing. About 10,000 years ago this

scientific work resulted in early domestication in Mexico and elsewhere, eventually producing immense varieties of potatoes, maize, peppers, and numerous other American crops, while in Africa and Asia other basic foodstuffs were domesticated and altered during about the same period.<sup>14</sup>

Some of our modern male scientists might wish to ignore all of this, perhaps because we now understand that it was women who probably were the primary herbal-horticultural scientists (because so many past and present cultures feature women as the primary gatherers of plants and as agriculturalists) and, secondly, because agricultural science is primarily an American, African, and Asiatic contribution, not European.

“Science” means “seeing, understanding,” or in its modern usage, research (research or again-looking) to carefully and thoughtfully analyze phenomena or things. It does not mean laboratory experimentation alone, since most of post-1500 science involved careful observation, classification, and analysis, the same processes used by pre-1500 scientists. The development of experimental science is essentially nothing but an elaboration, using ever-better tools, of the above methodology. And, of course, without the invention of the concept of zero by non-whites and the adoption of Arabic numerals there could be no modern mathematics, no equations, to facilitate experimentation, observation, and description. Similarly, the focus on women's role in ancient science and herbology cannot help but be useful in attracting more women to scientific fields.

Of course, there are some university professors who do not wish to see students study the history of science. Instead, they call for the immediate “doing” of science and even cast aspersions on courses that do not “do” science as not being “real” science!

Certainly, there are many reasons for having students engaged in actual hands-on projects. No one can disagree with that, however, it is also vital that our youth be exposed to the history of science because science has become such a powerful force in our society that we, as democratic citizens, must be able to make critical judgments and ethical decisions about projects proposed by scientists, engineers, and other specialists. Our students need to learn about the mistakes of science, and how scientific experimentation has been used on human beings without their permission, and how dangerous it is to allow government officials and others to simply do whatever they please with the powerful tools of science and technology.

Thus it is very naive to propose that our youth only need to “do” science. No, they also need to be able to see how science interacts with other aspects of our world, and how individual, group, and species' rights may be affected. Otherwise, we face the danger of emerging into a totalitarian society or one totally ruled by whatever can be invented next.<sup>15</sup> Interestingly, the current craze at subjecting students to standardized tests, as discussed earlier, will hurt both “doing” science and understanding science.

There are always new fads in the teaching of science, math, and other subjects. In the late 1960s when I was with the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development there were new projects galore including computer-assisted instruction, new approaches to math and science, and new ways to train teachers (i.e., “micro-teaching”). But new fads never seem to live up to their promise or they are replaced by still newer fads. The current craze is once again about computers, but I am very skeptical if putting text and pictures in a machine necessarily makes them any more effective than “old-fashioned” films, slides, videos, and good, solid teaching. Perhaps the truth is that if a child is healthy, self-confident, and in a supportive environment

almost any method will work, but if the child is ill-fed, psychologically oppressed, depressed, and lacking in self-esteem, then perhaps no gimmick will work in the long run. If science is taught as a part of a curriculum which is indifferent or hostile to the child, then what might we expect? This brings us to a further consideration of the ethnic and ideological dimensions of science.

One of the key aspects of the scientific method is the intellectual posture typified by curiosity, discovery, and open-mindedness. Interestingly, this is one of the arguments used by many scientists to keep so-called “creation science” out of the school science curriculum, that is, that the latter is dogmatic. The argument over “evolution” as a “natural” process (no intelligent intervention or direction) versus various forms of higher-intelligence involvement is often heated, but at its heart one finds that materialists reject the latter perspective because of its often doctrinaire and sectarian formulations.

Sadly, however, scientific materialists are not always open-minded and flexible either, nor are their teachings necessarily “objective” or free from biases and unstated assumptions. We must be prepared to criticize scientific concepts at all times, since such a critical, exploratory, open attitude is, indeed, at the very heart of the discovery process which is science. In other words, to have “rigid science” is to have no science at all.

Here I would like to present two examples of where modern science tends to become “Euroscience” rather than science. First, let us look at the materialist viewpoint that the Earth and the non-organic biosphere is “dead,” that is, non-living matter, in contrast to the Native American view that the entire Universe and Mother Earth are “alive.” The materialist viewpoint is grounded in a widespread Jewish and Christian perspective, while the Native American perspective is in essential agreement with other

indigenous traditions and with such Asian traditions as Hinduism, Taoism, and Shinto etc.

Margaret Lock, a professor of anthropology at McGill University writes in the Social Science Research Council newsletter *Items* that

nature and culture are inseparable; they are neither a duality, nor in a simple dialectic, but inevitably mediated by and intimately associated with human intervention. The difficulty is that in talking about nature we tend to assume that scientific representations of nature are truthful, factual representations rather than one very powerful method of constructing reality . . . .

In planning for a conference on the “Culture of Biomedicine,” Lock and her colleagues took the position that:

It is a mistake to assume the existence, on the one hand, of scientific, epistemologically-free thinking and, on the other, of various second-class, culturally infused folk biologies entirely divorced from the realm of scientific thinking. . . . all thought is, to a greater or lesser extent, steeped in culturally and historically situated assumptions.<sup>16</sup>

The current materialist notion that matter is “dead” until it becomes part of an organism considered to be alive, is, as noted, grounded in Judaic and Christian dualism. It is also, no doubt, strengthened by the rise of both capitalism and Marxist Leninism and the latter's need to often ruthlessly exploit the planet and also allegedly “lower” forms of organisms (including, quite often, allegedly inferior human beings). Judaism and Christianity seem to have created a hierarchy that materialist science has taken over.

I think that it is very instructive to note that the ancient Greeks (who are, supposedly, at the very core of the eurocentric heritage) shared the same view of “nature” as Native Americans. A noted historian of philosophy states:

We have been accustomed to think of a universe, composed of dead matter and . . . a few living beings. . . . But to the Greek mind nature was living and companionable through and through. . . . It has been suggested that it was, and for that matter still is, the attitude of the Pueblo civilizations of the American Southwest. "The native American . . . like the Oriental" and, we should add, like the early Greeks, "viewed nature as the great source of all existence, found in contemplating its orderly processes the principle for the ordering of his life . . ." (from J.N.B. Hewett, *Ancient Life in the American Southwest*, p. 61).<sup>17</sup>

In any case, the dualist and hierarchical view ignores the fact that supposedly non-living matter (and the electrical-energy particles which comprise it) is not only capable of acting but is, in fact, characterized by constant movement, interaction, attraction, repulsion, merger, combining, separating, growth, and changing, characteristics which hardly seem possible in something which is "dead." In fact, most scientific theory rests upon the assumption of change (evolution, mutation), rather than stasis.

### **Conclusion**

Curriculum standards that discriminate against Native Americans and that give preference to Anglo-Americans are illegal in my opinion. We must seek to block their adoption and, if adopted, we should seek legal action to force them to be changed. Specifically, California's curriculum standards should be set aside or suspended until a task force can be selected to thoroughly revise them to meet legal requirements. Such a task force must be comprised of knowledgeable persons who are of diverse ethnic, racial, and national origin backgrounds. Half of the task force should be women. No one ethnic or national group should be allowed to dominate the task force, and persons representing working class and tribal perspectives should be included. It would be a serious mistake to attempt to implement standards that are not only illegal, but that also will continue the process of alienating large sectors of our youth.

**Jack D. Forbes** is professor emeritus of Native American Studies at the University of California, Davis. He is one of the co-founders of the emerging field of Native Studies and also of the Indigenous-controlled higher education movement. He is the author of *RED BLOOD, ONLY APPROVED INDIANS*, and numerous other books. His web site is <http://cougar.ucdavis.edu/nas/faculty/forbes/personal/forbes.html>

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Portions of this article will be incorporated in a book I am writing that is tentatively entitled *From Kindergarten to Prison: California's Educational System or the Crime of Studying While Black or Brown*.

<sup>2</sup> Barbara Miner, "Making the Grade," *The Progressive*, August 2000, p. 40.

<sup>3</sup> For a review of three new books dealing with standardized testing, see Barbara Miner, "Making the Grade," pp. 40-43.

<sup>4</sup> *The Sacramento Bee*, May 6, 2000, p. A7; *San Francisco Chronicle*, April 29, 2000, p. A6. Also see Ben Wildavsky, "Are Today's Students Learning More?" *U.S. News and World Report*, June 5, 2000, p. 34.

<sup>5</sup> See "How Europeans Have Stolen America," *The Guardian* (London) Aug. 24, 1987, p. 19; and "What Do We Mean by America and Americans," *News From Indian Country*, VIII (12), Late June 1994, p. 16.

<sup>6</sup> *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary* defines the noun "American" as: "1: an Indian of No. America or So. America, 2: a native or inhabitant of No. America or So. America, 3: a citizen of the United States." Thus the term American can correctly be used to refer to the indigenous people, as well as to all other inhabitants of the Americas. See Charles Maclaren, "America," in *Werner Encyclopaedia* (Akron: Werner, 1909) pp. 587-8, 602-4; and Daniel G. Brinton, *The American Race* (Philadelphia: McKay, 1901) pp. 17-8.

<sup>7</sup> See Jack D. Forbes, "The Historian and the Indian: Racial Bias in American History," *The Americas* (Academy of American Franciscan History) XIX (4) April 1963; "Frontiers in American History," *Journal of the West* I (1), July 1962; "The Indian in the West: Challenge for Historians," *Arizona and the West* I (3) Autumn 1959; and "Racial Bias in Gold Rush History," *The Masterkey*, 33(1), January-March 1959.

<sup>8</sup> Jack D. Forbes, "The Urban Tradition Among Native Americans," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 22(4), 1998, pp. 15-42.

<sup>9</sup> See Jack D. Forbes, *The Indian in America's Past* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965) and *Native Americans of California and Nevada* (Happy Camp: Naturegraph, 1982) for many examples.

<sup>10</sup> See the work of Roberto Rodriguez and Patrisia Gonzales presented via their “XColumn” in many newspapers. See also Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands La Frontera: the New Mestiza* (San Francisco: Auntie Lute books, 1987) and Jack D. Forbes, *Aztecas del Norte: the Chicanos of Aztlan* (New York: Fawcett, 1973).

<sup>11</sup> A book that I am writing contains more information on the “Divine Providence” doctrine and its relationship to white supremacy and Anglo-American imperialism.

<sup>12</sup> The aggressive, competitive culture may also be harmful to white males, judging from recent articles about “road rage,” “golf rage,” “passenger rage,” and so on. The United States is, of course, the country with the worst record of violence of any in the world, much of it related to anger, rage, and hate.

<sup>13</sup> For example, Lewis Thomas, in his interesting book *Late Night Thoughts on Listening to Mahler's Ninth Symphony* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1995) p. 18, stated, “For about three centuries we have been doing science.”

<sup>14</sup> Jack D. Forbes, “Native American Science” in Heydar Reghaby, Ed., *Blossoms of Life Science* (Davis: D-Q University Press, 1979) pp. 131-40.

<sup>15</sup> See Jack D. Forbes, *Racism, Scholarship, and Cultural Pluralism* (Davis: Native American Studies, 1977) for a discussion of why “wisdom” sometimes conflicts with “knowledge.”

<sup>16</sup> Margaret Lock, “Culture of Biomedicine,” *Items*, 49(1), March 1995, p. 19. See also Sandra Harding, “Is Modern Science an Ethnoscience? Rethinking Epistemological Assumptions” in Emmanuel Chukwudi Eze, *Postcolonial African Philosophy: A Critical Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997) pp. 45ff.

<sup>17</sup> B.A.G. Fuller, *A History of Philosophy* (New York: Holt, 1945) p. 19.