

RUDOLPH C. RYSER
728 212th Pl. S.W.
Lynnwood, Washington
98036

28 October 1982

Ralph Eluska
National Congress of American Indians
5028 Mills Drive
Anchorage, Alaska
99504

Dear Ralph:

This letter will serve as an update communication regarding certain of my activities during the last two months. This information is supplied to you in the spirit of keeping lines of communications open.

As you know I wrote a paper in August (pro-bono for NCAI) entitled "Neo-Termination and the Reagan Administration" as a follow-on from a piece I wrote in March entitled "Indian Affairs in the United States: A Reasonable Critique". DeLaCruz read the paper and decided it should serve as the basis for his annual report before the NCAI General Assembly. He asked me to work with Joe Tallakson (in Washington D.C.) and Gary Morishima (his technical aid at the Quinault) in the preparation of the speech which he subsequently presented in Bismark, N.D. To facilitate and reinforce Joe's speech I drafted materials to arrange a meeting between past NCAI leadership with current NCAI officers; and, I drafted several working documents (National Reconstruction: A New Indian Strategy, The New Indian Strategy Brief and Indian Country Under Siege: A State of Emergency) which were designed to be adapted for use at the NCAI General Assembly. Joe apparently decided not to use these working documents.

Throughout the latter part of August, during September and October I have been working with Joe Tallakson and DeLaCruz to promote funding for the international arm of NCAI. Particular emphasis has been placed on the short, \$40,000 proposal (drafted in August) which has been directed at the National Lutheran Council. In August I spoke several times with the executive assistant to the President of the Luther Church regarding the NCAI international proposal. He advised at that time that Eugene Crawford and the National Indian Lutheran Board would be asked to review the proposal and either endorse or oppose the proposal. DeLaCruz and Crawford were supposed to meet in Bismark and discuss the proposal. About a week following what I understand was a very brief meeting between DeLaCruz and Crawford I then spoke with Crawford over the telephone to answer any questions he might have. He was admittedly "iffy" about the proposal, but finally agreed that the proposal would be submitted to his Board for review and comment on 30 October. Before the end of our conversation Crawford indicated that he did not "see any reason why the Board shouldn't endorse" our proposal. Given the possibility that Crawford is not playing "straight arrow" with us Tallakson, DeLaCruz and I have set in motion a procedure through NCAI's central office to send the proposal to about ten other possible sponsors.

Meanwhile, I have written an article entitled "The World Bank's New Indigenous Policy" (you received a copy of the draft manuscript) for publication through the Friends of the Earth publication in San Francisco. My final draft of the article has been completed and sent to San Francisco. Copies of the final draft were sent to Aslak Nils Sara, Margaret Mallard, Millian Painimal, Jose Carlos, Floriberto Diaz Gomez (CORPI in Mexico), Hans Pavia Rosing, George Manuel and Chief Wayne Christian (Spalmucheen Band of the Shuswap Nation). I also sent a copy to Tim Coulter at the Indian Law Resource Center. While I wrote the article on my own without sponsorship it seemed to me that the subject matter was of sufficient importance that it ought to be considered immediately by some of our colleagues. I sent a copy to the Indian Law Resource Center because the subject matter was directly germane to the conference on Indigenous populations and Multi-national Corporations which they sponsored in New York during the month of August. (Incidentally, I just spoke with Tim Coulter regarding that conference. He reports that about one hundred people attended, including a delegation from Australia. The WCIP made no attempt to contribute to this conference. The conference produced no declarations, nor any papers; it was apparently devoted to group discussions.)

DeLaCruz discussed my "World Bank" piece with Russel Barsh (an advisor to the Micmac on international matters), the fellow who worked with Tim Coulter and others who pieced together a submission to the UN Human Rights Commission's Indigenous workgroup which met last June in Geneva. Russel and I have been discussing the prospect of establishing communications between the Micmac, Shuswap, Zapotec and Mixe, Swapo and the Aboriginals of Australia to promote the development of mutual aid and cooperation in connection with the World Bank's new loan policy.

DeLaCruz contacted me earlier this week and asked me to coordinate tribal leadership participation in a meeting on November 10 (in Seattle) with a Mr. Anwar Barkat who represents the Geneva based World Council of Churches Program to Combat Racism. The World Council of Churches is making preparations for its ten-year general assembly scheduled for Vancouver, British Columbia (late July through early August 1983). The WCC Program to Combat Racism is looking for ways to gain tribal participation in that conference while offering potential grants to indigenous populations in North America. I have already begun discussions with local WCC organizers regarding the Nov. 10 meeting. I might point out that because the Program to Combat Racism has given money primarily to the International Indian Treaty Council in North America it has been doing a great deal of work with the Abotiginals in Australia and tribal populations in Africa. They have received a great deal of criticism for their support of IITC since they have not been able to demonstrate significant contact with indigenous peoples in North America at the "local" level. I believe they are not only trying to gain our support and interest in their conference, but they are trying to repair their image concerning indigenous types in North America. We may be able to secure financial help from them for the North American Regional Council and the National Congress of American Indians. I will advise you about details after Nov. 10.

Make a note on the QT: G. Manuel, at the request of CORPI, left this week for a two month stay in and around Southern Mexico and Guatamala to offer direct assistance and support to the refugees. GM wants this information kept quiet. He is not being sponsored by the WCIP. Best wishes,

728 212th Pl. S.W.
Lynnwood, Washington
98036

10, February 1982

Mr. Ralph Eluska, First Vice President
National Congress of American Indians
c/o 5028 Mills Drive
Ankorage, Alaska
99501

Dear Ralph:

I have enclosed for your review a draft copy of a proposal for the NCAI Office for Tribal International Relations as Joe requested me to prepare on 3 February 1982. As you will no doubt note, the scope of this proposal is somewhat broader than perhaps you or Joe had originally envisioned. I have deliberately prepared the proposal in this way because I believe it is more fundable and potentially more useful to NCAI, its member tribes and the WCIP. I have designed the proposal so you can expand or reduce it to meet your needs and expectations.

As I wrote Joe, I am hopeful that my relationship to you and NCAI can begin as quickly as possible. Frankly, I have exhausted my income and paying consultant contracts. The work I am doing as special assistant at the WCIP is "free" and work I am doing for the Canadian Indigenous Provisional Government is also pro bono. So, anything "you all" can do to get this NCAI thing going will be greatly appreciated (and I believe timely in terms of the international work that must be accomplished).

Regards,

Rudolph C. Ryser

Enclosure:

C
O
P
Y

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ralph Eluska, NCAI International Representative
Joe DeLaCruz, President, NCAI
Hollis, Stabler, Jr., Treasurer, NCAI

FROM: R. Ryser

Subject: North American Leadership Conference: Special Session
to consider North American Indigenous Political Affiliation
and Organization internationally.

DATE: 29, June, 1982

+ George Manuel
Ellenae Horse
Tom Goble
Blond J.T.

Persuant to our brief discussion on the topic with Sol Sanderson in San Diego, my meetings with PSI/WAFN people in Regina on 21-22 June and our telephone briefings on 23 June, the following proposal has been made to PSI/WAFN:

- C
O
P
Y
1. In view of the fact that Sol Sanderson wishes to secure political support for a permanent World Assembly of First Nations Organization which would have independent standing similar to the World Council of Indigenous Peoples; and in view of the fact that since 1975 various efforts have been initiated by Canadian Indian Leadership and U.S. Indian Leadership to formally establish a North American Regional Organization affiliated with the WCIP; and in view of the fact the Ralph Eluska and the NCAI have prepared a draft Charter for a North American Regional Indigenous Council (NARIC); and in view of the fact that there appears to be emerging a consensus which calls for the establishment of a permanent political alliance between tribes and nations in North America to secure mutual advantages within the international community it seems timely and proper that a meeting of key North American Indigenous leadership be convened on 18 Jul, 1982 to forge commitments and procedures through "initialed protocol agreements" which will formalize a process for creating an international mechanism which coordinates and promotes North American Indigenous interests within the international community.
 2. The special meeting of key North American Indigenous Leadership should be scheduled apart from the WAFN events and be called the North American Leadership Conference. The Conference should be scheduled to convene for no more than six hours. The six hour session should be chaired by George Manuel as the senior Indigenous leader in North America. The meeting should include no more than twelve people. All protocol agreements must be initialed only unless the principles are prepared to exercise total and complete authority on behalf of their respective organizations.
 3. The following leaders should be invited to participate in the North American Leadership Conference:

George Manuel, Chairman
Joe DeLaCruz, President, NCAI
Phillip Martin, Chairman, NTCAI
Smokey Brier, President, NCC
Dave Ahenekew, President, AFN
Sol Sanderson, President, FSI

clm Shastri

Supporting participants from NCAI should include: Ralph Eluska and Hollis Stabler.

MEMORANDUM

North American Leadership Conference

29, June, 1982

Page 2

The tentative purpose, goal and objective of the North American Leadership Conference should be as follows:

Purpose: Reaffirm commitments to a North American Indigenous Political Alliance.

Goal: Outline procedures and initial protocols for the establishment of a permanent indigenous mechanism to advance North American Indigenous interests internationally.

Objective: Initial a North American Protocol agreement to establish an interim Secretariat to facilitate and promote bi-lateral and multi-lateral cooperation between North American Indian governments.

Initial a protocol to establish a draft, and or procedures for a draft Chart for an international mechanism.

Establish guidelines, procedures, and tentative schedules for a founding general assembly of Indian governments to consider and ratify an international indigenous mechanism to advance North American Indigenous interests

Tentative Agenda Outline for the North American Leadership Conference:

- I. Review past actions and steps for political cooperation within North America.
- II. Consider Protocol Agreement on "Continental Cooperation Among Tribes and Nations in North America".
- III. Consider Proposals for formal international affiliation:
 - a. World Assembly of First Nations Charter proposal (FSI)
 - b. North American Regional Indigenous Council proposal (NAI)
- IV. Consider Protocol Agreement concerning Charter proposal and compromise considerations, including:
 - a. Schedule
 - b. procedures
 - c. interim mechanisms
- V. Consider FSI proposal for "continuing roundtable discussions".

.....
NAI considerations:

NAI is a Charter member of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples. NAI has a policy of unconditional support for the WCIP, support for the formation of a North American Indigenous Council affiliated with the WCIP and a policy of opposition to the establishment of new and independent international indigenous organizations. NAI does support "direct indigin government" involvement in international affairs. NAI has opposed all actions internationally which would undermine the WCIP/ I suggest that either Joe or Ralph contact Phillip Martin to ensure NTCA participation and strongly promote the NAI proposal that George Manuel Chair the session.

C
O
P
Y

CONFIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Ralph Eluska, Senior International Delegate
National Congress of American Indians
cc: Joe DeLaCruz, President
NCAI

FROM: Rudolph c. Ryser

SUBJECT: First Nations World Assembly (FNWA) - June 1982, and
NCAI Cosponsorship.

DATE: 7 MAY 1982

C
O
P
Y
In accordance with your telephone directive, I have conducted an inquiry into the organization and the politics of the First Nations World Assembly; scheduled to convene in June 1982. My findings, analysis and recommendations follow.

Based on materials I have received, telephone conversations with Marie Marule (WCIP Secretariat), George Manuel (former WCIP president), a staff person under Bobby Manuel at the UBCIC, Wayne Christian (Chief of the Spallumcheen Band of the Schuswap Nation and Jacob Marule (an advisor to Wayne and George and a representative of SWAPO in North America, and my own observations and experience with other Indian Officials in Canada I find that:

1. The principle organizers of the FNWA have invested a fair amount of time and money to produce a loosely organized, randomly structured, and hottly political conference which features the "flashy" social appearance of a non-indigenous "elite" meeting. The conference agenda is cumbersome and generally irrelevant to indigenous interests. Superficial attempts have been made to make the meeting appear "authentic" as an indigenous gathering, but the overwhelming evidence points up the shallow facade. There is no clear rationale for the meeting, nor is there a clear explanation of goals and objectives. Only a broad assertion that "Indians need access to the international arena is made. In an evening discussion with Gary Youngman (a Canadian lawyer hired by the FNWA organizers to write some natural resource papers) I found that the substantive base for the conference is not defined -- efforts in this regard appear to be "window dressing".
2. Despite disclaimers to the contrary, the FNWA appears clearly aimed at establishing "a replacement for the WCIP" with obvious intent to encourage the Canadian Government to shift its political and financial support away from the WCIP to a more "palatable" FNWA.
3. The organizers of the FNWA are deeply involved in the "internal" politics of Indian/Canadian government relations. A split within "Canadian" Indian Country has been brewing between "assimilationists" and "antiassimilationists" during the last three years over the issue of the Canadian Constitution (which has recently been conveyed to the Federal Government by Britain). Assimilationists won control of the First Nations Assembly (replacing the NIB) in the person of its new President: David Henique (sp?). Henique is the former head of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians and has close ties with Sol Sanderson-- FNWA organizer.

7 May 1982

- C
O
P
Y
4. The Canadian Foreign Ministry and the Department of Indian Affairs have a major interest (financial and political) in the conduct of the FNWA as a "showcase" to demonstrate to the world that Indians in Canada "share equally in Canadian Society and are economically successful." Such a propoganda effort is seen as necessary to "counter adverse international publicity" generated by "antias-similationist" leaders who have approached the UN, Britain, European governments and several Third World Governments to build international support for Indian opposition to Canadian Constitutional patriation from England, and support for trilateral negotiations between Indian governments, Britain and Canada for settlement of longstanding territorial and political conflicts. Canadian officials believe they must "demonstrate" their good will toward indigenous peoples to avoid criticism from Third World Countries.
 5. The Canadian Government has increasingly become uneasy with its financial support to the WCIP since last Spring's Third General Assembly in Canberra. The WCIP has been a visible supporter of "anti-Constitution" Indians, caused embarrassment to the Australian government with its "vigorous support" of aboriginals, created a disturbance at the UN before the Sub-commission on Petitions under the Decolonization Committee (particularly involving Indonesia, Australia and France), and it has become increasingly visible regarding the controversial issue of Sami opposition to the Alta River Hydroelectric project in Norway. Canada has recently worked to curry favor with certain Third World states (notably: Kenya, Tanzania, Nicaragua and Cuba), and is, therefore, very sensitive about its human rights image -- particularly as it related to Indians. The Canadian Government is searching around to "create" an alternative indigenous international organization it can fincnally support -- an organization which wont create political problems. It is suspected in many quarters, that the First Nations World Assembly would be sufficiently benign that Canada could shift its financial support away from WCIP to the FNWA and, thereby, retain its image as a strong supporter of Indigenous peoples.
 6. The WCIP has withheld its endorsement of the FNWA meeting though individual regional representatives are not discouraged from attending.

Analysis:

Since its begining, the FNWA meeting has been bound-up in the internal political struggles of Canadian Indians (those opposed to and those in support of the Canadian federal policies toward Indians). The principle organizers from the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians have been closely tied to pro-Canadian government interests (assimilationists) interested in defusing the growing strength of Indians who seek the establishment of Indian political power outside of the Canadian political system (anti-assimilationists). The Canadian government has been attempting to reduce or eliminate the political influence of anti-assimilationists (located primarily in the Yukon Territory, N.W. Territory, British Columbia, North Quebec and Nova Scotia.). Canada wants to encourage progovernment Indians.

CONFIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM

Page 3

FNWA and NCAI

7 May 1982

C
O
P
Y

The "international" character of the FNWA is suspect since it has been entirely organized by "domestic Indians", and the Canadian foreign ministry. The net result is that the FNWA will be dominated with Canadian Indian concerns as a "demonstration of the cooperative and supportive spirit of Indian and Canadian federal government relations". The agenda of the conference is calculated to produce the least amount of controversy, while the "entertainment agenda" is calculated to demonstrate that Canadian Indians are successful and equal participants in Canadian society. Direct and indirect Canadian Department of Indian Affairs staff support has been provided the FNWA organizers while the Canadian Foreign Ministry has injected substantial amounts of money. The international indigenous character of the conference is non-existent, while Canadian federal government interests dominate.

The WCIP and the FNWA are poles apart in their political views of international indigenous affairs. FNWA is emerging as having a "pro-states" policy toward Canada and other "friendly states". This view is characteristic of FNWA organizers who seek to promote "non-controversial" international relations, while keeping the "dirty linen" within the political framework of the dominant states. The WCIP, on the other hand, has taken the position that Indigenous interests supercede state interests and are best expressed within the international context -- even though a dominant state may be embarrassed. In some quarters the FNWA is seen as a "replacement" for the WCIP which will be more easily controlled by the Canadian or other state governments. The WCIP has been a serious factor in the embarrassment of Canada, Australia, Britain, Norway, United States, Denmark, the Soviet Union, Chile, Bolivia, Argentina, Indonesia and Nicaragua in international forums during the last three years. Its insistence on Indigenous group rights and disclosures of violations of Indigenous human rights has caused it to be charged with supporting "separatist movements" and reversed racism against European descendants. Right-wing military and fascist groups as well as left-wing socialist and communist groups have made these charges. Such controversy has been responsible for advancing indigenous group political development, though dominant states and political groups have reacted with caution and often negatively.

As an active Charter member of the WCIP, the National Congress of American Indians is, by virtue of its "cosponsorship" of the FNWA and, in the unenviable position of appearing to endorse the FNWA and the WCIP, even though to do so is contradictory in many respects, and naive in other respects. NCAI has achieved a high level of positive achievement within WCIP during the last two years. Delegations from other WCIP regions (who once held a negative view toward the politics of "U.S. Indians") now regard the NCAI as fair and sensitive as well as responsible. NCAI representatives to the WCIP Executive Council and General Assembly have earned greater respect from their indigenous peers. Such an achievement can only contribute to increased indigenous understanding, cooperation and mutual support.

The contrary nature of NCAI support for the WCIP and the FNWA threatens to create renewed misunderstandings by creating the impression that the NCAI has divided loyalties which favor the wealthy, assimilationist Indians and northern industrialized states. Furthermore, NCAI's role in the WCIP

will doubtless be compromised, because of the appearance of NCAI support for an emergin and competing indigenous organization. NCAI further jeopardizes its ability to politically defend its member governments in relations within the United States, while also jeopardizing NCAI influence in Central America, South America and the South Pacific. In short, NCAI's formal involvement in the FNWA promotes divisions in the international indigenous movement which can only benefit those who oppose indigenous rights, while weakening the links of cooperation among indigenous peoples so far developed.

Recommendations:

- C
O
P
Y
1. NCAI should immediately and publically withdraw from its formal roel as cosponsor of the FNWA.
 2. NCAI should release a letter of explanation to FNWA and the WCIP explaining its withdrawal, making the following major points:
 - Establishment of an ongoing FNWA is counterproductive and duplicitous. NCAI unconditionally supports the WCIP and regards any attempt to create another international indigenous organization as divisive and destructive of global indigenous interests.
 - NCAI favors establishment of a North American regional Indigenous Council which is directly affiliated with the WCIP.
 - The role of the Canadian Foreign Ministry and the Canadian Department of Indian Affairs in the organization and establishment of the FNWA reduces its acceptability and the independence of indigenous olitical action, while permitting the Canadian government to use the FNWA forum ~~of~~ for its own purposes.
 - Z NCAI will not discourage nor promote individual Indian government participation. For its part NCAI will only observe the proceedings.
 3. NCAI should notify the WCIP Secretariat of its intent to formalize the establishment of a WCIP North American Regional Indigenous Council (NAIR) or (NARIC) in cooperation with its member governments, Indian Governments in Canada, and with Indian governments like the Navajo, Hopi and the Six Nations.

NOTE: The substance of this memorandum should perhaps be discussed by the NCAI Executive Committee and a resolution be adopted for subsequent Executive Council consideration.

Reply to:

A. C. Nysor
723 Fifth St. S.W.
Lynnwood, Washington
98036
206/775/1007

16, September, 1982

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ralph Eluska, Senior Internl. Rep.
NCAI

cc: J. Dehaerius, Hollis Stabler, Jr.

FROM: A. C. Nysor
International Counsel

SUBJECT: The World Bank's new Indigenous Policy
and implications for tribes in U.S.

I have enclosed for your review a copy of a draft manuscript of an article I am writing which reviews and analyzes the World Bank's policy on loans to its member states which have indigenous populations. Issued in May 1982, the new policy provides tribes in the United States an opportunity to apply real political leverage on the United States from the international arena. Even though the United States is not a recipient of World Bank loans it is vulnerable to political pressures from international agencies and heavily indebted countries which do take out loans.

The countries which are heavily indebted (i.e. Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Greece, Spain, Costa Rica, Venezuela, etc.) and also have indigenous groups within their boundaries desperately need IB loans. If NCAI and its member tribes were to coordinate closely with tribes in some of these countries (Mexico, Costa Rica and Brazil for example) both the borrowing state and the United States could be compelled to respond more directly to tribal economic and political demands.

I suggest that if the tribes in the United States are truly serious about protecting their rights and advancing their own political development toward true self-government then the World Bank's policy must become a part of our overall "New Indian Strategy". This policy represents real economic and political influence as opposed to mere "moral" persuasion. It has both domestic and international significance.

Your comments?