12-15-2014

Statement by Frederick Moore collected by Charlotte Bacon on December 15, 2014

Frederick Moore

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.bowdoin.edu/maine-wabanaki-trc-statements

Recommended Citation

https://digitalcommons.bowdoin.edu/maine-wabanaki-trc-statements/62

This Statement is brought to you for free and open access by the Maine Wabanaki-State Child Welfare Truth & Reconciliation Commission Archive at Bowdoin Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Maine Wabanaki-State Child Welfare Truth and Reconciliation Commission: Statements by an authorized administrator of Bowdoin Digital Commons. For more information, please contact mmcderm2@bowdoin.edu.
General Information

Private or Public Statement? - Private
Statement Provider: Frederick Moore
Date: December 15, 2014
Location: Sipayik, Maine
Previous Statement? N/A
Statement Gatherer: Charlotte Bacon
Support Person: N/A
Additional Individuals Present: N/A
Recording Format: Audio
Length of Recording: 51:43

Recording

FM: Whatever I’m being asked about or to give general statements concerning any number of topics.

CB: Let’s see where our conversation goes. I have three questions for you. That’s all, and I just need to tell the recording here that I am with Chief Moore in his office and I’m Charlotte Bacon and the file number is ME-20190-00097 and it is December 15th and we are in Sipayik. And my questions are very simple, Chief Moore. It’s really about what do you see as your community’s needs, what do you see as the State, the Tribal-State relations and how would you like to see those changed, and what are your hopes, if any, for this process, of the TRC moving forward? We can start anywhere you like.

FM: Right, right. Let’s begin with the first question --

CB: Okay.

FM: About the community’s needs.

CB: Okay.
FM: That, that question has many different answers if you will or aspects to it considering or for a second, the fact that the community’s needs vary.

CB: Of course.

FM: … greatly, depending upon who you’re speaking to, whether it’s a particular setting for the community or depending upon the individual’s experience within the community. In other words, we don’t have a class system, although we have, we do without realizing it or perhaps even recognizing the fact that there is a sort of class system that is in the subconscious. And that is broken up over a wide range of everyday, you know, issues that people deal with or any of life within the community. In other words, you have people who were born and raised here in Sipayik or nearby who never left the reservation for the most part, whose families have always remained here and thus those particular family groups enjoyed the benefit of immersion in the Indian and tribal culture. And they did not leave their family, their community, their culture or the language and all of those things have remained intact, if you will, with those people whereas forty, fifty years ago for example some people would have left the reservation because they were encouraged to do so in order to create a life for themselves. They would have worked in various locations around New England or elsewhere and raised a family in the completely urban environment absent their family, their culture, their community and their language. And so those persons would end up coming back to the reservation and thereby establishing two separate classes, if you will, of individuals whereas you have the traditional, if you will, tribal resident as opposed to a person that would’ve been considered an ex-patriot, if you will, in some form or another because they left the reservation and then they come back with a different value system and only traces of your language and/or a concept of what their culture should be. So when you ask a person like that about the needs of the community, they’re going to provide you an answer based on their perspective. Whereas a person whose family never left here and grew up here, they will give you a completely different view. However, the folks that are the second generation of you know descendants from the people who left, like I said, would give you one view and then you have the parents of those, the people who first left who are now you know in the later stages of their life who remember the things that they tried to get away from. They remember why they left. They have yet a completely different view. So there are all these competing value systems if you will. All competing for a place of prominence within the everyday lives of our people and that speaks to the social construct if you will of our community. So, it’s very difficult to speak to the needs of the community because they vary so widely and it would be almost unfair for any individual to try to describe what they feel the needs of the community are without understanding how widely they vary.

CB: The diversity of perspectives, could you…

FM: Absolutely, very English.

CB: No, no, no, I’m just clarifying in my own mind what you’re saying. I’m not trying to --

FM: Right, it is diverse even though they’re all native. When people, when non-Passamaquoddy or nontribal folks look at the tribe we’re all one.
CB: Right.

FM: But when, for example people who didn’t, were not raised in the traditional tribal value system come to the reservation, come back to the reservation to live and they come to our meetings, which they’re absolutely welcome and encourage to attend, they bring with them a different value system. So when we talk about the utilization, if you will, of resources from their perspective that conflicts with participation in the life cycle from our perspective.

CB: Right.

FM: Right and, when you have people that come from a capital society if you will or economy and then where it’s competitive based, I-win-you-lose that’s the way it is as opposed to a social environment or structure within the traditional tribal economy where you take what you need, you leave the rest; you share with those less fortunate and you are thankful for what you receive. The two conflict.

CB: I utterly really understand that. I think that’s absolutely fascinating and I’ve a film on kind of, I’ve got to write down the title for you that I just saw that I think you would really enjoy about learning to use values of collective shared experience, taking what you need, giving more to others than you give to yourself and how that positively impacts absolutely everything around you. So that’s for, that’s a side note for before I leave I’ve got to make sure I give you the title of this film, which I watched with my children and we found profoundly moving. But I would ask you to reflect on if, from your perspective if you were to look at all these diverse experiences, people who moved away and come back, people with different notions of a capital economy versus folks who had lived here many, many generations and not lost contact with the culture; in terms of child welfare, what would you say they would say the needs are? So this group versus that group; obviously, there’s going to be more than just two, but --

FM: No, absolutely I was leading up to it.

CB: I know.

FM: No problem. So, given what I’ve shared with you and then revisiting the question about what does the community need, what our community needs is balance. Okay, we need to balance the interests of the people today, the elders and the young people. We need to balance the interests of our people today with the rights and the interests of future generations. So we need to balance the responsibility, our responsibilities today with the interests of future generations and the world that was created and the one that we dwell within is indeed in fact the balance, the connectivity between us today to that environment and those yet to come. So, the health of the environment is actually the measure of the balance. So to, so in other words, to me it doesn’t matter what one believes or what their value system is, there’s an over arching
responsibility that we all share no matter what we want or believe and that is to give equal representation to those yet born, those is yet to come. So that starts with the young people and the youth, so by adhering to our value system whereby we place equal emphasis on those not yet born as displayed, if you will, in the way we treat those just born. So there’s an entire life cycle that must consider even the ones who are not born yet. They are part of this conversation. We have to speak for them and so from those yet born you go to those just born where those are the most sacred and precious. So when you know I could speak to the child welfare from any, I can speak to it from you know the legislative construct. You know the laws and that sort of stuff. The policies the various entities have or I can speak to it from within the context of what we consider our responsibility as a people to maintain a healthy community by guiding our decisions from a value set as opposed to a legislative. I don’t even know if I answered your question, but you know it’s complex. It’s not --

CB: It’s very complex.

FM: I don’t mean to complicate the matter, but for me it goes way beyond child welfare per se.

CB: Of course.

FM: Right, these are policies that are driven by politics and/or various interests, the needs and the interests of these diverse interests if you will. It’s a little repetitive, but we’ll get through this. So it isn’t as simple as well you know what do you think about child welfare.

CB: I would not expect it to be.

FM: Not for me anyway.

CB: I know and I appreciate the interest and complexity and the emphasis on complexity because I think systems are incredibly complex when they involve especially children, when they involve values, when they involve competing notions of what constitutes a good safe childhood for people and that’s what the interests of the TRC is in, is helping to gather words of wisdom, people’s experiences around, not some quick fix, not some legislative tweak, some bigger, broader, richer conversation that allows the entire relationship between tribe and State to shift. And you very sensibly the last time we spoke talked about third parties, talked about beyond the mandate, talked about what it was that was needed in terms of an intellectual, moral, emotional shift to stop what you described as genocidal policies against your people.

FM: Let me expand on that.

CB: Please do.

FM: What I write about are the problems that are brought to my attention. I examine those issues privately, separately in my own fashion, whether I’m out on the water by myself or walking on the beach or in the woods, whatever or sitting on the couch.
CB: Yeah.

FM: Well I believe we’re missing, and this is why I raise this point beyond the mandate, what is the mandate? What the mandate is to examine a situation I believe as it occurs, as it is occurring and has occurred over a certain period of time. How far back in the history do you go, right to examine this problem and the root or the cause?

CB: Five hundred years.

FM: Right, that’s what you’re doing. Is that what this mandate is for?


FM: Okay, right.

CB: As we began to speak with Wabanaki people, first we heard well that’s all well and good to talk about ICWA, but my grandmother, oh but no, no, no, my great-great grandmother --

FM: Right.

CB: Carlisle School, (inaudible 14:42.2) schools --

FM: Exactly.

CB: The memories of King Philip’s War --

FM: So what --

CB: It goes so far back.

FM: …let me, let me break this down a little further than that. What you experienced is the difference between a concept of time. And I think you probably documented that to some degree, even examined it, but what we’re dealing with today is a little deeper and broader than an individual’s experience because of our concept of community or our entire thought process and our culture being an oral tradition and visual in that we don’t have a written language. We use pictures. We tell in pictures. We describe and what occurs to a family or an individual at any given point in time is carried forward.

CB: Exactly.

FM: And so what has been occurring and which perhaps may not be resolved through the current mandate.
CB: Oh, it won’t be.

FM: Right, and which is, and I’m not even suggesting, are just lost on the participants, but we, people in my position are dealing with are the results of a social trauma.

CB: Exactly.

FM: Right, you know, how do you separate the issues?

CB: You don’t in some ways.

FM: Well when you, right but if you have an entire generation of tribal members who grow up in a state of uncertainty concerning their rights and that’s trauma. That’s traumatic. That traumatizes an entire generation of people. That’s going on today, right now. This didn’t happen, I mean it happened back whenever, but it is going on today and so how can one people cling to be able to want to help another if they don’t understand and I think that’s what this truth and reconciliation process is all about. Isn’t it trying to develop understanding not just through experiences, but also what is happening in real time today, as we speak?

CB: Exactly.

FM: We’re still being traumatized as a people.

CB: Exactly.

FM: We have one generation after another growing up or carrying, living in doubt of the validity of their own culture and their own sense of being. That’s happening today, right now. So that’s why I you know I speak to things about beyond the mandate where what exactly or precisely is the limit of what this process would be able to do and so that’s what I write about, a collective conscience, which is essentially what tribal culture is. It’s a collective, a collective conscience at least in my own terminology, that’s the best way I can say it. We have a tendency to think alike particularly since our language is what binds us. And so how, you know we can try to think differently and we can come from somewhere else and bring different values, but then eventually there’s something within. We speak to the Hawaiians about the, about where the problems are.

CB: To how (inaudible 18:46.0).

FM: Yeah and how (inaudible 18:47.4).

CB: How (inaudible 18:47.4).

CB: Yeah and it meant the people with no ancestors.

FM: Yeah.
CB: To people with no lineage.

FM: Right, well we write the same thing here and I’ve written and I can dig the documents out. It’s called the Spiritual Connection to the Environment. When our teachings, which are thousands of years old speak to the time of glaciers for example and our folklore, our legends they’re called and times when our people believed that certain events were true and actually happened. That if we described those events today as being real we’d be carted off to Acadia or we’d be referred to counseling.

CB: Right.

FM: Right, so those traditions if you will really, at least from my perspective, speak to something beyond the physical that which would receive by science today to be impossible or simply not capable of, you know that can’t happen. Animals don’t talk to people, right. Right, but this is what you’d be told. You’d be carted off if you said that and if someone said to my, to one of my relatives that you know I was with these animals and they told me this. Well you know what the older the tribal member becomes, the closer they get to the environment. It doesn’t matter where they came from and we have seen elder tribal members go into the woods and just touch a tree and feel and have tears come out of their eyes and to speak to the fact that these trees are not going to be here. They’ll now come to cut them, that’s what they’re saying. You know things like that and these are well-respected people who are in the latter part of their lives. So there’s something about the psychology if you will or the psyche of native people that this is not something that can be connected to or with by people who are not of that culture. I guess that’s what I’m trying to say it’s a completely different belief system whereby newcomer societies often treat indigenous people in the same way they do other indigenous species. We’re simply in the way…okay and thus we’re often displaced much like other indigenous species. So we on the other hand feel that we are in fact a part of that environment because we participate in the environment because we participate in a life cycle. So that’s where the different value systems come from and we don’t expect the newcomer society to have the same appreciation for a (inaudible 21:58.0) or a plant because they don’t have the same spiritual connection in the environment having come from a different land. They don’t have that connection. They can feel it and they can understand it and recognize it, but they don’t have it. They do not possess a spiritual connection to the land. And that’s the difference I think and so getting back to modern life and everyday life, we have seen our people, at least over the course of my lifetime, go from a subsistent lifestyle and economy to a capital economy, a more social and subsistence-type economy to a competitive one in which ‘I win, you lose.’ That is what I have seen occur over the past fifty years of my life, actually fifty-four, but about four years old I have a very clear recollection of much earlier than that, but from about four years old I can tell you that there were many things you know that I started to see because I was getting out more so to speak. And so I watched the community change right before my eyes and --
CB: What did you see?

FM: Just you know everyday life, just the way things changed, where children would play on the side of the road in the dirt and nobody would think anything of it. I saw very simple needs, like I said take what you need, leave the rest, share with those less fortunate, be thankful for what you received to a competitive environment where sometimes deceit is viewed as cunning. Where when I was younger there would be absolutely no need to have five canoes in your yard, but today it’s okay to have three vehicles when, and in our thinking you cannot possibly drive three vehicles or you know in other words you obviously you have a choice, but where material possessions and wealth seem to overtake the responsibility to share and the measure of success has changed from communal benefit to individual profit. So these are the conflicts that are recurrent within our community and the lives of people where even today I think that there’s a trend, we’re trending back to the more traditional value system because we’re recognizing that the value system that was being imposed upon this culture, which was not designed to fit or accommodate our culture is giving way to a desire or that spirit if you will, which is emerging to recognize that this is not right. This doesn’t work. It’s causing pain and illness and sickness and stress and a social trauma like I said whereby our people are beginning to recognize that this system of competitive individuals doesn’t fit because there is not enough to go around. So people are competing for less and that competitive mindset if you will is being rejected because it’s not right, but it’s taken the year since not long before ICWA, say 1975 Passamaquoddy vs. Norton where all this money came in. I remember as a young person the debate taking place in my father’s workshop where the elders that were elder then had been around the country to these various other locations, said to one another in their sharing with our people who they know never left that when this money comes in here it will ruin this place. Okay, so that’s, you know I heard these conversations. I heard other conversations in 1967, again in my father’s workshop. I owe my father everything for the knowledge that I have because I listened to those conversations when we were granted the right to have, the right to vote in 1967 when people said why would we want to do that. These people don’t even consider us as human beings you know the way they treat us. We can’t even, why would we want to do that. We should just stay right away from them and well, I remember these very personal conversations about these very important subjects. Now my father was not a political person, disliked politics in that sense, but our family, perhaps because my grandmother raised us and she was there all the time, even there’s a lot of activity constantly where people would come and have conversations. The tribe’s attorney at that time, Don Gellers, in the ‘60’s and ‘70’s frequented my father’s home. I remember him being a constant and I remember State Police coming, looking for my relatives, no, my relatives, yeah they were all hanging out together and all those stories that you read about in the Portland Press Herald. I heard about those things as they occurred. I heard the same stories. I heard them the same day they occurred because my family was there. My relatives were there on both sides of my family, on my mother’s side and my father’s side, and what did I, you know other things that I saw, that caused me to have these views about the State and the way they interact if you will or treat our people from the policy standpoint, my mother getting arrested protesting at Indian Township because the State wanted to cut off or just to cease meeting their obligation under their assumption of obligation to the tribe during Statehood. When Maine,
you know became a state they accepted Massachusetts treaty obligation to the tribe and they over you know several period of time attempted to get out of the deal so to speak and our people were protesting. I remember those days so those of us who grew up here and whose families were active in those areas have a view of the State. And now getting into the tribal state relations, and I’m kind of, you know, blending in through the other.

**CB:** I greatly appreciate the natural and evocative flow of the conversation that they do connect. It’s artificial to separate out the questions. I appreciate your ability to weave them so richly.

**FM:** Well good, I hope that it is working out that way.

**CB:** It’s incredibly powerful to be your witness to this experience and I really do appreciate your perspective and I am really keenly aware of how much you must have heard and how much you know and how much you’ve seen.

**FM:** We have a collective thought --

**CB:** Yeah.

**FM:** Those of us who are from here and like I said the difference is because we grew up next to each other. We grew up with very simple needs in our head and survived. There is not the competition or the encouragement to compete…

**CB:** As individuals.

**FM:** Yeah.

**CB:** Yeah.

**FM:** But with whom?

**CB:** Yeah, against whom?

**FM:** Against the people we grew up with.

**CB:** Right.

**FM:** And that is what causes distrust or suspicion, whatever you want to call it. So it’s the money.
CB: Yeah.

FM: Right, but it doesn’t need to be like that, so I started -- I’m getting away from where I just had gone.

CB: Sorry.

FM: That’s all right. I don’t who distracted who.

CB: I did, I did.

FM: But, about tribal state relations and I’m able to go from that to tribal state relations and where is child welfare in between. And I think, I’m trying to answer them all in one story I guess.

CB: I understand.

FM: And our value system that I keep speaking about, one that’s based on those principles that I mentioned earlier and when we started to have all of this money coming in and we started competing. People were literally left right out, and we often hear about this, you will hear perhaps somewhere along the line if people completely open with you there’s a tremendous amount of jealously within our communities.

CB: Yeah, we have heard that.

FM: Right, and so again I write about it and I try to write about it in a way that describes the cause. What is the real cause? Whose perspective are we putting forth or bringing out? You know whose perspective are these actions you know based on? And so I have to go back to the value system to say that it isn’t so much jealously as much as it is back to that social trauma, that hurt because we are not supposed to amass wealth. We’re not supposed to have more than my neighbor or to leave my neighbor without. I am not supposed to do that. That is not who we are any more than we should endeavor to catch the last fish or to kill the last rabbit before someone else does. We are supposed to leave them alone when they’re hurt or, and when they’re being hunted to near extinction or pursued or exploited to the point of collapse. You’re not supposed to do that. That is not who we are any more than we’re supposed to leave any of our people without or to ignore them or to let them walk down the road without giving them a ride, but then because of this competitive nature, this system of values encourages or promotes, we create these stressors within the community that are based, it’s not so much jealously as it is hurt. See, you are not supposed to succeed without sharing because our leaders were never recognized as being productive leaders based on how much they could amass, how big their house was or how many vehicles and toys they have. That was not the measure of success or ability on the part of leadership. It was based upon how they could derive benefit from the environment and share that with our community in a balanced way so that it’s self-sustaining. And I might be getting way off the track, you know the reality that other people are living in; however, when, so when I deal with this term of jealously it’s because our people were taught our people can live here who never left here, who would burn driftwood for firewood and
collect it that way and feed their family from their efforts associated with harvesting marine resources, subsistence. A subsistence culture to a commercialized culture that has been emphasized, if you will, or driven almost in line with the getting the competitive, the intensity of the competitiveness is, can be measured almost at the same rate of the growth of the population over the past one hundred years.

**CB:** Interesting.

**FM:** The more people there are, the more competition there is for a finite resource, so increased competition. We’re just competing; we’re no different than animals that they have bounties on. You know our environment is what they call, that they have bounties on them because they were in the way. Well they stopped putting bounties on us a few hundred years ago, but I asked you how far back does this go before you stop…trying to measure the injury and the origins of some of these occurrences you know that are taking place today. What is it based on? The fact that newcomer society arrived here for the, in part for the intended purpose of finding a new home, if you will, where they can be free to practice their religious beliefs everyone had, but then we’re probably overtaken with if you will, by people who saw opportunity, but came here to exploit. So the laws of the competing jurisdictions today are based on a grant of privilege to exploit. They’re not changed. They’re the same laws. They’re founded in the exact same principle of you know of which they originated. It’s all exploitation based whereas we are participation based. So there are these two collide, you know two cultural values that are constantly colliding and so within each society you have people who question what occurs in the State or you know in this case, the non-native society. We have recognized and continue to recognize that there are a number of good people like I said who perhaps originated from those who came here seeking a better way. That still exists as well. That was carried forward and I think that’s where some of the values that are constantly trying to balance out or you know the exploited side, often come to our people, and sometimes try to tell us what they think is best for us or ask us as you did in that question, what does the community need. It’s just balance, that’s what we need. So all right I think the, I believe that the hope for better relations between our people lies in education of one another’s culture, if that’s even possible, but also acceptance. On the one hand I see tremendous potential and hope for improved tribal state relations. I think you did ask me that, where do I see that going, but it has to be based on communication, understanding, and respect and --

**CB:** You mentioned having a vision and feeling that if you had the vision, if you imagined, could imagine it, it could then be true.

**FM:** Oh earlier on?
CB: Earlier. For your leadership and for your work here with your people and you may not be in a place where you’re able to speak to the shape of a vision that would encompass improved relationships. What would it look like? What would it feel like? Are there tangibles to it?

FM: Absolutely, you know…

CB: Yeah.

FM: Well --

CB: I want to go on and I don’t want to...

FM: Oh you could, you can because it won’t distract me or your batteries are going to go.

CB: No, my battery is good. I’m all plugged in. Everything is fine. I just have to make sure it doesn’t go to sleep. That’s why I keep looking at it.

FM: Right, right, so --

CB: That’s half the facts of life.

FM: Are there tangibles?

CB: Yeah, what does it look like? What does it feel like? How does it sound, a better relationship between the tribes and the State?

FM: A better understanding of oneself and acceptance in the knowledge of who we are.

CB: You’re talking about metacognition. You’re talking about people being aware enough to reflect on themselves?

FM: I have absolutely no idea.

CB: Yeah.

FM: But, being comfortable in one’s own skin.

CB: Okay, I like that better.

FM: Okay, like I said there is no better statement of support for an activity than its undertaking. We are Passamaquoddy, there is nothing wrong with that. So, we have to show people that literally, our young people what it mean, who we are, what we do and how we do it and why. Why do we do things in a certain way? Once we do that our young people, and it’s happening already, and I say it’s happening already because of our needs, when you had asked the need, or the needs of our community, of any community regardless of who they are or where they are, are centered around or based on a form of commerce, a universal religion, that’s the
right commerce. It doesn’t matter whether they’ve never been exposed to any society outside of their own. They have their own form of commerce and so the need to provide food and clothing and shelter and other necessities for one’s family or self, causes people to grow up and seek those things. When we explain to people about have a right to fish, to derive benefit from the resource through which they can provide their needs, they’re doing it within, and they can do it within the context of their cultural identity in a practice, which is normal and acceptable; however, it has to be done with balance so that we don’t become like those who would exploit something to the point of collapse. It has to be done with respect and acknowledgment of the other party to this story, which is the living creature that has eyes that looks back at you, that has a language and from our beliefs a spirit and that must be respected, so how do we do that. We have to find a way to balance our utilization or taking of that resource that, and we don’t even call it a resource, it’s a living creature, we’re taking it and sending it off to a concentration camp somewhere to be grown, you know and trying that. So we struggle with that and then through our own value system and our spiritual connection to that, which is spoken about openly and then codified into a management plan, which prohibits us from taking more than we’re able to put back. So we develop a plan, using eels for example, 575 permits issued to our members to take eels, and these are small amounts by and large, but they are opportunities for people to feed their families and connect themselves to their culture, to the water, and so we designed a plan to grow these eels and to put them back above these obstructions to their passage because of the high mortality rate that these young eels experience. Upwards of 97 percent of these glass eels, if you will, don’t make it. So we, in the first year, have to take 10 percent of what we catch, grow them out and put them --

CB: Higher above.

FM: Above, as a result more eels will make it above the obstruction than would have had we not taken any. [knocking] excuse me… Sharing our approach to if you will management of various activities we often find ourselves in conflict with approaches to management and, which often are seen as impediments if you will to everyday life as a tribal member and conflict with our culture and our rights so we understand that in today’s environment - political environment, competitive environment - it is not enough to demand recognition of our right and so we’ve, through this process we have transformed our thinking if you will, our entire thought processes is to recognizing that, this isn’t about our rights, this is about our responsibility as native people and so we have taken a different tack if you will. Rather than pounding on the podium and demanding our rights, we can speak to the world and demand that we all adhere to our responsibilities as human beings to not destroy the environment. We can be invigorated by our desire and our responsibility to provide a voice like we said earlier, in the same context that we would provide equal consideration or a voice to those yet to come. We have an equal responsibility to those other living beings within our life cycle. So the challenges that we faced have actually helped us whereas we could constantly you know clamor for our rights and/or benefits, it’s actually caused us to recognize the strength in truth.
And the truth as we know it is valid because we are finding that there are many people who agree with us. So it doesn’t have to be adverse. If it is adverse for us and competing jurisdictions, it’s equally adverse within those jurisdictions.

**CB:** Right.

**FM:** And so we need to pick battles that we can win, but we need to not only that, we shouldn’t pick a battle simply because we think we can win it. We need to pick the right battles. We need to pick the battles that need to be won. That are best for everybody and so my, if you said you know what is a vision, you know how do you describe it, and it starts from within one’s self. And then the way in which we treat one another within this community and I have found and we have experienced that within the surprisingly short amount of time we are able to make those changes and so when we continue to pursue that line of thinking, greater opportunities come for more change. And eventually we are no longer, like I said, pounding on the podium complaining about things as much as we are reminding people. So that the tribe as a group, as an entity and our individual people can start to take ownership of who they are and rather than be demoralized or disadvantaged economically, legally or whatever, all of a sudden start to find themselves on the high moral ground and that is the ground that we can claim if we adhere to our value system. (Inaudible 51:33.7). I’m not even sure whether or not that is even close to what you are looking for.

[END OF RECORDING]