



Native Perspectives on Sustainability: Roberta Conner (Cayuse)

Interviewee: Roberta “Bobbie” Conner

Interviewer: David Hall

Date: 9/25/2007

Transcriber: Brianna Finney

DH: Well, thank you, Ms. Bobbie Conner, we appreciate you taking the time with us today. As you know from our other communications, this project is about the subject of sustainability from the perspective of Native leaders, and our aim today is to hear from you on the subject. So if we could start, please, with you telling us a bit about yourself in terms of where’s home for you, a bit about your heritage, and the focus of your work.

BC: Sure. I am from right here, in Cayuse country. My ancestors all come from the Columbia River drainage. They have lived for thousands of years in villages along the Snake and its tributaries, and the Columbia and its tributaries, as far away as Hurricane Creek in the Wallowas and up into the Palouse country, and down river as far as the Cathlamet. So kind of a big triangle. My ancestor’s tribes would now be known as Cayuse, Umatilla and Nez Perce. Most of my upbringing was centered right here in the Umatilla Reservation. I’ve lived in lots of places. I’ve lived in Coulee Dam, Washington, near the Colville Reservation. I’ve lived on the Warm Springs Reservation in Oregon. I’ve lived in Portland, Denver, Salem, Seattle, Washington DC, Eugene. But most of the important things in my life have happened right here; this area of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, or the ceded lands, around here.

My job, as director of Tamástslikt Cultural Institute, is provide leadership, and direct the marketing, and the finance, and staffing of this 20 million dollar project that is designed to do three things: to contribute to the tribe’s economy, to tell a more accurate story of our history than has ever been told before, and to help perpetuate our cultural knowledge well into the future. So, that means I get to work with academic scholars, tribal elders, museum professionals, interns, students, lay volunteers, to do any of the projects that are pursuant to those goals.

My premier interest in my job is that which is the most important topic personally to me, and that is family history, and every tribe is a compilation of family histories. We have descended from common ancestors, and we are interrelated now in the Columbia River Plateau in a way that belies our origins. We are divided up by arbitrary reservation boundaries pursuant to the treaty process that don’t reflect our aboriginal ways of sharing, and reciprocity, and trade, and travel. So my ancestors were all related; I have relatives on the Warm Springs, Yakama, Nez Perce and Colville Reservations.

(4:15)

DH: Wonderful. Later, I’ll ask more questions about “your community.” I’m wondering if you can help us gain a sense about what you identify with as “your community” in terms of people and places.

BC: Okay, well, I'll start very nuclear. My immediate nuclear family includes 7 cats, 2 dogs, 7 horses in my household. My family used to have 6 siblings, have 4 now. Used to have 12 aunts and uncles, and have 2 now, three maybe. So, my sense of community starts, as with all of us, egocentrically, and goes out from there—from my immediate family to my kinship system, which is about 125 people. I have about 36 first cousins and siblings on my mother's side. So, that is sort of the *nucleus* of the sense of community I have. It goes in concentric circles from there, to all of the families of the Cayuse, Umatilla, Walla Walla, and especially Wallowa Band Nez Perce. Then out from there to our relatives of the John Day River Basin, the White Swan and Satus area. From my nuclear family in that community—the majority of my nuclear family live in our homeland, in the ceded areas. In that sense, the community that thrives, or doesn't, include all of the species that are supposed to be here.

Our people have been sustained in this homeland; this group of ancestors that we descend from have been sustained by all of the animal and plant relatives in the homeland. So, the community that I belong to includes all of those two-leggeds that are familial and kin, as well as all of the relatives in the universe that's supposed to be here. As we as we get farther and farther from here, and change climates, and change geography, the species that are supposed to be represented begin to change. So, when we leave freshwater and go to saltwater, that kingdom changes. But the community that we work to protect and restore and sustain really includes, according to our teachings, all of the things that sustain and give life. So, it starts with water and air and sunshine, and moves right on through the entire ecosystem.

The family of animals, the families of plants, or communities of plants, in many ways have seen the same kind of disruptions that our two legged families have seen over the last couple hundred years. So, the community if we look at it as a social fabric, including all of those other species, has really been torn and ripped and fringed and has holes in it now. And so, when I think about community, I think it's not just indigenous people, it's all of the people who live here now, and all of the species who should be here as well as those that are present. Because that is the communal connection. That is the natural order of things.

(10:43)

DH: You've used the word "sustain" a few times. "Sustainability" is a word that is being used by a lot of people now who are seeking to address economic, social and environmental challenges. This is a word that you use, yes?

BC: Yes, not so much in the environmental, conservation, ecosystem sense. The part that I think is so interesting about the word "sustain," is sustenance. The roots of the word have to do with giving life and livability. Not in any organized sense that represents coalitions of modern peoples, but in the sense that there was a natural order, and nature sometimes re-sequences that order all of its own accord, whether it's an earthquake, or hurricane, or a tornado. There is an order to things, there is a balance to things, and that balance is sustaining. If things are out of balance, we have difficult times. Because, when there is nothing else for the cougar to eat he is going to eat what's available. And when there's nothing else for bear to eat he's going to move and eat what's available. Same with wolf, or coyote, or us. So, when we get out of balance things can no longer be sustained. I think about it in that very elemental sense of survival. It's not a *brand* of behavior.

When I think about the behaviors that humans have to have that go with sustainability,

fundamentally it's about respect and honor. It's about how much we appreciate all forms of life, and if, in taking the life of a cedar root to make a basket we are disrespectful, and wasteful, and spoil it, and don't make something of it that is useful, and well made, we've disrespected the life we've taken. If we don't use all of the parts of the animal that's hunted, the hide and the horns, if we just take things for trophy or sport, then we are not doing things respectfully. We are not honoring the life that's been given to us when the elk died, or when the deer died, or whatever life we've taken. It seems to me that understanding sustainability is about the necessary balance required for survival. For human behaviors it's about honor and respect.

I find it interesting that bears, and coyotes, and all kinds of creatures, co-inhabit spaces without the violent interactions that happen once humans are introduced to that, and sort of start categorizing, and creating paradoxes, and juxtaposed positions of what belongs where. I think it's because we mess up their balance, we change the equation in a way that's not sustainable for them. So, I look at codes, or mores, or ethics that have to do with sustainability and I can only trace them back to the idea that if we don't respect the gifts the creator has given us, and you don't respect yourself, then how will you respect everything else that will come in your life, and that you will *take* in your life? So, for me sustainability is not so much about economics, although ultimately it becomes that, it's about balance. It's dangerous to make it too complicated; biodiversity and a lot of the language that goes with the challenges of keeping the entire ecosystem operating, there's great complexity there. (16:00)

I look at animals in the wild and I see their behaviors of reciprocity. I have my own sort of entertainment because I live up on top of Cabbage Hill. I watch my Appaloosa stud look at a cow elk at my water trough. And he's looking at it and kind of smelling the air, thinking, 'what am I supposed to do with this? This isn't my species, its drinking out of my trough, she better not try and eat my hay.' He's a little puzzled, but he just gives it safe passage, he gives it its space and it drinks and licks the salt lick, and goes back down the canyon. I watch when the coyotes don't come within a certain boundary of the house. We don't kill them but my dogs don't allow them to come near the house because they eat the cats. So there is a perimeter that they have safe passage and then beyond that it's not safe passage, they get chased. And a few cats have been sacrificed. They have their own order of things and they understand how to give each other their own due. I watch when a new highway lane is added and we blast on the freeway to make room for that new highway lane and we disrupt elk calving in the canyon. Well it takes years for that to be reestablished, if it is even reestablished. So, we've upset the balance of things. For me it's no longer a place where they can sustain the calving activity because it's been disrupted, it's out of balance. Highway construction, and pouring tar, and putting in new culverts, is more important than the calving season. So, it is disrespect, we've disrespected where they live. I don't have any fancy thoughts about it beyond the fact that we tend as human not to be humble enough, not to be careful enough.

Where economics comes into play is with the commodification of resources. So when water becomes a commodity that has to be sold in bottles and it can't be consumed at its natural source. When oxygen bars are necessary in Southern California. All of the accoutrements of economics that say 'we've messed it up, we've spoiled it, so now we have to do it a new way.' We've commodified water to death; we've sentenced it to its own death sometimes. That commoditization says then that people have the right to fight over it. So that's where water fights come from, the idea that it's my resource not yours. I'm not saying economics are bad, I'm just saying balance is still necessary. I don't know which economic principles to apply to make that seem true, but it's clear that industrialization came at a cost to nature, and the

heartbeat of industrialization is the commodity, the idea of product being singularly important. So, I don't have an architecture in my head for how sustainability gets manifested today, except to say that fundamentally if we have no humility, respect, or honor and no balance then we don't really know what we're talking about.

(20:11)

DH: Can you say more about humility, what you mean by that?

BC: (laughter) Well, I've always found it fascinating...we see it a lot in Indian Country where people assume that inside the tribe we don't have a sense of world class; or, we don't have our own sense of what's remarkable; or, we don't have our own definitions of things. We're not surprised, but we are often subjected to opportunities with outside consultants, where they're going to define things for us, and give us the parameters and definitions. That works if they come with humility to the situation. Take off their expert hat, and say, 'I'm here to listen and learn and understand and then maybe I'll share what I know, if it helps, and we'll see where we go together.' The same is true about nature, how we tackle tasks on the landscape. How much square footage is necessary to sustain a family, do we need 6,000 square foot mega- mansions for a husband and wife and two child, and six cars, including the RV? That takes more water and electricity than maybe those 4 people have need for. There's no humility in doing that. There's no humility in over-building, overpopulating over taxing a landscape. (22:06)

My grandmother told me, she said, 'I'm just a happy, humble river Indian.' It didn't mean she didn't have pride, and it didn't mean that she didn't have standards, it just meant that she didn't put on airs, she didn't pretend to know more than she knew, and she didn't pretend to tell the rest of the world how they should live. She certainly had expectations of her family (laughter), but that was different. I think that, her humility--she was very tough, she was very gentle, and very strong--but her humility came in the fact that she worked hard every single day of her life to create and have the balance in her life that she needed in her marriage with her children, raising a family during the depression (*interruption-23:09*).

It's not hard to think of personal up-close examples; it's harder to think of how things apply globally. I guess that's the thing that's amazing to me. There's a state of grace that is about humility, it's a reflection of honor, respect and humility. You can't achieve or be at or enjoy that state of grace if you haven't agreed to be humble. To be a part of this world rather than to pretend that you run this world, or that you make the world around you happen. You're a part of it; you're not in charge of it. That doesn't mean you can't be a catalyst, and that doesn't mean you can't be a change agent, but you do not dictate or provide the dogma by which all else things function.

For me, to look at so many systems of values that have been imposed *externally*, here on Indian people, there have been many, many layers. We have chosen in our early contact with Euro-Americans which things we would accept and adopt and adapt to our way of use, and we've also chosen to reject or ignore the existence of some. That worked for a while, but it began to fail. We couldn't ignore when people were plowing up land and making claims, and squatting, and mining. At that point, the people who were doing that had no honor or respect towards the Native people here. It's not that that weren't people who had honor and respect, there were individuals who did, but as the westward migration grew, the idea that people had a right, that they had the right to have dominion, not only over the land, and animals and plants

species, but dominion over other people was a representation of a total lack of humility and a total lack of honor. It also is a reflection of how needy they were. When people get that needy they're greedy and it's not a good thing. So, I think that's kind of the foundation of our Western relationship going South; that neediness and greediness. People coming here who has been prosecuted and persecuted elsewhere who felt that they had no prospects except here, and when they got here and saw such enormous prospects, a little wasn't enough. They couldn't take just what they needed, just like the mega-mansion people can't have just what they need, they need more. And that consumptive behavior throws things out of balance.

(27:13)

DH: If you're in a position where you're speaking with someone who is unfamiliar with the concept of sustainability at all, are there things that you tell them to help them understand the basic idea, in terms of an analogy or story that you might share with them?

BC: I'll give you a business example. The Tamástslikt Cultural Institute is a fabulous, beautiful facility. It was built with perhaps the most complex HVAC system of any building in our region, and unfortunately it was built with the largest air handlers in the places we needed them the least and the smallest air handlers where there were greater needs, the least variable controls in places where we needed more variable control. As a consequence, (this building is now going on 11 years old), we've been open for 10 years, and we have been working to retrofit and re-commission this building. So changing out the way the soffits are constructed, changing to variable frequency drives, changing our boiler system, cooling towers, all of the pipes. Changing all of that so we are cutting our energy consumption in half, is the beginning of a process here where it's not just what it looks like, it has to be about how it functions. And it's not just a function of the price tag or the utility bill; it's that we have to practice what we preach. So the idea that we can change our energy consumption: we're working on changing our lighting fixtures down to those that have the lowest emissions, the lowest UV consequences for our artifacts and the lowest usage of watts, *and* long-term durability. We have the goal of taking our energy consumption in the facility as low as possible. Then when we have it as low as we can possibly get it, using alternate sources of energy to run this place. That won't happen overnight, but we have to be headed in that direction because that is what our culture says we should do. It's also good for the budget, but it's what the culture says we should do. If we're going to build a big building like this, we should not make it an energy hog, we should use common sense, and all of the modern technology to make it as smart of building as we possibly can. That is an application of cultural standards to a modern business setting. Question again?

(30:30)

DH: Yeah, you're describing the idea of sustainability to someone who is unfamiliar with it.

BC: Let's see, that is an example of something we're doing...So, we're talking about how to describe sustainability to someone...well, I guess I think about my nieces and nephews, you know, third and fourth graders, people who visit here, and I think about the idea of camping. Not many people camp the way people used to camp when I was a kid. The idea of low impact camping is the closest thing I can get to sustainable behavior as a code. The idea that you pack

out what you pack in. That you don't ever take more than you need and that your needs are balanced with the needs of others. So that when you're camping, you know that everybody has to eat out of the same pot of stew. So you have to make sure that there's enough to go around. You can't come into camp first and take three bowls full and leave none for the rest coming in. You can't camp in a place for very long if you kill all of the game near you, and leave nothing for future years for breeding purposes, propagation.

So I think about little kids and I think about the idea of sustainability, and they come here and they see buckskin dresses and think, 'oh those are really cool clothes.' They look at eagle feathers, and baskets, and tule mats, and they don't look at those objects and see that something gave its life in order for those things to be made. So the idea for me of explaining sustainability is the idea that some life has been sacrificed to a new use and a new purpose. When you explain to children this is a beautiful eagle feather, and not many people have the privilege of wearing eagle feathers, but that our people didn't ever kills eagles for the purpose of taking their feathers. They are the most honorable, and respected, and venerated bird. We might harvest feathers from them; we might set up a blind and pluck feathers from an eagle's tail, but not kill an eagle for its feather. When we kill a deer we're not killing a deer just for its skin. We're killing it because we've, one, asked permission; two, communicated with the spirit world and the animal spirit about that taking or harvesting; and, then use the hide in a way that would show honor so that people would know that we respect the deer and his/her skin because we've used it in a beautiful way. For me, most children have to have a physical manifestation, something tangible, as an example and those are concepts of sustainability. You can talk about water rights and they're not going to understand it. You can talk about anadromous travels of salmon, and they might or might not get it. But if you talk about the things they enjoy and admire, and try to make it clear that that was a sacrifice of something else, then maybe you begin the dialogue about sustainability. It's an entry point, that's all it is...

Here's another historic example and I guess these are more snapshots than descriptions. When the Fort Dalles soldiers wanted the Indians to leave the area around the vicinity of Celilo, where my great grandmother used to live, they decided that they should pour out all of the Indians food. Take all of their caches of preserved foods and dump them into the river, and that would force them to leave because they would not have food to stay there. They could not be sustained in that place without supplies. Thus, dumping their food in the river would force them to go elsewhere. They had lived there for thousands of years, they had been sustained by the fish that came there every year, they were sustained by the trade and travel in that region, and they were sustained by the changing seasons and all the gifts that came with it. That was a recognition by the US Army that we could not sustain ourselves without our food preserves. So that was getting to the heart of the matter, without killing us, without a specific attack, or a violent confrontation. That was the way to go to the heart of our sustainability was to get rid of everything that we had gathered, harvested and stored over the 6-8 months, to make us go away.

(laughter) That makes me think of other historic examples. I think about the idea that when our people got the horse 300 years ago, our people knew that you couldn't over graze a landscape, that you had to keep those horses moving. So their horses moved with them seasonally, and if they did go on a seasonal migration, somebody else stayed if they left horses here, to move them around the landscape. It was never okay to over-graze, or over drink a source of water, or food. We knew that about livestock when they came after the horse. We are not shepherders; sheep are really hard on the landscape. That roller they use as a compacting machine, it's called a sheep's foot, it does a thorough job because it's compaction to a very small

fine point. I think about sustainability and I think about land that has been subjected to intense grazing.

This is not my area of expertise, but I think about the consequences of trying to rebuild an environment that's sustainable. The first thing we had to do before we could put fish back in the Umatilla River was there had to be water in the riverbed, there was none. When I graduated from high school, the Umatilla River was nearly dry at the end of the summer, harvest season, there was hardly any water in it. So we had to put water back in the river, and the tribes negotiated with irrigators and others—they had a mutual interest, to put water in the river. But we haven't just reintroduced Salmon to the Umatilla River, we've reintroduced Lamprey, and people say, "why would you do that, don't they eat juvenile's?" But don't they have a right to? Who says they don't have a right to? We're not a one species kind of tribe. We're buffalo hunters, as well as other kinds of game. We are working on reintroduction of river mussels. Two of the species that lived in our river lived to be 80 and 100 years old. You think about all of the stories that must go with that time frame. So we work on the river to get water and then we work on these species, and what happens is somehow, the black bear population begins to rebound, cougar population begins to rebound, the osprey is growing by great numbers, and there's actually not just golden eagles but bald eagles that come with that. So you begin to wonder, 'okay, what else is missing?' If you just fix the river what other consequences are there?

A more entertaining example, for me, is the golf course. This entire vast landscape was a pothole marshland. These wheat farmers know where all the pothole marshes were that have now been plowed through smoothed out and terraced by now. This is a pothole marshland and in this pothole marshland animals knew where to live to find water. So lo and behold, we put in an 18-hole Championship Golf course that has water features in a pothole marshland and what comes back? Yellow headed blackbirds, curlews, all kinds of things. And the superintendent decides to introduce indigenous bees to help pollinate what needs to be happening there at the golf course. So, you begin to think, okay, we've got the bees, we've got all of these species coming in, now what are we missing? Well, how's the otter population, how's the beaver population? The beaver population is rebounding too, and that's fascinating because when the Hudson's Bay Company was in competition with the American fur companies, their goal was to make this a fur desert, and I think they came close. The otter's still coming back, but you begin to see that putting that one life giving source back in the riverbed, water, changed the dynamic for all sorts of other things in the ecosystem. I'm not sure what it is but I know what it isn't. A dry riverbed is not the foundation of an ecosystem. When I think about sustainability, I think about: you can't make a journey of 1,000 miles without water. Maybe someone can, Forrest Gump. You have to have water, you have to have air and you have to have some kind of sustenance.

When you see a riverbed without water in it, it's a sad story. I think a sadder story is global warming and the consequence it has for our sacred foods. That's a much more global look. Our sacred foods, our first foods grow at all different elevations at different times of the year. So the first foods that we celebrate, and honor, and give thanks for, are the wild celery plants that come back in the spring in the foothills and the lowlands. Those are usually about February. Then we pass through the seasons: so there will be spring Chinook, spring fishing, and we'll go into the rest of the roots and berries over the summer, and hunting and fall runs of fish. When my grandmother was a child, about 100 years ago, they were still traveling by horseback, about 6-8 months out of the year, about 1000 miles a year, and it was not a large convoy, it was a small pack of travelers. She, and her sister, and her father, and her aunt, and those earliest years her uncle, and they would travel with her cat and her dog. (Domestic cats are

a new thing to us still at that time.) They traveled 1,000 miles every year by horseback gathering and preserving foods. They would make their way out of here, down over towards Catherine Creek outside of Baker. They'd go over to into the Snake River country and make their way all the way back around to where the Tri-Cities are now and come home. It was sustainable for a variety of reasons, one of which, they never stayed anywhere long enough to kill a place. Two, all of the people who traveled on that system understood reciprocity. So, they didn't take all of their heaviest equipment, they left it right where they used it by the stream bed; pounding stones, grinding stones, and it was there when they went back the following year. No one stole it. The tenets in that life way are that you always have to leave some; you never take all of anything. You always leave some berries because bears eat berries, other animals eat berries, birds eat berries and there have to be some berries to feed next year's harvest. The same with salmon, or sage grouse, or anything you're taking for sustenance; you can't take all of it. The root diggers are very conscientious about never over harvesting. When people used to camp by the 100's in the big Camas prairies in Idaho, Oregon, and Montana, they had systems. This is where the people who camp on this side work in this area. The people who camp on this side work in this area. They might share a lot during that season of camping there together, but there was a system of understanding of what was necessary to leave enough for the next year, to leave enough for other people, and other species. I guess that's really fundamentally where sustainability must begin: how much do you really need? How much does one person or one family really need?

49:27

DH: You've offered a lot of imagery in what you've shared in your responses so far. I'm wondering if there are any images or symbols that stand out for you that represent sustainability in some integral, core way. If so, I'd like to ask you to draw that image for us, if you would entertain that.

BC: To physically draw that? (*Yeah*) Oh no, there's no way (laughter). I'm better with words. I think about the Wallowa Mountains. It was about 14 years ago. I rode a little filly I had up into the mountains, just her and my dog and I. The three of us girls went to one of the glacial lakes up in the mountains. And we encountered a couple of people coming down, which was kind of exciting because there was a backpacker with a *big* square backpack, and he looked very alien to my horse, and she was really scared of it. But we got past him and there were not very many travelers high on the trail. We went about 5 hours up-we started really early in the morning-by about 1:00 we'd been traveling for at least 5 hours up. There was a beautiful meadow right next to a beautiful little lake. I was hot and tired, so I let the horse graze, and the dog went to drink out of the lake, and I had a water and lunch packed with me. I took my boots and socks off and rolled up my pants and stuck my feet in the lake, because I knew it would be ice cold and thought it'd really be refreshing. But while I sat there with my feet in the lake, wondering how safe it was to drink the water-because when I was growing up there were streams we could and did drink out of, up at Hurricane Creek and up at Surprise Lakes on Mount Adams-I wondered how clean the water was. While I was sitting there kind of looking, trying to figure out how much algae there might be in a lake that was that cold, and what else might be living there, this little performance started, and it was all of these fish jumping, it was like a party. They were just unfettered, uninhibited, having a big time all by themselves, and there was nobody there to catch

them. And it was wonderful. That's sustainable, that's a picture of sustainability to me: the idea that something can be plentiful and not have to be counted and commodified, and harvested and sold. Its bounty can be enjoyed without harvesting it. It can simply be and not be necessary to take it, for me that's a really strong image of sustainability. The other image of course is just being able to drink out of a clear mountain stream and not get Giardia or anything else-toxicity. Those are very strong images for me of sustainability; clear, clean water is just so fundamental. Because that's what salmon live in, that's what mussels, and lamprey and everything else lives in and drinks from. So, I think about that, and I think if there's only a future in bottled water, then we've already been too compromised. We've already given up too much. And what price have we paid? I think that was a marvelous, marvelous day, and the amazing thing about that trip, that 10 hour horse ride--I'm not supposed to collect them because it's national forest land-but I collected 18 different colors of Indian paintbrush on that trip. That's the mineralogy and the soil of that glacial terrain. So there's school bus gold here, and honeysuckle color, pink or lavender at another elevation, and at every elevation there was a different shade of Indian Paintbrush. I thought 'wow, everybody thinks they're one color.'

The other image I have of sustainability is just childhood memory: my great aunt was born on Mount Adams during huckleberry season, August, early August. We used to go every year, she and her sister, my grandmother, and they would go and camp up at Mount Adams and pick Huckleberries for 2 weeks. There are lots of vivid memories from that. One year when we were camping, we found wild strawberries. Wild strawberries are very tiny, and at certain elevations, and they are a deep, deep red. When they are ripe, they are more intense than a cube of sugar. They're just incredibly lush tiny little berries. I remember as a kid having the thought, 'who put this here?' because I didn't know there was a wild strawberry. I only knew about the introduced kinds. I think my grandmother told me, 'well, God made them.' It wasn't really to dismiss me; it was the idea that these were gifts from the creator. I think that may have been the first time I realized that these were part of the big gift. I don't think I'd entertained the concept before then. But those strawberries to me where a sign of that untrammelled landscape that gave them the freedom to be, and grow right where they were, right in our path. I think we found two and ate one, we had to share it. We looked for more, and didn't find any.

(57:56)

--break--

(Off recording conversation about the difficulties of today and the structure of the interview, with the next segment being a vision of a sustainable future.)

DH: Yeah, so the idea of this next segment is to move beyond that and think about what's the alternative.

BC: Yeah, that's what I'm thinking about...I guess the thing I get stuck in is the *how* to get there, when we have other kinds of toxicity now that's toxifying brains. Methamphetamines and ingesting just radically horrible chemicals and what that does to our teeth and membranes and all the soft tissues. And I think about that, and how do we get past meth, and other substance abuse, and all the involuntary consumptions of toxics?

DH: That's the nice part about this segment, you don't have to worry about the *how*, you can just kind of focus on the *there*.

BC: My mind just kind of goes to that I guess.

DH: Yeah, and that's the third segment, is *how*. We can go back to that. Now allow yourself to be free with a vision of a sustainable future for your community. What would that look like?

(2:28)

BC: I guess a sustainable future to me, requires us not to live in sort of our own newly invented urban life, like housing projects, but in small pods, like villages used to be. So that no particular landscape is too taxed by humans. And there's lots of space between each of those pods to the next pod, so that people can grow things as well as grow their minds in that environment. I think about one of our deceased leaders from here, who talked about roads being out of the river bottoms. That's an important part of a sustainable future. The river belongs where the river belongs. Everything else doesn't have to be there. People want to live next to the river and that has to be done in a sustainable way. I think about roads and industry being out of river bottoms. Public transportation being a rural function not just an urban function. I guess I think about something along the lines of modular, and kit homes, and cabins being sized to livability, to sustainability. And water usage being scaled to that in the idea that there's a code that you don't take more than you need. This is probably not something I should say, but I'm willing to give up showers and baths and daily hair washing so that horses have water to drink (laughter). I won't give up cleanliness, but in order for horses to have water to drink, if I had to give something up, I'd give it up, because people aren't the most important thing in the universe. We're not more important than other things. So I guess I think about the sustainable future means that we balance human's interest with other species' interests. So that means that in the future there'd be a whole lot more species free to be populating the landscape than we're comfortable with now. We always have to have a way to mediate beaver over-population when they decide that they've taken up a streambed and they're going to run the place. But that can be managed, we can live with that. I guess I'm getting snapshots again; I'm not getting the whole picture.

(6:00)

DH: Keep sharing those snapshots as they come to you. Can you say more about that co-inhabitation with other species?

BC: Sure. I get amazed how long Indians have lived in bear country and don't have bear attack stories. We have vast oral histories, and the only agreement we have in our culture to not eat a certain meat is cougar, because cougar broke the agreement from the animal council. When humans were going to be new on this landscape, and coyote asked the animals if they would teach these people how to live here, the animals agreed-and salmon was first-that they would teach us about this place that we live, and show us how to live, and give themselves to us to help us learn that. And in kind, we have to be good to them, respect them, honor them, show them our respect to continue that relationship. But cougar didn't agree, and he attacked and ate a human. We don't eat cougar meat for that reason. That's the only such anomaly in that

agreement for us. So I think about when I had a bear-maybe 180 maybe 220 pound cinnamon bear living up where I lived. The reason he was living there was because somebody was dumping deer carcasses from the road kill off the freeway in a pile by the cottonwood trees on my road to my house. That was like a party invitation with a map to the bear. 'Oh, here's where I'm going to live. Lunch is free and easy to get.' And then I guess he hibernated there, and they spotted him in the spring. He apparently relocated, they stopped doing that, and he relocated. But I think about him as my neighbor. I have a porcupine that I see now and then. I think about sustainability...where I live, on 352 acres of mice, and skunks, and hawks, and deer, and coyotes, and elk. When I go home at night, there's a lot of deer on both sides of the road. My only goal is to stop and convince them to go away from the freeway. With the porcupine, my only goal is let him turn around and go back up the fence line because I don't want porcupine quills in my horse's nose. I don't care if he lives there, I just don't want to have the problem with the nose. He has a right to be there, that porcupine has every right to be there. The skunk has a right to be there as long as he's not living in my garage. So, they can be in my backyard they just can't be in the buildings. (9:51) I guess I think about that and I think that's why I love where I live. Not just in my homeland on my reservation, in a place where I have no human neighbors very close. I love it because I get to watch my neighbors the porcupine, the elk, the deer, the coyote, the skunk, the hawk, the meadowlark, I get to watch them. They're a part of my everyday life. And that to me is what sustainability should be about. They have as much right to cross the road as I do, and they have as much right to be there as I do. The only challenge is I would prefer that more mule deer and less whitetail deer come (laughter)...when it's hunting season. I don't begrudge them their right to be there, and that's the part where I get caught up in the tenseness between Indian and non-Indian relationships.

A lot of people have tried to escape the inner-city challenges of California and moved to Idaho. Looking for a corner of the world where they can raise their children in a school, in a church, according to their beliefs, without the challenges of gangs and things that they don't to be a part of their children's lives. That's all Indians wanted, that's all we wanted. Was a way to continue to live the way we had lived according to our laws when the new people came here. So I think about that tension between people looking now to escape those things, and I think, we weren't looking to escape our homeland we just wanted to have our homeland as we'd always had it, and to be able to live in our homeland as we had always lived in it, and that meant everything else should be able to live here too. (12:04) I guess that's what a sustainable picture is for me: is the idea of other species having equal rights. Some sense of parity with human beings, that human beings don't have dominion over everything.

The idea of personal property ownership, in many ways, rather than collective stewardship, is the foundation of the idea of deciding what's going to be here and what's not going to be here. There's a videographer from the University of Montana, Missoula, who captured a bear sitting in a huckleberry field, just by the bush, just eating berries, and a coyote walks through the frame. He looks at the coyote, and the coyote stops and looks at him, the coyote kind of sniffs the berries, the bear goes back to eating berries, and the coyote continues on. There was no bear attack. I think that's what it's about. We've had some funny illustrations here with water (the little stream in the Living Culture Village). Before this field is harvested, there's deer that live out here in this wheat field. We had a fawn this year, and we've had one in previous years. But the magpies, and other ornery birds, like to sit up in these poles, and we had a fawn that was trying to come in here (before we put the deer fence up) and drink at night. It got all the way in and it would get chased out by these birds. One of the tepees was closer to the

water, and that poor little fawn turned around to run away from the birds and ran straight into the tepee, which I'm sure was immediate claustrophobia, and then it had to fly out of the tepee and take off back into the field. It was fun to sit here and watch. We have resident pheasants that have taken up occupancy here, and a few other critters that sort of moved in. It's fascinating to watch them at play with each other. These birds harass each other to no end; sometimes you can even hear them... We have very graphic stories about skunk, and eagle, and coyote, competing for the affection of one beautiful woman. When you get to watch that interaction of species all the time, you can imagine the genesis of those stories, because they're pretty entertaining to watch. I've watched animals fight over shiny things (laughter). It's pretty fascinating. (15:50)

When I imagine what I would hope it would be like 100 years from now, for example, I would hope we could sit here and not hear the freeway. I cannot imagine how we get there, but I'd love it if what we were eating didn't come from more than a 100 or 150 miles away, because I think a lot of the trouble we have is the transportation of goods that we have. The commoditization again, and the distribution systems associated with it. If I could only eat strawberries when they were in season because I got them only from within this homeland, to me that's what a sustainable future should be about. If I have to go to China to eat a certain food, then so be it, I may never eat it. I'd rather that than growing the trucking industry. I'm not sure how it rates in terms of cleanliness, but since the backbone is there, I wish the railroad, which used to serve this town, still served this town, because we used it heavily. It was a form of public transportation that didn't require jet fuel. We lobbied, we tried to help get the train passenger service reintroduced here, but to no avail. I'm struggling to think about what else it's about because now I'm stuck with those pictures of all of those animals (laughter). I go off on that tangent pretty easy.

(17:56)

DH: So, they'll be lots of animals in the sustainable future (laughter)...

BC: Yeah. Well, what's funny to me about it is, I think when other people think about it that they get a Disney-esque, Bambi kind of idea. I'm not romantic like that. I've watched animals eat other animals. I've lived in 100-year flood plains that flooded three times in 10 years. I know that it's possible to have violent re-ordering of things, compliments of nature. Mother Nature, our earth, shakes things up all of her own accord, and I think that's okay. I think that's good. That is the best reminder. When I worked on disaster duty while working in California, we had quite a portfolio of loans from disasters. I always enjoyed it to some degree-not all of the pain that it caused other people so much, and discomfort, for animals too-but I enjoyed the fact that there was a reminder that people weren't in charge of the universe. No matter where you build a freeway or a football stadium, Mother Nature can still reorganize that for you, and you don't get to whine about it, it's the way things are. I guess I get a certain amount of pleasure out of it because it's kind of like when you're a child and someone pulls you up short and says, 'pay attention.' That's what she's doing. And if they don't, then she has to scold them again. I don't think of it as a punitive God, or a form of punishment, I just think of it as a gentle scolding, gentle reminders, and sometimes they are not very gentle.

I guess the thing that I think in the future that I would love to see for our people, especially, is that we could live long lives, diabetes free, drug free, and not have the incidence of cancer that we are succumbing to now because of the toxicities. So our people would be healthy,

and that physical health would be manifested in spiritual health as well. We'd become whole again.

For me, more children would know the names of the creeks and streams and canyons, valleys and hilltops on this landscape because they would have intimate relationships with it by walking on it, or praying on it, or visiting it, or camping in it with their families. That's not very common now. Maybe that's it, maybe that's the difference between the past and today and tomorrow, is that we aren't very intimate with our landscape, and with the other species anymore in our knowledge. And the more intimate and familial our knowledge is of landscapes and species, then it's no longer an impersonal destruction that we're involved in. It's a personal reconstruction, a personal restoration. I think that's how you value it, that it's known to you in a familiar way, and you come to value it. The idea that you value it comes from first an acquaintance, and then an understanding, and then a deep knowledge of that place and everything that belongs there. When you have that, then sustainability I think is a natural outgrowth of that, or by product. I think about how an animal never wants to soil where it lives. Watch how birds and everything sort of functions, and they don't usually, unless there's a purpose to it, they don't actually, usually, have feces where they are living. They have a system for it, and so we have to be reminded by animals to do as they do. One of my co-workers here, who has passed away, used to say, 'animals are still teaching us. Every day the lessons are there. We just don't pay attention, we just don't learn them. We're not listening.' He was right. We can walk out here and there's mule deer and bobcats... I'm surprised, I'm surprised we have as much as we have. If I was sitting in a cement jungle, maybe this would be easier for me (laughter). Maybe it'd be easier for me to have a then and now picture, but I don't. I don't live in that, I don't sit in that, and I'm sort of emotionally separated from that.

DH: So you feel pretty good about where you are here, in terms of your home?

BC: Yes and no.

DH: What are some of the changes you want to see happen?

(28:43)

BC: Ok, so images of things I'd like to see in a more sustainable future... It's not just the size of the house. One of the things about these structures, the tule mat lodge, these tepees, these lean-tos, these are all easily renewable resources. Straw bales, whether it's adobe, or mud, or newer recycled alternative forms of construction materials. There is so much in the future that's possible for us to do that's renewable in inexpensive ways, using common sense, that I would hope that the forests of my lifetime will be maturing well into grandchildren's lifetimes.

For me a sustainable future is about taking less, being smarter about how we use things, and giving more. Part of what I think that our tribal culture teaches us is about giving. If you give from any place other than your heart, it's not really a gift. If you give with expectation of something in return, that's trading or reciprocity. Neither of those is bad, but what we know is that our lives are richer and more honorable when we give more than we take. I would like for that to be the way people live their lives. To expect, not to pay for things, but to give back because they've been given so much. I talked about respect and humility and honor, we're not very grateful as people. Our culture tells us that we cannot expect these plants and animals to

have a relationship with us if we don't show our appreciation, our thanks, our gratitude. That is something that I think as human beings, that's part of that humbleness or humility, is the idea that we have so much to be grateful for. Instead of capitalizing needs and maximizing needs, we actually have to take stock in different ways in the future. Measure our wealth in different ways, so if 500 years from now people are measuring wealth by their health, and longevity, and respect, and mutual stewardship, that's a different place than where I live today. That's a place I'd want to live in, or be. It's not that there aren't individuals today who feel that way and live that way, but as communities we don't live that way. I think our culture has told us that is part of the law for continuing.

I also think that there's a fundamental, and it's really elemental to our humanness, idea of perfection. I think a lot of waste is created in pursuit of perfection. It's not that I don't understand zero deficiencies in a production line. But, the consumptive habits of coming up with a new model of car every year; if that was a new engine every year and not just a new body style, and if every year the engine was better for the environment, that would be different, but that's not what we're doing. We're creating a tremendous amount of waste, and the waste in the pursuit of the perfect, ideal image that people have. People think they are their job, people think they are their church, people think they are their car, or their home. That's not who we are. So they spend a lot of money on those trappings and a lot of time pursuing those trappings and create a lot of waste in the process, and that waste is not good for us. That wasteful behavior is not good for us. I vowed that I'm not buying any new cars, I'm only buying used cars (laughter), and it's not just because it financially makes sense. They're not making better cars yet. There are very few better cars that do the things you need to do, living in a rural environment; hauling hay and that kind of stuff. We're still making the same kind of vehicles; we're not living any smarter. So, I would hope that in the future that is one of the things that we do, live within our bio-means. Does that make sense?

(35:15)

DH: Yeah, you said an interesting thing there, in terms of the way people think of who they are, and what they really aren't. So, who are we? This is actually a question that I would like to ask. Imagining the average person, about 100 years out, what would their sense of identity, and sense of self be, and how might that be represented in some 'I am' statements?

BC: Our identities used to arise from our villages -- primarily our winter villages where we would stay the longest; our language -- people that spoke the same language; our diet -- how far we traveled for diet and trade; and who and what we were responsible for. So our sphere of responsibility was the reflection of who we were, and I think that's who we should be in the future. I am an aunt. I am a sister. I am a daughter. All of those statements mean I have responsibility to those nieces and nephews, brothers and sisters, parents. I can't be an aunt in title only; I have to have the function that goes with being an aunt. A part of that extended network that says, 'no child will be an orphan.' So that's a tenet. It's not a title, it's a tenet. It's an agreement. It's a human agreement to be part of a kinship system that says I'm responsible for people. I'm responsible for young lives and old lives. I'm responsible for a landscape that sustains me. I think about how we used to say who we were: who our relatives were, who we're responsible for, where we live, what we are responsible for, what we eat, again, who we owe our gratefulness to, and how we sustain ourselves. The idea of villages, again, I do not think cities

are a good idea for sustainability. I think that people find them exciting and efficient in many ways, but if they are going to have to start putting grass on rooftops to be sustainable that doesn't make sense to me.

(38:03)

DH: Any other 'I am' thoughts?

BC: I am a consumer. Apparel, clothing: I think about hemp, and cotton, and bleach, and I really enjoy the fact that our people used to, a long, long time ago, use hemp for clothing. Dogbane is all over this landscape, and dogbane rolled into cordage until its fine and soft is amazing like flax or linen, supple, durable. I get somewhat fascinated by the idea that there's not a tribe or an organization that's actually able to make clothing a sustainable project. My sister says she's a 'dumpster diver.' She's good at recycling, and reinventing, and reusing, and it's not so much out of an eco-friendly idea, it's probably more of a budgetary motivation. Our people have been doing that for a very long time: taking something and putting it to another use. There's a pun in ingenuity: an Injun, in ingenuity. Our people here took scraps from the woolen mills, and made tote bags, and glass cases, and pillows, and moccasins, and leggings. Now there's an entire home store line that's really inspired by our people's *ingenuity*. Using scraps to make things. I think that's just part of who we are. Not that we live a life based on scraps, but we don't like to see things wasted. There's always something it can be used for. I am the grandniece of a woman who made an entire quilt out of buckskin scraps from her life's work. Her only income besides crop shares in her life, my great aunt Vera Jones, was from brain tanning and smoking hides so that she could make moccasins and gloves. That's what she did. She has all of these tiny scraps of buckskin, and she made quilt of those scraps of things she had made in her life. It's an amazing testament to her life that every single one of those is a part of her history. It's her handiwork there, and it's a representation of the fact that when they went to hunting camps in the mountains in the fall, they stayed and when the deer was taken and skinned, they'd process the hides right then and there.

Maybe what it is, is that certainty; that's one of things that I know about our Indian people. This is something that I am beginning to understand that is my inheritance. Our people have always been from this very same landscape, 6.4 million acre landscape, this very same part of the Columbia River drainage. We have been from here for so long, and people have done horrible things--federal government policies, lots of well-intentioned desires to 'kill the Indian and save the child.' Over the course of time, the past 150 years, people have treated Indians very badly. What I've not understood until very recently, is that we know something that nobody else seems to get: we're not leaving. We're not giving up. We're not giving in. We're here for the long-term. We're here forever. It's a surprise, because our modern world is so transient. We may live somewhere else, go to college somewhere else, but come back here to be buried. Our people are from this land, and we belong to this land, and we will return to this land, and the land will embrace us, that's a promise, when we're buried. We're never going to be from somewhere else. I think that gives us an insight into sustainability. If you think that I am not going to leave this place, then it is never in your interest to harm the place you live. It's never in the interest of your future generations to harm the place you live, to despoil the place you live. I guess that's what the vision of the future is for me, that people stop thinking so transiently. Not just transient through time, and not just transient vote-with-their-feet across the United States or Canada or

Mexico. But transient as if they have no consequence. Everybody has consequence and if you live in a place as if your grandchildren have to live in the same place you might treat it differently, I think...is that...?

DH: Yeah, makes a lot of sense.

BC: I don't know if it helps or if it's insightful at all.

--break--

BC: It's not a belief, our people know that we were given this place to live a very long time ago. It's so long ago it's usually unfathomable by other people...thousands and thousands and thousands of years ago. As a consequence, when we talk about the future, and when we talk about restoring landscapes, or species, or we talk about how we should live together in the future, or work on things together of mutual concern, we're not just talking about Indian people. While we are trying to take care of and promote the health and well being of our own people...when we put water in the river, everybody benefits-all of the species, Indian and non-Indian. It's important for people to realize this is a shared responsibility now. We may have been given the gift of this homeland thousands and thousands of years ago, we may know more about it than people give us credit for. We may expect less of it and expect ourselves to be more thankful for it than other people. But now, today, there's got to be a recognition that this is our mutual inheritance. The problems and the gifts are a mutually inherited set for Indian and non-Indian people. We're not going to solve these problems alone, and we're not going to solve them just for ourselves, and we're not going to solve them for not just for humanity, but we're going to solve them because it's a resolve, or promote or improve them, because it's the right thing to do. It's not because there is an economic bottom-line that necessarily benefits, although that will be true at some point. It's because to do otherwise is to be in violation of natural law, natural order, and natural balance. It is not a freedom to ruin the lives of people who have not been born. It is not a freedom to deprive them of something you've enjoyed in your life. That's not about freedom, that's about responsibility, and no one individual has the right to deprive another of that...song of a meadowlark, beauty of a sunrise. It's in everybody's best interest to have clean water. I hope that people understand that when Indian people are looking for solutions and looking for ways to restore our homelands and our people's health, that, yes, we're talking about ourselves, but we're talking about you, too. If we don't go there together then that must mean you're either moving on and we'll get the land back, which is okay by me, *or* it means that you don't care about what happens to your children or your children's children. I don't think that's true. I think all people want to protect that inheritance, that legacy for the future generations. Not just Indian people. So I hope people can get excited about the idea of having a different tomorrow.

DH: The last segment of this conversation...one, I want to respect your time, you've given us as much as we've really asked for today. I also know that you mentioned before that you get stuck a bit on the *how* to get there, so that's the next question here, is how do we get there? What are the kinds of actions and strategies that we need to begin and/or continue to engage today?

(4:29)

BC: How we get there? Well, the first thing is we get there together. We're not going to get there alone. We don't have enough money, enough time, enough resources. We don't have all of the technology and intelligence. We have to do it together, first of all.

Second of all, I think we begin by having conversations, communication, dialogue that's real. We don't get to walk away in a huff, we have to stay at it until we've achieved what we intend to achieve. Because, as I said, we're not leaving. Indian people have so rarely been actually heard. People listen, but I don't know if they're actually hearing what we're saying about this planet, this Mother Earth. If they are really hearing then they would realize that we have knowledge that's worth regarding about solutions. One of the ways is through our tribal languages. Our tribal languages have embedded in them, encoded in them, stories and relationships between plants and animals, and amongst plants, and amongst animals, and places, and relationships with seasons. That's really your baseline, that's your empirical baseline, for where we need to get back to. That needs to be regarded with some acknowledgement of validity. People tend to think of the pre-dam Columbia River Salmon runs as a good baseline for restoration. Not even close. Extrapolate data from the Lewis and Clark journals about the rivers teaming with fish, 200 years ago. That's a baseline. Stories that aren't fiction about not being able to cross the river because it was so thick with fish that you were almost walking on them. That's baseline. I think that people would then be able to understand that our oral histories are not tall tales, and our language has science and knowledge in it. If we had respect for that, mutually, and heard it in our hearts, then our minds can set about solutions without conflict. We might have conflict about timing, or resources, but not about where we're going.

Many people romanticize about American Indian culture, but fundamentally they don't understand that this has always been about land. Not about ownership, but about responsibility, accountability and stewardship. That is a covenant between the maker, and the human, and everything else that lives here. It's a covenant. It's a sacred thing. It's not a contract. It's not a negotiation, it's a law. If we have that mutual understanding through hearing each other's hearts then I don't think we would let a lack of technology stand in our way, a lack of resources stand in our way, lack of common language stand in our way, we would find a way to make things happen. That's idealistic.

I also think there's much that can be learned from the species themselves that science is only beginning to understand. It's been called anecdotal information before. Yet, the relationships between things and amongst things is probably as pivotal as anything. We humans interject ourselves into those dynamics way too often to really appreciate how the world really works...because it can work without us too. I think that there is a role for indigenous scholarship that elders have in their knowledge as well as academic scholarship, because we want the best minds and the best hearts pursuing these solutions. The question for me is: how do we get the corporate world engaged with those two communities? I suspect that someday we may have to do it by enforcement. It will have to be the right thing to do because there are penalties on the other side. It may have to be legislated (laughter). I don't know that everybody is as good-hearted as they need to be.

DH: At least not today.

BC: Not yet.

DH: The idealistic hope is tomorrow there will be?

BC: Yeah.

DH: Other things you'd say in terms of actions and strategies?

(11:18)

BC: Start with children. Children don't come into the world polluted. I should say they didn't used to, but now we have fetal alcohol syndrome, meth addicted, cocaine addicted, crack addicted babies. But when children are born, not only are they innocent, but they come with knowledge as well. Knowledge in their DNA, knowledge from their journey thus far. I think children have the ability to cross boundaries that adults have made and legislated, and they have the ability to imagine solutions that are unimaginable for me.

This Tamástslikt Cultural Institute. This tribe is the second largest employer in the region. It was not in my mind's eye as a child, it was beyond me. It was in our elders' minds and eyes, that they could find a way to create jobs so that we could still live here, on this remnant, a subset of our homeland. Children and elders in all colors don't have preoccupation with their own egos, and so they can think more widely and broadly and deeply sometimes than adults can. We're in a 'do' mode, and they're more capable dreamers and visionaries, I think.

(13:17)

DH: Anything about education?

BC: Well, it's an interesting idea because my mother was a teacher, and I guess that's why I think about starting with children. When you're in school you learn in the primary grades about earth science: you plant some kind of seed in a milk carton, and it doesn't usually go much further until you're in high school biology. I think we ought to be doing earth science K-12. We ought to have hands-on, outside, not-in-a-square-classroom, *real* earth science. Why the world works the way it does. Why this species lives where it does. Why this flyway is through here. The classroom of the out of doors was the multicultural, multisensory, multigenerational classroom that Indian children had aboriginally, and it's a fabulous experience. Not just for one week in sixth grade, it needs to be life-long, but we can start K-12. I think absolutely children out of doors, out of offices, out of classrooms, away from desks, best classroom ever.

(14:39)

DH: Well before we close, is there anything that you'd like to enforce or add?

BC: Well, I'm sure there will be. I'm kind of numb I think. I had no idea where this was going to go because I feel like the biologists are the ones that know the answers to these questions (laughter).

DH: Biologists wouldn't have given nearly as good of answers (laughter). So just closing thoughts, or points that haven't been made, or reinforcement of any of your ideas that have been

made?

BC: One of the things I talked about earlier is, I'm a descendant of people who lived freely in this landscape. The freedom was not without responsibility. Their responsibility was to a law, that pre-exists America, that pre-exists modern laws, and that law teaches us: that we are accountable to one another--we're not supposed to harm each other; that we are accountable to this covenant, this landscape, and everything that lives on it. That law has not or cannot be superseded or overturned. The only way that law will cease to exist is if we cease to abide by it. So as long as people choose to abide by that law, that covenant with the Creator and everything else on this landscape, in the water, in the air, we will be honoring that law. We will be respecting that law. We will be living by that law. I think that people in their hearts need to take a journey in time, because every human being has tribal roots someplace: Irish, Scottish, French, Germanic, Australia, Africa. Every human being has tribal roots. And one of the things about tribalism that is inescapable is the responsibility to others. People have invented new tribes: corporations, clans, organizations, non-profits, for-profit businesses, and they have their own cultures. But people the world over, tribally, understood what it was like to be responsible for other people, a group of other people, a village of other people. What it was like to put other people at risk; knowing that your village could take your life if you put everyone else at risk by your behavior. When a business owner chooses to dump toxic chemicals into a stream in the middle of the night, hoping to be undetected, that individual is harming his village. We don't have the right anymore to take his life for that, but he's putting everyone at risk. Those tribal roots teach us that behavior is wrong. I would ask everyone to look into your own personal family past, look at those tribal roots, look at the persecution, and prosecution, and all the things that caused your family to move, and understand that once upon a time you had people in your family who loved where they were from for thousands of years, just like we do...

(19:51)

DH: Thank you for taking the time today to share your knowledge and perspective.

BC: You're welcome.

DH: It's been a pleasure and an honor.

BC: Thank you.

To quote this interview, please use the following citation:

Conner, R. (Interviewee) & Hall, D. E. (Interviewer). (2007). *Native Perspectives on Sustainability: Roberta Conner (Cayuse)* [Interview transcript]. Retrieved from the Native Perspectives on Sustainability project website: www.nativeperspectives.net