

Wulustuk Times

Wulustuk - Indigenous name for St John River

*This publication produced monthly at Tobique, NB, Canada E7H 5K3
pjpaul494 (at) gmail.com*



TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR SEPTEMBER 2016

FROM PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP TO SWINDLED VICTIMS (PART 4 OF 4)

THE IMPORTANCE OF TRIBAL STORIES

FIRST NATIONS MAN FATALLY SHOT ON SASK. FARM WAS LOOKING FOR HELP WITH FLAT TIRE: COUSIN

**ONTARIO IS STEPPING UP TO ADDRESS FIRST NATIONS ISSUES: EDITORIAL*
MI'KMAQ NATIONS WANT ABORIGINAL AND TREATY RIGHTS ADDRESSED AS PIPELINE**

HEARINGS CONTINUE

DEAN'S DEN: SEPTEMBER TRILOGY IN VERSES

Wulustuk Times:

Each month we gather and publish the latest, most relevant native information for our readers. Proceeding with this concept we feel that a well informed person is better able to see, relate with and assess a situation more accurately when equipped with right data. Our aim is to provide you with the precise tools and information possible.

From Peace and Friendship to Swindled Victims (Part 4 of 4)

Part 4 - ABORIGINAL TITLE BECOMES THE MAIN ISSUE IN FUTURE TREATIES

This is a continuation of a four-part series that examines treaties with the Eastern Indian Nations before reserved lands were introduced (1763) and before the Indian Act was created (1867) to manage and assimilate them.... and when they still had "Indian" names, not Euro-Christian names. This was a time when they were a free, self-reliant and sovereign peoples. In Part 3 I examined the 1693 Treaty of Pemaquid, another written treaty or "talking paper" that got broken and even though attempts were made to "renew" it, it is seldom referenced today. However these broken treaties have value in the lessons they teach. In Part 4 I will examine some later treaties with the English and what was discussed with the First Nations at the conferences before the treaties were written and signed, and what actually got written into the treaty. Keep these realities in mind: (1) that the conferences with the "Eastern Indians" before the final wording and signing of each treaty were recorded by the English; (2) that these First Nations could not speak or understand English, only limited French if any at all, so an interpreter was required who was provided by the English; (3) that at these conferences there were often other allied First Nations present as witnesses and for support who did not sign the treaties; and (4) that the Chiefs (Sakomak) didn't speak for themselves. They had to consult with the other lesser chiefs of the various villages and families. If one of these other chiefs didn't agree with the treaty they didn't feel obliged to honour it. This form of social consensus made for unpredictable results.

The signed treaty document and its legal English wording are primarily what the courts focus on, provided the document can still be found and is legible. However, some treaty researchers have examined the minutes of the conferences that led up to the final treaties to appreciate the context behind the wording of the signed treaty document. There were occasions where, after the legal document was signed and the Eastern Indians took their signed copy back to their people and approached trustworthy English or French acquaintances to interpret it for them, at which time they became outraged that it wasn't what they thought they had agreed to.

1713 Portsmouth Treaty (St. Johns Indians were participants)

After the international peace Treaty of Utretch in April 1713 (actually a series of peace treaties) when France and Great Britain and other European countries ended their wars, France ceded to Great Britain its claims to Newfoundland, the Hudson's Bay Company territories (Rupert's Land), and the Acadian colony (Nova Scotia). The Eastern Indians supposedly were now dealing with only the English (called British after 1707 when Scotland and England merged into Great Britain) whose modus operandi was to institute their form of handwritten paper treaties and deeds. A conference was called by the British with the Eastern Indians, which included the St. Johns

Indians. It was held at Portsmouth at the mouth of the Piscataqua River on July 11th, 1713. Present were Governor Dudley, members of the Massachusetts Council, with John Gyles [former Maliseet captive] as interpreter. The purpose of the conference was to negotiate "articles of pacification" with the Eastern Indians. There were several Indian languages among those attending, a challenge for Gyles. There were 180 men and 460 women and children of the Eastern Indians present. Among the St. Johns/Maliseet Chiefs were: *Joseph*, *Eneas*, and *Piere*. Although Piere attended the conference he did not sign the treaty. Others were: Bomaseen, Teramaugous, Waracansit, Wedaranaquin, Kirebennuit, and Moxus from the Kennebecs; Iteansi, Jackoit, Wununogonet and Nudagumboin from the Penobscots; and Luzagouet from the Amoscoggins. Maliseet Chief Joseph who signed the treaty might have been Madockawando's grandson, Joseph d'Abbadis St. Castin (half Maliseet) who was born about 1692. Altogether there were 180 men, and the women and children stayed at a distance, making about 460 people of the Indian Nations. So there were plenty of witnesses present as was their tradition for oral treaties.

The issue of land ownership came up at the start of the conference. The Indians were told by the English that the French had turned over all their lands to the English and that the Indians could no longer have any friendship with the French "short of Quebec." Puzzled by this statement, the Indians asked how the English Governor could say that "the King of France surrendered all the land on this side of Placentia up to the Queen of Great Britain." The Governor Dudley answered the Indians that the British army was superior to those of France and that the King of France surrendered Newfoundland and the land on the other side. Governor Dudley obviously didn't get the essence of their question, so the Indians rephrased it more clearly with this insightful historic response: "*The French never said anything to us about it and we wonder how they would give it away without asking us, God having at first placed us there and they have nothing to do to give it away?*" How could the French give away the land of the rightful occupants of that land, the true holders of aboriginal title, the First Nations? The English dodged the question responding that it was not their place to dispute the rights of Crowns and that in a little while the English would come back to settle their former plantations. The Indians, desiring peace, answered that they would be glad to see the English settling their ancient plantations and they would not disturb the English in their rights and privileges. They wanted to trade as they did with the French and they wanted a truck house (trading post) built near them. Also as requested by the English in the negotiations, the Indians were to stay on the north side of the Saco River at a distance away from the English plantations until the English settlers had "cooled down" towards them. However, they "hoped" that after a little while the Governor would give the Indians more liberty. In the actual treaty that was signed it was agreed that the English might come back and settle in all their former lands without being molested by the Indians. That the Indians could have their liberty to hunt and fish and all other liberties in their own

grounds as agreed to in a previous treaty of Aug 11, 1693 with Gov. William Phips. In that treaty Chief Madockawando of Maliseet ancestry had led the delegates of the Eastern Indians. The 1693 treaty stated that all trading would be regulated by her Majesty's Government. That the Indians would not be allowed for the present to come near any English Settlements on the west side of the Saco River. That any differences that should arise between English and Indians shall be remedied by Her Majesties Laws who rules them, not by the Indian's customs. That they acknowledge they have broken several previous treaties and ask Her Majesty to be pardoned and ask for her protection. That they "solemnly renew, ratify, and confirm all & every of the articles & agreements contained in the former and present submission [1693]." No clear statement was made about who owned what lands except that the English could come back and settle on lands specified in former "deeds" and weren't to be molested. Mention was made in 1693 that the lands in which the Eastern Indians were living were within the Monarch's "sovereignty." It will be seen later that the Indians understood this to mean that they would be under the English leader's [Queen Mary] protection as an ally. This was basically a mutual peace and friendship agreement. Keep in mind also that there were several Indian nations with different dialects trying to understand the complex legal language of the English. John Gyles was in a powerful position as an interpreter and translator for such words as sovereignty.

1717 Georgetown Treaty

The land issue surfaced again at another conference that began on August 9, 1717 between "his Excellency the Governor with the Sachems and chief Men of the Eastern Indians" at Georgetown, Maine in which John Gyles was again the interpreter. There were eight Chiefs: Moxus, Bommazeen, Waundagumboit, Wiwurna, and Quaguaroomanit of Kennebeck; Querenebuit of Penobscot; Adeawando of Pegwackit; and Sabbadis of Ammarescoggin. Chief Wiwurna was their spokesman. He gave his people's approval of the English coming here to "settle on our lands" to which the Governor replied through interpreter Gyles to tell the Indians, "They must not call it their land, for the English have bought it of them and their ancestors." Under the British Crown's land tenure system (tenure = to hold), the Crown owns title to all lands but title to a parcel of land can be purchased and that "tenant" becomes the present holder under specific conditions such as making improvements and paying rent (aka property taxes). So the British are claiming all the land and putting it up for sale by legal "deed." Not fully appreciating the concept of buying the land, Chief Wiwurna responded, "We desire there may be no further settlements made. We shan't be able to hold them all in our bosoms, and to take care to shelter them, if it be likely to be bad weather, and mischief be threatened." Wiwurna didn't get it. He thought his people were to watch over the English settlers and take care of them in times of need, mutual protection as agreed in the previous treaty. He went on to ask that in regards to the spaces presently not occupied between what land has been already settled, when more English come to

settle these empty places why there should not be "a consideration for that land, and whether we shall not have a further gratuity or acknowledgement made for us for what has been purchased of our Forefathers." In his rationalization why shouldn't new settlers of these lands also pay the Indians to use them just as previous settlers did to his forefathers? He didn't understand the concept that thousands of English would be coming here and establishing permanent settlements on land that was already sold under English land tenure laws by previous men such as Madockawando who died in 1698.

The Governor at one point took an English Bible and an Indian Bible in his hand and said he would give these Bibles to "Mr. Baxter, their Minister, for their instruction, whenever they desire to be taught." Chief Wiwurna responded in regards to the Bibles; "We desire to be excused on that point. God has given us a teaching already, and if we should go from that, we should displease God. We are not capable to make any judgement about religion."

Later Chief Wiwurna told the Governor that they had considered all the things being negotiated thus far and "admire it exceedingly, and believe it pleases God, and hope your Excellency will endeavor it shall be so." The Governor responded that he assured them of it, BUT only if they "carry themselves suitably with duty and allegiance to KING GEORGE." To which Chief Wiwurna replied that they had had the same discourse with other Governors and that those governors had "said to us that *we are under no other Government but our own*." Puzzled by this remark the Governor asked them, "How is that?" To which Chief Wiwurna responded that they would be obedient to King George only "if we like the offers made us." Obviously Wiwurna did not understand the concept of allegiance to King George who lived across the ocean and who was claiming sovereignty of all his Indian land. He didn't see his people being under British sovereignty by English legal definition. He was viewing the relationship as strictly peace and friendship, of the English offering protection as an ally, not of ceding ownership of their Indian lands to the English. He didn't want more settlers to be sent here to his lands. There would be too many to look after. Also, he didn't want more Forts to be built as was stated at the Casco Treaty. The Governor made it clear to them that "King George builds what Forts he pleases in his own Dominions, and has given me power to do it here," and the forts were for the Indians security as well as the English. Wiwurna was not happy about new forts and told the Governor that his people would be pleased with King George if there was never a fort built in the Eastern lands.

These lands and forts issues were left unresolved, but one thing was agreed upon, *that the Indians would have fishing and fowling wherever they wanted.* The Indians would take an account of these proceedings back to their people.

When Chief Wiwurna and his companions were leaving to go back to their nearby camp for the night, the Governor reminded them one more time, "Tell them they must be sensible and satisfied that the English own this land, and have deeds that shew, and set forth their purchase from their ancestors." Wiwurna would not budge from his position, but there was another chief among them, Querebennit, who was seduced by the advantage of obtaining guns and ammunition and other provisions from trade with the English. He began to sway the others against Wiwurna.

The next morning as the Governor boarded his ship and made ready to leave, two Indians in a "canoo" arrived and came on board. They apologized for their rudeness the previous day and said they would like to meet with the Governor again. The Governor said he would meet again only if the Indians would stop pretending they owned the English lands and that they would comply with all the other things he said. They said they would and a time to meet was set for 6 o'clock.

Now it gets even more interesting. At 6 o'clock "the Sachems and Principal Men came over with the British Colours, leaving behind them Wiwurna, because (as was said) he had behaved himself so improperly yesterday." Instead, Chief Querebennit was now their speaker. He spoke saying they were very sorry for their rude carriage and prayed it would be forgiven. And so the conference continued. Querebennit said that they would agree that the English could settle where their predecessors had done and that they agreed with all the articles of peace. Then the Chiefs presented the Governor with a Belt of Wampum saying "We desire to live in Peace." He spoke again asking that the English would shelter his people if they were caught out in cold, stormy weather. The Governor agreed as long as they would "behave themselves." Querebennit said they would do the same for the English and he then said, "What I have said, God Almighty hears," and he presented another belt of wampum. Then Querebennit asked for winter supplies to be sent his people, "especially provisions and ammunition." They asked for some other things, a trading house to supply them, an interpreter named Jordan, and a gunsmith. After some deliberation these things were agreed upon and all the Indians "readily & without any objection consented to the whole" or so the English record shows. The Treaty of Portsmouth 1713 was read to them and interpreted by Jordan because Gyles had been ordered to his command at the Fort at Brunswick. On August 12th twenty Chiefs and Principal Men signed, sealed and delivered a new instrument to the Governor, which made reference to all of the articles in the Portsmouth Treaty except the 4th and 5th which related to trade and commerce. It then added a peace article which states plainly that the English may return to their lands to which they have a Right & Title, without being molested by the Indians.

To be continued in the next issue with a famous letter to the English Governor in 1721 from the Eastern Indians including two Wolastoqiyik, one from Eqpahak and one from Meductic.... all my relations, Nugeekadoonkut

THE IMPORTANCE OF TRIBAL STORIES

Both Grandmother and Grandfather have been credited with keeping stories alive. Many of the villages had a dominant person who, among other things, was the tribal story teller. A good story teller could keep a story going for several evenings by adding segments or chapters to it like our serials that keep going endlessly. The stories were not just for children but for adults as well. A good story teller kept his audiences's attention to midnight or into the early hours of a new day. Babies and young children fell asleep while the elders remained very attentive. The story teller was creative in his thinking and often got his subject in a real tangle from which it seemed that it would be impossible for his hero to extricate.

Stories were the property of the person who created and told them. In 1952 I heard one of the Shay boys, who had returned from military service and was trying to start a new life, tell a group of visitors to Indian Island, Old Town, Maine, early Penobscot history. Later I heard his mother angrily tell her son that he should not tell a Big Thunder story. He had no right to tell it as his own story. Although Big Thunder had been dead for years, he was still the owner of the story. The young man would have to make up his own stories.

Sometimes at tribal gatherings the very creative minds of the story tellers were challenged in "Top This" informal programs. Such unplanned sessions caused mirth to the solemn ceremonies. There were stories that emphasized the strong fighting spirit of the tribe. Tales from the Colonial wars have come down stating the heroism and trickery events that made the Maliseet winners in the conflicts, quite different from the mid nineteenth century movies when the Indians never won.

Tales of the Mohawk Wars era were still popular in the mid twentieth century. It seemed that every story-teller had a piece from the Mohawk Wars. One such tale told by Maliseet in the mid 20th century was of a Woodstock hunter who was hunting south of the St. John River. Suddenly he became aware of a group of Mohawk warriors following him. He decided that he must continue running to Pokiok Falls, now a drowned geologic site due to the flooding of the Mactaquac Dam. The cleft in the bed rock of the stream, especially in the spring, wore down the rock to a considerable depth and it was at least 15 feet wide. The hunter reached the challenging gorge, looked down at a deep ravine with raging water billowing as fast as it could on its way to join the St. John. He had to make up his mind quickly since he could now hear the voices of his adversaries clearly. He hastily concluded that he must make a mighty effort to jump the roaring crevice doubting that any Mohawk would follow him. He completed the daring jump to safely quickly hide in the forest making sure that there were no Mohawk followers who would attempt to jump the gorge. He could then alert the rest of the tribe about the Mohawk's presence. As long as the water rushed through the gorge to the St. John it was easy to recall the heroic act. Anyone could go and see what a tremendous challenge the jump would

have been.

The hero remains nameless so no family could claim relationship to the jumper. Every Maliseet could have the feeling that he, too, could have the confidence that his grandfather had when making the daring jump. Such stories could build up a bold confident spirit in the tribe's young men who would be the future of the tribe. The Mactaquac Dam project drowned this unique geologic creation that became a tourist attraction so that now it is no longer designated on road maps.

Nicholas N. Smith

FIRST NATIONS MAN FATALLY SHOT ON SASK. FARM WAS LOOKING FOR HELP WITH FLAT TIRE: COUSIN

The Canadian Press

BIGGAR, Sask. -- Racial tensions are flaring in Saskatchewan after the fatal shooting of a First Nations man who relatives say was just looking for help with a flat tire.

Colten Boushie, 22, was killed Tuesday after the vehicle he was in drove onto a farm in the rural municipality of Glenside, west of Saskatoon.

Boushie's cousin, Eric Meechance, said he and three other friends were also in the car, heading home to the Red Pheasant First Nation after an afternoon spent swimming at a river.

But Meechance said they had a tire blow out and that's how they ended up at the farm.

"That guy just come out of nowhere and he just smashed our window," said Meechance.

Meechance said they tried to drive away, but ended up colliding with a parked car. He then ran for safety as gunshots rang out.

"Running is probably what saved all of our lives, you know, because if he's going to shoot one, he's probably would have shot us all," he said.

"He wasn't shooting to scare us. He was shooting to kill."

Gerald Stanley, 54, is charged with second-degree murder. He is to make his

next court appearance in North Battleford on Aug. 18.

Meechance said Boushie was a hard worker, mowing lawns and cutting wood to earn money.

A GoFundMe page has been set up to raise \$10,000 to help Boushie's family cover funeral expenses.

Another GoFundMe page has been set up to help Stanley's wife. The hope is to raise \$35,000.

That page has been set up by someone who said they live in the area. It says "much of the farming community around us who know this family know they (are) loving and deserving of some help through a difficult time."

First Nations leaders say the RCMP news release about the shooting was biased.

The first police news release said that people in the car had been taken into custody as part of a theft investigation.

Chief Bobby Cameron of the Federation of Sovereign Indigenous Nations said the RCMP statement "provided just enough prejudicial information" for people to draw the conclusion that the shooting was somehow justified.

"The messaging in an RCMP news release should not fuel racial tensions," he said.

Chief Clint Wuttunee of the Red Pheasant First Nation said the media's initial portrayal of the event, based on the RCMP release, made the incident sound like a crime was about to be committed by the passengers in the car.

The FSIN wants a review of the RCMP's communication policies and writing guidelines.

National Chief Perry Bellegarde, with the Assembly of First Nations, said he was particularly disturbed by "racist, derogatory comments" about the incident on social media. It's a stark reminder of "how much work we have to do to eliminate racism and discrimination," he said.

"In too many ways, this is a sad day for Saskatchewan," he said in a statement.

Robert Innes, a University of Saskatchewan indigenous studies professor in Regina, said the situation shows the community divide.

"You can see that the racial tension is basically a tinder box in

Saskatchewan," said Innes.

Speaking generally, Innes said some farmers are blaming First Nations people for rural crime. Their mentality is to protect their property, he said.

"So there's this real fear and contempt towards indigenous men by many white people, to the point where they will shoot before asking questions."

Innes said indigenous people are angry that Boushie was killed.

He notes that some Caucasians are angry that the young people were even on the farm and believe Stanley is being railroaded by political correctness.

"A lot of people who are talking on social media are happy that the person was shot and killed and believe it was justified. That, to me, is kind of disturbing in a lot of ways."

ONTARIO IS STEPPING UP TO ADDRESS FIRST NATIONS ISSUES: EDITORIAL

Thestar.com

Premier Kathleen Wynne's apology and \$250 million in funding are promising first steps to building new relationships with First Nations communities.

It's never easy to say you're sorry. But Premier Kathleen Wynne's moving apology
<https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2016/05/30/kathleen-wynne-to-reveal-ontarios-response-to-truth-and-reconciliation-commission.html>
in the legislature on Monday for Ontario's part in the mistreatment of First Nations peoples went a long way to acknowledge past injustices and was an important step towards building a more respectful relationship with aboriginal communities.

Just as important, with her promise of \$250 million over the next three years to finance 26 initiatives

<https://news.ontario.ca/opo/en/2016/05/ontario-apologizes-for-residential-schools.html>
to help right wrongs and build trust, Wynne made clear that Ontario no longer intends to stand by and brush off First Nations issues as something for the federal government to deal with.

Too often in the past, all provinces (Ontario included) have stood on the sidelines as aboriginal students fell behind in schools and native people filled the prisons. In these and other areas, the provinces could have used their expertise and resources to respond, but they either failed to act or

dragged their heels. They hid behind the fact that the federal government has constitutional responsibility for First Nations peoples.

But with Wynne's apology and 26-point plan, Ontario is stepping up. It is now the second province, after Manitoba, to officially respond to last year's report from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission

http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/File/2015/Honouring_the_Truth_Reconciling_for_the_Future_July_23_2015.pdf

on residential schools, which called on all governments to work hand-in-hand to help resolve the issues faced by indigenous people.

At the top of the Ontario government's sensible initiatives is a promise to make sure that students learn about First Nations history, including educating all Ontarians about "the horrors of the residential school system" and "the betrayals of past governments."

That responds to key recommendations in the TRC report to make education about aboriginal issues and concerns a part of school curricula at all levels. Justice Murray Sinclair, the commission chair, has long advocated that approach, telling the Star last December that "children should be taught proper Canadian history; that's how respect will be maintained."

A new Canadian narrative that puts aboriginal people at the heart of the story and respects their culture can only help to build understanding.

Wynne's apology comes just a week after the province stepped into another area that has traditionally been seen as a federal responsibility – health care on First Nations reserves.

Health Minister Eric Hoskins promised \$222 million over the next three years to increase physician services, train front-line health-care providers who work with First Nations communities and create 10 new or expanded primary care teams.

It's another sign that Ontario is prepared to act rather than wait for Ottawa. And it's a welcome indication that governments may be ready at long last to put the health and well-being of indigenous people ahead of their jurisdictional squabbles.

Wynne promised other measures to address past wrongs, including putting in place a strategy to address systematic racism and discrimination directed against indigenous peoples; investing in mental health and wellness programs; and creating a justice system responsive to aboriginal legal principles.

It's an ambitious agenda, and will take many years to implement. But it promises to represent a fundamental break in how the provinces address indigenous issues. The days of regarding them as Ottawa's problem are gone,

and that can only be for the good.

MI'KMAQ NATIONS WANT ABORIGINAL AND TREATY RIGHTS ADDRESSED AS PIPELINE

HEARINGS CONTINUE

SAINT JOHN, N.B. – Mi'kmaq communities in New Brunswick say they remain “deeply concerned” about the effect the proposed Energy East pipeline will have on their Aboriginal and Treaty rights.

Chief George Ginnish, of the Eel Ground First Nation, made the comment on behalf of nine Mi'kmaq communities at the National Energy Board hearings in Saint John, N.B., Wednesday.

Ginnish says the communities are concerned about the impacts on watersheds and water crossings as well as on traditional fisheries and on species such as Atlantic salmon.

He says there are also concerns about increased tanker traffic in the Bay of Fundy.

Ginnish says unless those concerns are “meaningfully addressed,” the Mi'kmaq will not consent to the pipeline crossing its territory.

Officials with Energy East say they are committed to ongoing consultations with First Nations groups in order to address their concerns. The hearings are taking place as Environment Minister Catherine McKenna urged Canadians to have confidence in the evaluation process of large-scale energy projects like Energy East.

McKenna declined to comment directly on new revelations surrounding the National Energy Board, the body responsible for conducting consultations on TransCanada's proposed pipeline project.

The National Observer revealed last week that the NEB's chairman and two of its commissioners met with ex-Quebec premier Jean Charest in January 2015 while he was acting as a consultant to TransCanada.

The NEB, which initially denied the meeting had taken place, apologized to the online news site and called it an honest mistake.

NEB spokesman Craig Loewen said there was no ill intent behind its initial denial.

The federal regulator had asked to meet with Quebec representatives from a wide range of groups: municipal associations, chambers of commerce, mayors and a former premier.

The exercise was in an effort to learn how to engage with the province, said Marc-Andre Plouffe, an NEB director at its Montreal office.

Plouffe said the board wasn't aware of any ties Charest had with any particular company.

With the board's credibility under fire, McKenna told a news conference in Halifax that Canadians must have faith in the system.

"We must have confidence in our system, we must have confidence in our institutions, and we must ensure we have decisions that are independent," McKenna said, adding the Liberal government is committed to reviewing the environmental assessment process rigorously.

A spokesman for Charest at McCarthy Tetrault law offices where he works was unavailable for comment Tuesday.

NEB hearings began Monday in New Brunswick with promoters of the Energy East project reassuring the public about the safety of the 4,500-kilometre pipeline that would see crude oil transported from Alberta to Eastern Canada.

Hearings move to Montreal from Aug. 29 to Sept. 2 and to Quebec City from Oct. 3 to 7.

The board must submit its report by March 2018 after which the federal cabinet will have the final say on the project.

DEAN'S DEN: SEPTEMBER TRILOGY IN VERSES

September trilogy in verse

Manhunt

Now, truth and worth and justice

Seldom see the light of day

Common-sense, so understated

With a "Manhunt" underway,

When prejudice takes precedence

And 'purpose' can't be budged

When impression's not impartial

But - presumptive and prejudged,

Equality and parity

Undervalued, minimized

Balance and proportion

Not fully realized,

Fairness - underrated

Ancestry - profiled

Stereotyped conclusions

Biased views compiled,

Not always openness in action

- Two wrongs don't make a right -

Underestimated oneness

Out of mind - when out of sight,

What he did, and 'what' he did
When tensions tend to fly
Who he was, and 'who' he was
All beg the question - "Why?"
Perspective and perception
And perspicacity all shatters
When finally, it is recognized
Everyone, and all life ... matters!

Due Diligence

Delinquent in duty
Due diligence done?
Deficient - debunked!
They dilly and dally
Propped up - piggyback
Until ... they're defunct!

A Truism

An "old saying"
- though it may have been
A truism often said!
If you can't spit on his boots
- when he's still alive,

Don't pi--- on his grave

... when he's dead!

-----D.C. Butterfield