

all, but certainly confusion on my part as to the suit that's pending. What is actually being contended? What is actually being said? What is actually being challenged? Because the way I understood, and again I get a chance to understand things like most members of the body, we read the newspapers, talk to as many people as we can to get our information, that the Historical Society decided that it did not have to, under this situation or possibly any situation, I'm not sure, but they didn't have to follow the open meeting laws. And it is my understanding they decided that that was the case because they did not particularly believe that they were a state agency. And I think that is intertwined in that particular case, which, obviously, is the reason for the amendment to have some discussion on if that is, in fact, true and if that question is in doubt, maybe we shouldn't appropriate funds because maybe we should not appropriate funds to an entity that's not sure that it should receive the funds because it's not a state agency. I don't know. That question needs to be thought out. And I think it is somehow, at least in my understanding, somewhat involved here within the case. And I believe I have some understanding what the Historical Society is trying to do. I understand archeology's theory, anthropology. My sister has her doctorates now in cultural anthropology and we trade a lot of stories and we also have a good insight with each other of what we try to do. But there is a feeling among anthropologists, archeologists, historians, and so on, that we are uncovering the past, we have the treasures of the past, we need to study the past so we can learn about the past and, hopefully, know more for the future, and I understand that. And there is a great reluctance of anyone within the scientific community, particularly the historical community, to give up any of that. It's kind of like if you begin to open that door where we are denied access to study whenever we want on whatever we want, whenever we want, that that might carry over into other areas. It's almost like science is again fighting religion again because we're talking about moral values on skeletal remains and burial goods versus the right of people to know. And we really haven't gotten out of that problem, that dilemma of discussion, for centuries and, really, underneath the surface it's there. And I firmly believe that what...and this is only my own personal opinion, that if there are people in the Historical Society that really believe that if we harass this enough, if we delay enough, if we cause enough delay and enough concern, that we might be able to actually get 25 votes next time so that we can undo what was done before and we will be able to keep all