

say, "Wait--you're telling it different. It's this way--this is the way I heard it." Well, then they'd both agree. They didn't come out and say, "No--you didn't know nothing! I know better!" No, it wasn't that way. They just finally agree. My father used to say these people that didn't have a good upbringing were the ones that most often misinterpret old stories, than the men that had better upbringing, that were brought up by men that had good ancestors back there. They're the ones that knew things better than the one that wasn't brought up that way by real good people. Maybe they didn't have a chance to hear just exactly how it was. (Did the young members ever take part in this telling stories?) No. They had to respect their elders. The elders did all the talking. My father used to say, "It's so different. Whenever men try to get together again and talk the young ones want to interrupt and do all the talking." He said, "No, it wasn't that way back then in my time. It's so different now." He said, "Maybe the white people are like that, and that's where they're learning from. They want to out-do each other in knowing things." Which is getting worse today.

BOWSTRING CLAN AND ARROW KEEPER IN 1920's

(When they selected a headman or sub-chief for those Bowstrings, did it make any difference whether a person knew very many of these old stories?)

No. Stories didn't have anything to do with selecting these men. It had to be a sensible man--a good man. Honest, reliable man. That's the one they select. They didn't just get Tom, Dick and Harry. They had to be good men.

(Did your father--or other people--ever talk about why these clans