

Rauk,

6/11/2012

You and I certainly have different ways at looking at the issue of these Constitutional Amendments coming up in August. I do agree with you that non-shareholders have no business being allowed to vote on anything to do with the Minerals Estate. They shouldn't even want to. But nothing says that we Shareholders shouldn't vote to protect our interests. It's OUR BUSINESS, and it's OUR RESPONSIBILITY.

Apparently, the framers of our Constitution either didn't see it that way, or they just didn't know what they were doing. And that just may be the reason. I would hate to think that any Osage would knowingly and deliberately put us in such a situation. I must admit, I voted for the change in our government, and I darn sure wasn't smart enough to see the dangers to our Minerals Estate lurking about within all that strange language.

There are many good things about this Constitutional form of government, but it's now quite clear that in our eagerness to get the good parts, we overlooked some of the serious problems with it. I would hope that those who created the document were just making the same mistake I did when I voted for it.

I am convinced it was passed primarily because of the massive publicity campaign selling the good points to the voters while a pitiful few of the Shareholders, seeing what was really happening, just did not have the financial resources to get that information out to the people effectively.

Anyway, we've got it---so now we must fix it. And we've got to use the tools provided within the Constitution to do it. These amendments are the only legal way to do that, short of holding a Constitutional Convention, which would be quite expensive, take a long, long time, and open the doors for other things to be slipped into the Constitution without ample time for the voters to once again, completely understand the issues. It's up to us, the Shareholders, to step back and take a hard look at what we have willingly allowed, and then use those tools called "the vote of the people" to repair the damage we've done to ourselves.

Rauk, you seem to feel that there is something inherently wrong with Shareholders voting for these amendments. Please explain to me just why approving would be wrong, and more specifically, how approval could possibly hurt any of us. You have also stated that anything we might approve in August, could be disapproved later on. It's possible, but not likely any time soon.

Looking at the voting percentages in our recent election concerning proposed amendments, all failed with 50.8 % to 59.6% in favor, and one of them with 64.7% in favor. None of the issues involved strictly minerals matters. Where the well being of the Shareholders is the ONLY issue on the ballot, I firmly believe that all of the amendments can be passed. And when they are passed, it will be just as hard, or even harder, to raise that 65% again to un-fix the fix. There's no reason for any Shareholder to ever vote against these amendments, now or in the future. It's a situation where we have everything to gain and absolutely NOTHING TO LOSE. If the amendments do not pass, then nothing changes, and we go right on embracing the possibility of having a non-Shareholder Chief involved in minerals affairs somewhere in the future.

If we let this opportunity to correct our mistake get away from us now, we will have nobody to blame but ourselves. I sincerely hope you will take another look at this. If you still disagree with me, please point out where I'm wrong. I'd sure be upset with myself if I made the same mistake twice in a row.

Ray McClain, Osage Shareholder