

Den Nena Henash - Our Land Speaks
Ut Kah neek - Informing and Reporting
Yupit Qanlautciat - The Way Eskimos Talk
Unangan Tunukun - The Aleuts Speak
Inupiat Paitot - People's Heritage

Criticism of Campbell commercial

To the editor:

Hey! Run Jim Campbell's commercial by me one more time. Boy, that is certainly misleading. Campbell is trying to deceive the people into believing that Rick Halford and Arliss Sturgulewski both voted to increase the budget.

Campbell does not come right out and lie to you, but he comes so close that he completely hides the truth.

What the commercial says is that Halford and Sturgulewski both voted on the increased budget. The key word here is "on." Now I know that Campbell is not experienced with the state

political process but even he knows that as a member of the Legislature, you always vote on the budget. What he is trying to hide from you is how they voted.

Halford fought against and voted against the bloated budget. Halford fought for reasonable viable budget cuts. Sturgulewski, on the other hand, as usual, voted for the increase.

So tell me one more time where does Campbell stand on ethics and who does he think is sexy?

Sandra Clark
Anchorage

Taking issue with Anderson

To the editor:

I was somewhat appalled by the comments made by former state representative and senator, Nels Anderson Jr. of Dillingham, that we have to take drastic measures in order to protect our resources.

I find it hard to believe "us Natives" would have the heart to make it stringent for others to hunt on corporate lands, much less fueling the fire with words non-existent in our culture.

At the political scene, in relation to District 26, we fought so long and hard to manage fish and game with statehood.

From the would-be Native executives, to the halls of Congress, they seemingly want to challenge the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act's constitutionality. ANILCA does not stand alone. Its roots are buried within Sections 17(d)

1 and (d)2 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

It does appear compellingly clear that there are those like the state legislators and Wayne Anthony Ross who overstay their welcome.

Besides closing the "corporate lands" to shareholders, I presume it will not solve their crisis more or less. They should reconsider doing it, due to the instability of the corporations' indemnifications clause that clearly states the corporation is there to be sued.

We need not downplay one another, but we should be specific who we are including. Generally speaking, a paragon government does not take advantage of its people, nor is it an excuse to betray by trust the indigenous people of this land.

Sincerely,
Kenneth N. Nanalook
Togiak

Murkowski responds to TT editorial

To the editor:

I was disappointed to see your July 30 editorial entitled "What's Murkowski's point?" I do not mind my position being challenged, but I do mind my letter to Gov. Cowper being misinterpreted.

In answer to your editorial's question, my point is that the responsibility for meeting the subsistence needs of Alaskans must be with the state, first and last. And we should amend the constitution to reflect the paramount importance of this responsibility and to give the Legislature flexibility to protect subsistence harvests for those who need them most.

I have consistently advocated this position before and after the recent special session of the Legislature. If the state will lead the way to put the questions of the constitutionality of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act behind us, we may then begin to form an Alaskan consensus to protect subsistence.

Many aspects of ANILCA are not in the best interest of Alaskans who rely on the public lands. Access to vitally needed resources is often unfairly restricted by the federal land managers. (It is for this and other



Letters to the Editor

reasons that Alaska's congressional delegation voted against ANILCA in 1980.)

My view, as I wrote to the governor, the type of federalism contained in Title VIII of ANILCA is an

affront to the Statehood Act and contrary to the essence of our constitution. Our state government can justly and humanely address the needs of all citizens and protect the integrity of all resources. We do not welcome or need

federal direction or oversight in this regard.

You correctly point out that a lawsuit has already been filed. But I ask you, what's the point? This lawsuit may not take the right approach. It has not been filed by the state to protect the state's political interests. It has been filed by individuals on primarily equal protection grounds. This may be the wrong lawsuit.

I have never suggested or requested that the state join this lawsuit. Many attorneys conclude that a constitutional challenge to ANILCA Title VIII is certain to fail. I am not an attorney and therefore cannot pass judgment. However, it is fair to note that the Alaska attorneys who drafted Title VIII of ANILCA were certain that the law would pass state constitutional muster, and it hasn't.

Attorneys are prepared to argue both sides of this type of question, and 50 percent of the time they're wrong.

Let's get the question of the constitutionality of ANILCA Title VIII behind us and get down to the business of protecting subsistence harvests for those Alaskans who need them most.

Sincerely,
Sen. Frank Murkowski
Washington, D.C.

Jacko congratulates St. Paul on the opening of its harbor

To the editor:

Congratulations to the community of St. Paul for the official opening of its harbor this past weekend!

This harbor represents a great achievement for the Pribilofs. For 200 years, this island economy was solely dependent on the commercial harvest of seal for the government — first Russian, then American.

When the federal government withdrew the Pribilof Island Program in 1984 and subsequently banned the commercial harvest of the fur seal, the Pribilofs faced an uncertain future and had to create a totally new economy.

There are many communities across the entire United States facing this challenge — communities struggling to revive a local economy after being abandoned by industry. These com-

munities, however, have at minimum had the advantage of being on a national road system, with public infrastructure, transportation and communication largely already intact.

The Pribilof Islands — scattered, remote islands in the middle of the Bering Sea — did not.

The completion of their harbor is a testament of the Pribilovians' will to survive in a home many others might have too readily abandoned.

They have come a long way. And although they have far to go, I am confident they will succeed in their efforts to be economically self-sufficient. Congratulations.

Sincerely,
Rep. George Jacko Jr.
Juneau