

Den Nena Henash - Our Land Speaks

Ut Kah neek - Informing and Reporting

Yupit Kaniautciat - The Way Eskimos Talk

Unangan Tunukun - The Aleuts Speak

Inupiat Paitot - People's Heritage

Barrow foundation says thank you

To the editor:

The Arctic Education Foundation, the nonprofit educational program of the Arctic Slope Regional Corp., takes this opportunity to express our gratitude and appreciation to those organizations and companies who contribute financially to our program.

Without the generosity of these contributors, AEF would not be able to award scholarships throughout the year to more than 50 college students enrolled in 21 different institutions across the country.

Thank you for your support for the 1988-89 school year. Your support

makes our foundation work. Special thanks to: Arctic Slope Regional Corp., Chevron USA, BP Exploration, Qitiktichit Committee of Barrow, Shell Oil Co. Foundation, SKW-Eskimos Inc., VFW Post 9890 of Barrow, Point Hope Women Dog Mushers, UIC Construction Co., Amoco Production Co., Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission of Barrow, Barrow Mothers' Club, Piquini Management Corp., Wainwright Womens' Club.

Flossie H. Andersen, Manager
Arctic Education Foundation
Barrow

A call to villages throughout Alaska

To village tribal leaders:

This letter is a call to action. Last December the U.S. Department of the Interior issued a final notice in the *Federal Register* questioning the "tribal" status of our Alaska villages.

The notice states that the Department of the Interior no longer views Alaska villages as tribes — a major shift in the federal government's policy up to now — and then equates the status of Alaska villages with the status of the private Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act corporations established under state law.

We have come to expect attacks on our tribal status by the State of Alaska, and even by the Alaska Supreme Court. But never had we imagined that the U.S. Department of the Interior, the department which is charged by Congress with protecting our rights, would turn on us.

The department took its action under cover of night, just before department officials left office. They refused to disclose to us precisely what it was they were going to do and to give us

a chance to comment on what they were planning to do.

They acted in secret, although they disclosed their plans to the Alaska Delegation and got the delegation's blessing.

News of this new development has not yet spread across the state. That is why I am writing this letter. The new secretary of the Interior and our Alaska Delegation must have your views. Please write them and let them know that your villages have been self-governing tribes since long before memory and that the department is violating a law when it tries to deny this fact.

Let them know that you demand to have a full public hearing on the Department of the Interior's Alaska Native policies *before* those policies are adopted, not *after*.

Even if you can only write a brief note, every village must stand up and be counted. Please write to Sens. Ted Stevens, Frank Murkowski, Daniel Inouye, Reps. Don Young, Stuart Udall

(Continued on Page Three)

Southeast fishery problems

To the editor:

My name is Charlie Polk. I have lived and commercially fished in Southeast Alaska for the past 25 years. I would like to express my support for United Southeast Alaska Gillnetter's Amended proposal Number 136.

I think it is a good proposal that would affect the harvest of surplus pink salmon in the Taku Inlet terminal area while maintaining the normal harvest of sockeye. I oppose the adoption of any of the following proposals: Number 114, 116, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 193, 307, 313 and 314.

These proposals are all aimed at escalating the mixed stock fisheries in the Icy Straits corridor area. If anyone believes differently, there is a bridge downtown that I would be willing to sell them real cheap.

If all these proposals were adopted they would quite likely eliminate the Taku and Lynn Canal Gillnet, Sport and Subsistence Fishery. If any of these proposals were adopted they would without a doubt have a dramatic impact on the many systems that the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and private nonprofit hatcheries are trying to rehabilitate.

According to state reports, they are not presently getting enough brood stock to support enhancement efforts on many of the systems that are in jeopardy.

This alone should be reason enough to stop any thought of increasing the mixed stock seine fishery in the Icy Straits corridor area. In fact, it would probably be prudent to further curtail seining in this corridor area until these stocks are once again healthy.

I am sure that any question about the seine fisheries' ability to intercept huge amounts of Taku- and Lynn Canal-bound fish while fishing in the Icy Straits corridor area would be answered by reading the Alaska Department of Fish and Game's 1989 report to the Northern Pacific Salmon

Commission, regarding interception of Taku River sockeye stocks. The first sentence in this report reads: "Canada is concerned that large numbers of Taku sockeye salmon are being caught outside District 11."

As we well know, the only other place they are presently being caught is the Icy Straits corridor area by the seine fishery. The Canadians are concerned that the present effort in Icy Straits is too high.

I wonder what they would have to say if we increased the mixed stock fishery in Icy Straits, and only a fraction of the run returned to the Taku River system.

In the Alaska Department of Fish and Game's March 1989 statement paper to the Board of Fisheries, regarding Southeast Coho Management, it appears to me that their intent is to allow the salmon to move inside closer to their terminal areas for two primary reasons:

- To allow the sport and subsistence users a greater opportunity in the fishery.

- To allow the stocks to separate and move into the terminal areas where the harvest and escapement can be managed in a precise and professional manner.

I think this is a good strategy, but if you are not going to eliminate and even possibly escalate the Icy Straits mixed stock purse seine fishery — why bother?

The biggest question in my mind is why have a mixed stock seine fishery in the Icy Straits corridor area at all. The seiners can catch their fish in their terminal areas, and the gillnetters and sportsmen can catch their fish in their terminal areas — the simplest solution to a very complex set of problems.

Thank you. I appreciate this opportunity to present my views and opinions.

Charlie Polk
Juneau

•Threat to village tribal rights

(Continued from Page Two)

and the Interior secretary, all in Washington, D.C., and let them know how you feel.

Please take the time to write.

What the department has done is a terrible degradation of our tribal rights, but it can be reversed if enough tribes and the Alaska Delegation insist on it. Please act now before it is too late.

Margaret Roberts, Chairman
Shoonag' Tribe of Kodiak



Letters to the Editor