letters

TT is in error according to Schaeffer

Dear Editor:

I noticed that in your last issue you accused Mauneluk Association and NANA Regional Corporation, Inc., of being at odds on the respective positions we took on the Wien Pilots Strike. This isadefinitely not the case. Had you or your staff contacted Mauneluk or NANA about the facts involved, your unsubstantiated embarrassing article would possibly have some truth to it.

Mauneluk Association is our

ticle would possibly nave some truth to it.

Mauneluk Association is our non-profit tribal organization whose total emphasis is socio-conomic development of the people within our regional boundary. The Mauneluk Board of Directors, comprised of representatives from each of our villages, met in October and were quite concerned about the impact of the Wien strike. We took a strong stand for one reason-the safety of passengers traveling to and from Kotzebue, especially during our harsh winter months when the weather is usually quite bad.

Our resolution did not specify that we were "Pro Wien Pilot Strikers." It simply

our resolution did not specify that we were "Pro Wien Pilot Strikers." It simply asked the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to get involved in settling the strike because of safety reasons. On the other hand, NANA Regional Corporation, Inc., is a profit corporation whose total emphasis is profit motivation. NANA has substantial investments in Kotzebue. A majority of the investments are in the tourism industry. If tourism

of the investments are in the tourism industry. If tourism were to be discouraged, our NANA ventures in Kotzebue would be placed in jeopardy. Thus, because we know that the Striking Wien Pilots are picketing a show to encourage "lower 48'ers" to tour Alaska, NANA took action against the Striking Wien Pilots "dirty pool" action. NANA and Mauneluk are both in agreement because it affects our people in general.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Schaeffer, Chairman Mauneluk Board of Directors

Response from Alaska Airlines

Mr. Walter R. Carlo P.O. Box 101 Tanana, AK 99777

Dear Mr. Carlo:

Mr. Cosgrave has asked that I respond in his behalf to your recent letter. We were very sorry to hear about the difficulty encountered when presenting a check to our Fairbanks ticket counter.

In recent years, we have found it necessary to adopt a more restrictive policy on check acceptance. Losses on checks presented by individuals with

found it necessary to adopt a more restrictive policy on check acceptance. Losses on checks presented by individuals with good personal identification have been quite high. Our current policy of requiring the individual to have at least one valid, major credit card is the result of considerable business experience and an attempt to control our rate of loss. It is, of course, unfortunate that a minority of individuals can impact business procedure and customer convenience in such a way. We believe that our check acceptance policy is reasonable and no more restrictive than that followed today by most businesses.

letters

I can assure you, Mr. Carlo, that our policy concerning check acceptance is uniformly followed without any regard whatsoever for a person's race or place of residence.

Again, we apologize for any difficulty experienced in this matter and appreciate this opportunity to further explain our policy.

Sincerely,

Timothy T. Orkins Manager, Consumer Affairs Alaska Airlines

cc: Tundra Times

Supportive

Dear Editor:

I'm writing this letter to of-fer my support to all those who are advocating and fighting to-continue the Native right to sub-sistence way of life here in Alas-

There are those who want to efine" subsistence. For the There are those who want to "define" subsistence. For the Alaska Native who lives the culture, it is understood to be an intrinsic part of Native way of life. It is those people who do not know the culture who want definition of subsistence. If it is to be defined, it has to be defined in relation to the Alaska Native cultures. Subsistence is an integral part of Alaska Native cultures. It cannot be dealt with as a separate entity. It can only be dealt with as a part of the whole culture. It is one of the main ingredients which makes Alaska Native cultures viable.

For those who do not grasp this concept, let me attempt to give an example. Look at the sun. It gives light and it has a life-supporting quality which is essential to all living

the sun. It gives light and it has a life-supporting quality which is essential to all living organism here on this planet. Now take one of its qualities and define it so you can limit

letters

its usefulness. It cannot be done. The sun is whole and its parts kept together give it existence. We accept and appreciate their cultures as a

whole.

So along with all the other Natives of Alaska, I stress that subsistence is very important and it should be given a very serious consideration by all those who are concerned and dealing with the issue. Consider very seriously the concerns volced by all Natives of Alaska who will be most affected by future decisions which will soon be made. They live it and they know what subsistence means to them. Subsistence is what has made it possible for our people to live through past generations and what has perpetuated the lifestyle of Natives of Alaska.

Along with all the true Native people of Alaska, I reiterate that subsistence way of life is not only an individual endeavor. Besides providing for his immediate family, the Native person also gives and shares his catch with the other members of the community. There is always mutual sharing and giving of food. The Native people support one another by means of subsistence. They also have potlatches, potlucks and seal parties to augment the sharing and giving. So subsistence cannot and should not be misconstrued as a selfish individual endeavor of personal enrichment. Subsistence is the sustenance of Native culture.

What rhetoric should be used to express the importance of Alaska Native subsistence? The rhetoric is in the voices of Alaska Native subsistence? The rhetoric is in the voices of Alaska Native subsistence? The rhetoric is not was imply it is said and written. Alaska Native people know and live what they say. Rhetoric is our cul-

Sincerely yours,

David Chanar

RCA losing money

Dear Editor:

All of you are aware that at this point in time we are being bombarded with the usual election year rhetoric. The State has cinched the belt, directly affecting the harmonious existence of both business and labor. Most of us don't know which way to turn, and the State appears to enjoy twisting the spectators in circles.

Mixed emotions have now erupted on the APUC's decision not to grant RCA Alascom an increase in its State wide, long distance toll rates. The litigation has even been before the State Supreme Court, which handled it with sabestos gloves, dropping the hot potato back down to a lower court.

Since a very large portion of RCA Alascom's services have been appropriated directly to serve the State, and the State, by using the bureaucratic short-cut of adding another spool of red tape, is biding its time until after elections. While RCA Alascom, currently hand-cuffed, must experience the loss of an unrecoverable \$50,000 per day.

cuffed, must experience the loss of an unrecoverable abu,000 per day.

The ramifications of this maneuvering will probably include the loss of an unspecified number of professional jobs, (RCA Alascom has already pared its engineering staff to where the knife has just missed severing an artery) and would additionally deflate the total Alaskan economy. (To de-toll Fairbanks alone would cause an estimated \$21 million annually not to change hands, coupled with the fact that Fairbanks is already tolerating 20 percent unemployment, such a necessary move would only be met with bitterness at all levels.

fact that Fairbanks is already solutions and the such a necessary move would only be met with bitterness at all lesuels.

Telephone utilities are a highly technologically oriented business, where the state-of-the-art, electronic equipment is being implemented. When anyone dials 101, attempting a long distance call, they are using Alascom's sophisticated computerized equipment that switches the call to the proper circuits. Not all of the attempted calls are completed, thus, no billing, and no revenue generated. But, computer time was used, switching circuits operated, and an opertor was utilized.

The APUC, by law, establishes tariff rates that protect the people and also allows a utility a fair return on investment (7-15%). Without this authority, take for an example some local merchants who try for 25% and up. RCA Alascom could have earned much more during those lucrative pipeline days, but rather, was required to stay within the prescribed limit. The pipeline days are all but over now. RCA Alascom isn't making half of what that law says that it should make to obtain a fair return on investment.

When you go out to dinner, the price of the meal includes the use of the silverware.

Should the APUC continue to allow a major industry to die a slow and merciless economic death, or grant them relief before the upcoming political change of regime?

Thomas At Bazan