

# letters

## Fish council

NUNAM KITLUTSISTI

Box 267

Bethel, Alaska 99559

May 14, 1979

Congressman Don Young  
House of Representatives  
1210 Longworth Building  
Washington D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Young:

While in Washington, D.C., I visited with your staff and asked for your support of a candidate from Western Alaska who was to have been nominated by the Governor as one of six candidates for the two Alaskan positions on the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council this year.

I spoke with you with confidence of a Western Alaskan being included among the six candidates. The Governor had made a definite pledge to me personally in August, 1978, and had informed the two political leaders of our region one week before my departure to Washington that he would place a Western Alaskan as one of the candidates.

Western Alaskans took special interest in the nominating process this year, avoiding the confusion last year when we were not told of the deadline for nominations. We worked very closely with the Off ice of the Governor to make sure that nomination letters were present in advance of the deadline. With the Herring FMP, the Bering Sea Groundfish FMP, and the coordination of the INPFC with the NPFMC all viable issues for the next three years, the importance of having a Western Alaskan as a participant in federal fisheries decisions was essential.

As you are now well aware, the Governor did not nominate a Western Alaskan. It is unfortunate that once again, a festering wound was not closed, and the concerted effort to prevent Western Alaskans from participating as voting members in federal fishing bodies continues. Having no outlets, Western Alaskans will have to continue to channel their interests and employ methods of expressions that will be outside of negotiated agreements arrived at recognized policy-making bodies. Actions of this continu-

# letters

ing nature can only inhibit the constructive dialogue so essential for Western Alaskans, other Alaskans, and the Federal Government.

In peace,

Harold Sparck  
Director

## Thanks

May 21, 1979

Dear Editor:

This is an opportunity to express the Gajaa Heen Dancers appreciation to the Kodiak Parent Committee for sponsoring the dancers on a week long trip visiting seven communities.

The hospitality at each community was great! We visited Pt. Lions, Ouzinkie, Old Harbor, Karluk, Larsen Bay, Akiak, and the dancers performed in Kodiak for all the schools, one public performance and for the patients at the hospital.

It was a unique experience, as many of the dancers had never flown on a small plane before. At one place we were told that this was the first "live" performance to ever come to their place.

We enjoyed having Norma Gallagher accompany us to the various communities and to help us while we were in Kodiak.

There were 17 dancers as well as Ethel Makinen and myself.

Sincerely,  
Isabella G. Brady  
Executive Director  
Sitka Native Education Program

## Sealing

May 18, 1979

Senator Mike Gravel  
3317 Dirksen Bldg.  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Sir:

The conservationists are going to take it upon themselves to try to stop the seal harvest on the Pribiloffs. They will be up there to force their opinions on the Aleuts by trying to compare the baby harp seal killing of Canada to the fur seal harvest which is no comparison to the Canadians. We of the Pribiloffs kill the 3 and 4 year old males which in

# letters

the future will fight till death for a harem, it is nature's way of balancing the seal population. It has been proven scientifically that they are killed in the most humane way.

We the Aleuts feel that the conservationists have their priorities mixed up in that they show more concern for the animal than the human beings that live up there. We have been ill treated by the Russians then the United States upon purchasing Alaska didn't change the trend. All one has to do is read our history of slavery and the way our fore-fathers worked for meager necessities while our own government made millions off of the seals and the Aleuts free labor. During WW 11 we were evacuated like cattle to a remote fishing cannery in S.E. Alaska. Now I understand the conservationists are going to march up there and save the seals and us Aleuts from our selves. How many of these good people are willing to move from their homes by some one telling them to do so and give up there way of living because someone told them to. How about just across the street?

I have a suggestion for the conservationists, that they take pictures of all those poor "sad eyed cows" just before they are slaughtered. Also that they try banning hunting and fishing and see how far they get with this kind of protection. All conservationists must be vegetarians in order for them to practice what they are preaching.

Respectfully yours,  
Ruth Chambers

## Wildlife

April 23, 1979

Dear Editor,

I'd like to make a few comments about the proposed Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. According to a news release from the Department of Interior, Office of the Secretary, dated March 28, 1979. "Village Hearings set in Alaska on proposed Final Public Land Withdrawals".

This heading by itself says a lot! An issue as important as this which will change the ways of our life today and change the ways of our children's lives for the rest of their lives. (See LETTERS page Nine)

# Letters • • •

(Continued from page Two)

The Interior Department Secretary Cecil D. Andrus, himself, should give us the people who notice like at least six months before he come out and hold these different types of land law hearings in "The Villages" like he says.

When he say "The Villages", he is talking about Galena, Kaktovik, Bethel, Dillingham and Arctic Village. What about Allakaket? Bettles; who will be directly affected by the Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge? Why the hell should we travel all the way to Galena, Alaska, to talk, make comments or testify about the Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge? While the Galena area got two National Wildlife Refuges all proposed up to now to talk about. They are Innoko and Koyukuk, both over 3 million acres. And according to the news release, each individual is limited to 10 minutes of oral comments. This is a bunch of B.S.

As far as I'm concerned about this land business, I'll quote two parts of the news release: "A National Wildlife Refuge is an area committed to and reserved for the primary purpose of protection and perpetuation of fish and wildlife and habitat resources". It goes on to say, "All units of the National Wildlife Refuge System are managed to insure that fish and wildlife populations and their habitats will indefinitely benefit people". Now I don't understand this kind of English too well, but it seems like it is saying two different things about the same thing. Like it is saying The National Wildlife Refuge is all for the protection of fish and Wildlife and then at the same time saying The National Wildlife Refuge is there to benefit the people with the fish and wildlife.

Is this news release advertising the Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge and the other National wildlife refuges for public use? I wonder.

All the Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge, 1.5 million acres of it, all is where we the people of Allakaket, Alatna, and Bettles have been and still are today. And hopefully our children tomorrow will be using it for subsistence hunting, fishing, ber-

ry picking, camping and trapping. We have all the proof within most of the Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge.

I better state right here, that up to now this is all proposed refuges. I know that The United States Fish and Wildlife Service can't say, "O.K. everything within this wildlife refuge is only open to Native Subsistence," because it is a United States' National Wildlife Refuge proposal. But they damn well better listen to what Bettles, Allakaket, and Alatna and any other villages that want to be involved have to say about the proposed Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge before they make any kind of regulations or decisions. This area was the whole life of our Ancestors and still is the better half of ours today. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service better damn well not make any regulations or decisions behind our backs that might cause a conflict with our lives or even a confrontation. I'm sure we would all like to avoid this.

Sincerely,  
Eddie Bergman

P.S. I would like to hear criticism, remarks or comments on this letter. Please write to the Editor on this. I only read or rather get Tundra Times so please write to Tundra Times. Thank you.

## Wolves

Editor  
Alaska Magazine  
Box 4-EEE  
Anchorage, Ak 99509

Ed. Note: A copy of this letter was sent to the Tundra Times.

To the Editor:

Nunam Kitlutsisti is deeply offended by the content of an article which appears in the "Alaska Sportsman" column on pages 38 and 39 of your May, 1979, issue of *Alaska magazine*. This article discussed the aerial wolf hunt which occurred during the spring of 1979 in the Nowitna and Innoko River Drainages, and Game

Management Units 19A and 19B.

This article implies that Nunam-Kitlutsisti does not speak for subsistence users in Southwestern Alaska. This implication is a gross distortion of the facts. Nunam Kitlutsisti's Board of Directors is made up of villagers from throughout the Yukon-Kuskokwim delta who live and grew up in the subsistence lifestyle. The members of the Board are chosen by local residents who also are subsistence users. The staff members of Nunam-Kitlutsisti serve only at the pleasure of the Board. It is difficult to envision a more direct relationship between Nunam Kitlutsisti and the subsistence users in this area.

The article in question fails to mention several facts which display that local support for the wolf hunt by subsistence users was minimal. No mention was made of the fact that the local fish and game advisory committees, established pursuant to state law to supply the Divisions of Fisheries and Game with local input into their decision-making process, were never even consulted prior to the announcement of the hunt. Furthermore, the Lower Yukon and Lower Kuskokwim Advisory Committees, which met subsequent to the announcement of the hunt, both came out against the hunt. Both advisory committees stated that there will never be enough moose for subsistence use as long as sport hunters are allowed to continue to take between 20 and 25% of the moose harvest in the areas covered by the wolf hunt. The general consensus of both advisory boards was that the sport hunters must go first; then, and only then, can the wolf problem be addressed, if necessary.

The Division of Game's public justification of the wolf hunt was based upon the need to protect the subsistence moose harvest. Yet the Division failed to state that between 20 and 25% of the moose harvest in the affected areas is taken by sport hunters who also would be benefitted by the aerial hunt. If the true justification of the hunt was to protect subsistence hunters, why has the Division and Board of Game continually refused to create

subsistence moose zones in these areas, even though the Board is legally empowered to create such zones and on numerous occasions the local advisory committees have requested that the Board create such zones? Subsistence moose zones would exclude sport hunting from the designated area, and it is logical to assume that subsistence hunting would be tremendously benefitted in the process. Even today the Board has made no attempt to establish such zones.

Considering the facts stated above, it is no wonder that the article contains the names of neither its author nor the name of the Game Board member who stated that opposition to the wolf hunt came from those who were not personally affected. Nunam-Kitlutsisti demands that both the author of the article and the Game Board member identify themselves and apologize in writing to our organization and your readers.

Finally, we demand that *Alaska Magazine*, in the future, clearly label such one-sided and biased articles as being either editorials or opinions, as the case may be. In the interim, *Alaska magazine* should also apologize to Nunam Kitlutsisti and the readers of the magazine for the printing of an article containing such a biased attack on our organization. We trust that in the future you will

be more careful in what you publish.

Sincerely,  
Harold Sparck  
Director  
Nunam Kitlutsisti

## Clubs

May 24, 1979  
Pt. Hope

Dear Editor:

I've been contacting lions clubs for information on how to start a club that is big. I mean it deals with bingo, game activities, helping the community, and go by the laws which is a big thing. No results from them.

Your assistance would be a help. I haven't got around to get more members or veterans to help in this, but I do need the Direction, so that I can contact the local veterans, I'm interested because I care not only to have bingo and activities, but also to help in community affairs like to help raise or donate money for special occasions or needs. This kind of club would be beneficial to the people and the community. It can bring more activities, less violence. It can bring more financial help for the needy.

The city of Point Hope has (See LETTERS page Ten)

# Letters . . .

(Continued from page Nine)

several clubs. These clubs help to raise money for purposes, like to raise money to get more fuel for the clinic that is really under NSB/Manuelak. This is unnecessary, especially when finally this city is under a borough who has responsibility. There is no need to raise money just for a drum of fuel, when there is a borough who can get funds or grants for this type of thing.

This is why I care to start a club that is big enough to handle any kind of need for the Community. This would probably create less loads for the clubs who have fought these years and who don't need to

hold bingo especially the health committee who has a Borough who can do much for support. I'm not saying the committee should do away with bingo and itself. I'm saying the Borough and Manuelak can get funds to help the committee. The committee is no longer self-supporting, they are under a Borough who has total responsibility. I'm sure there are some committees out there who have the same process.

There are some of us who likes to get into things that could cause problems. There are some of us who cares to get into things that could come up to a progress. There are some of us who makes continuous

mistakes and not care. There are some of us who care to do much better through the mistake. This is success.

I got carried away writing this letter, but it says what I care. I've got to say that I learn from my mistakes. Easy to say that I once was a city official but I eventually end up resigning. But I still cared for a reason. I just cared for my people and the land around us. That is why I wrote this letter.

For those of us who have a talent of any kind, I encourage them to use it and to care for it. What you are is what is doing good. I've made some mistakes and I know I'm not perfect at what I do, but I begin to like it inside of me. This is my gift. As a Native and a Citizen of the U.S., I love it. I'm a Native who loves my tradition and culture. I love my land.

But I must admit, I hate politics. I love to see progress. I must support my own leaders, in City, State or Congress. They have the experience and Job to do for us Alaskans. But I still hate politics.

You see, I disagree with some others but I love progress.

This is my own concern. Many of us has different concerns. We have disagreements. But we love to make the corrections.

This is conscious. Making the better decision than the worst. Whatever you are, do for the best. Live to be a better person. This sounds like a preaching sermon. We all have gone through with it. Every speech, every conversation, every letter, even a line or two is a sermon whether you are a preacher or not.

As a Native and a human being who long to see my own ancestors as well as yours, I care for a reason. My final point: I tried but I end up goofing up-----But I shall try again to do much better than before.

Mr. Editor, sorry to put a lot of space in your paper, but I end up carried away. If there is a need to delete, I'll understand. To sum it up: I was just fed up. I hope this letter will not only help me but someone else.

Thank you,

Morris Oviok  
Concerned Citizen

## Easements

P.O. Box 159  
Unalakleet, Alaska 99684

April 26, 1979

Stanley H. Bronczyk, Chief  
Franch of Easement Identification  
Bureau of Land Management  
701 C Street, Box 13  
Anchorage, Alaska 99513

Dear Stan:

Thank you so much for keeping your word and sending the material I requested relative to our discussions about easements upon Unalakleet Native Corporation lands.

This will be an INFORMAL letter, in which I will attempt to convince you of the legitimacy of my reasons for objecting to those easements proposed by the BLM and LUPC, more specifically those which would provide for campsites on UNC lands, but also those which are proposed for access to public lands.

First, let me point out what I consider to be the key

paragraphs from the portion of the Federal Register which you sent: 1. "These regulations are effective *immediately* in order to expedite conveyance to the Alaska Natives. The issuance of patents to the Natives under ANCSA has been delayed, and it is in the *public* interest to carry out the purposes of ANCSA as rapidly as possible." (Page 55328, *emphasis mine*.) 2. "Present existing use means use by either the *general public* which includes *both Natives and non-Natives* alike, or by a Federal, State, or municipal corporation entity on or before December 18, 1976, or the date of selection, whichever is later. Past use which has long been abandoned shall not be considered present existing use." (From the same page, under "Definitions" (p) - again, *emphasis mine*.)

The same subtle dichotomy (look up the word, and consider for a minute its use in astronomical circles) seems to pervade every federal document that concerns "the Native interest". To me, it says, "Where the public interest' is concerned, the Alaska Native's interest will be set aside; but where the interests of the Alaska Native are concerned, then Alaska Natives shall be considered a part of the 'general public'." In the one case, the Natives, "in the public interest", are subjected to a process which has been ordered to be carried out in a fashion which necessitates hurried evaluation, discussion, and decision-making about areas which were occupied and used ages before the federal government arrived in Alaska. In the other case, Natives are lumped with the 'general public', even though the circumstances are such that their own private lands are at stake.

I, too, enjoyed our meeting; yet, in my frustration when confronted with these two disparate paragraphs, the only people I knew to blame were you and the other members of your team. I looked over the Register, and discovered that "The principal authors of this proposed rulemaking are Don Argetsinger of the Office of the Assistant Secretary - Land and Water Resources, and John W. Burke of the Solicitor's Office, assisted by other staff members of those two offices and personnel from the Bureau of (See LETTERS page Twelve)

# Letters • • •

(Continued from page Ten)

Land Management." Why couldn't we have met with Arget-singer or Burke? Obviously, because of their duties elsewhere, and I understand that, but something inside me wonders why YOU were present representing the authors, and I was present, voicing the concerns of shareholders of a corporation to which I am not enrolled, and together, we were supposedly formulating decisions which should have been thrashed out by the principals of the conflict.

Nevertheless, because my parents and family are enrolled to UNC, and because I will always have an interest in Unalakleet and the surrounding area (I was born here), I will press on with my arguments:

1. I am certainly at odds with what the Land Use Planning Commission and the Bureau of Land Management consider "ne-

cessary and reasonable" allocations for campsites upon UNC lands. It seems to me that assumptions are being made about potential use and present significant use for which I can find no reasonable basis.

For example, if it is true that a 'major waterway' (and in my use of the word *major*, I take the definition "greater in extent" of usage) means any "river... which has significant use in its liquid state by watercraft for access to publicly owned lands or between communities ('significant' being further described as "more than casual, sporadic, or incidental use by watercraft, including float planes, but not including use of the water-body in its frozen state by snowmobiles, dogsleds or ski-planes"), then the Unalakleet River does NOT qualify as a major waterway. Usage of this river by *other than local people* (the great majority of local people being stockholders of the Unalakleet Native Corporation) is indeed, "casual, sporadic, and incident-

tal".

Yet, the BLM persists in citing the future need for a campsite upon the Unalakleet River for those who *might* want access to public lands beyond the Corporation lands. I take the position that SHOULD the Unalakleet River become a "major waterway", thus attracting people who DO require a way to get from Norton Sound to public lands inland, then AT THAT FUTURE TIME, after evaluation has PROVEN the need for a campsite or campsites on the Unalakleet River, THEN the BLM can step in and justify one.

At the present time, to my way of thinking, if a person or persons is sincerely interested in getting to those public lands inland from UNC land, they might just as well start in Fairbanks and work their way to the public lands; or, if they were a little smarter, they could use the Yukon River (which both practically and historically is a "major waterway") and get to the public lands in whatever manner they wish to try.

2. As I stated for the record during our meeting April 9, I am further disturbed (no, INCENSED) by the implication that the Natives in the Unalakleet area should prepare to accommodate the general public in its pursuit of wilderness areas which, by right, by tradition, and by reason, belong to the Native people of the Unalakleet area. And by the

implication that, even if that pursuit invades the privacy of the Native people; and even if the potential for littering and other violations of the land is admitted by the BLM and LUPC to be high; and even if our accommodation of wilderness-seekers means that whatever Native commercial endeavors that might profit if there were no public campsites will have to suffer; nevertheless we will be REQUIRED by Federal law to make those accommodations.

3. Similarly, I feel that those easements proposed to provide access *across* UNC land are unnecessary and unreasonable, due to the fact that we live in the age of air travel; it would seem to me that the rights of UNC could be protected, and the public's right to access to public lands could both be ensured if the BLM were to propose the construction of airfields at strategic points on public lands. For those unfortunate enough to live far enough away from the wilderness and whose lifestyle precludes the ability to rent air-planes, roads from their areas could be built, but I see no point in assuming that if this is so, they could afford to travel to the Unalakleet area and then not be able to afford to travel further inland. (It defies the test of "reason".)

By the way, I seem to recall your using as an argument the protection of stockholders of the Unalakleet Native Corporation, should its present management change. I came upon this enigmatic statement during my perusal of the Register: "If public easements are to be reserved, they shall...not be reserved for the purpose of protecting Native stockholders

from their respective corporations;" and really did not know what to make of it, unless it could be for Natives who would try to avoid municipal taxes (which in Unalakleet are levied by the City of Unalakleet - an entity removed from the activities of the Corporation).

I was also puzzled by the clause which states, "(public easements shall) not be reserved simply to reflect patterns of Native use on Native lands;". are we a part of the general public, or are we not? And are not public easements granted for the use of the general public? If so, why does our use not count in this instance?

I doubt very much that my opinions will come to bear upon your office during the final evaluation of easements in the Unalakleet area. But I appreciate this opportunity to let you know how I feel, because I am sure my beliefs on these important issues are shared by the great majority of UNC stockholders and many people who, through indifference, shyness, or ignorance would never offer their own opinions, because they, like me, feel their opinions do not count and will make no appreciable difference in the outcome of public easements on Corporation land.

It is too bad the LUPC must disband at a time when the expertise and experience of its members are so needed for a process which will have such an impact upon the lives of all Alaska Natives. I would like to say thank you, for your work on something which, at times, must have been a thankless task.

Sincerely,  
Vernita J. Zilyis