

## Point Hope upset over poor mail service

Mr. Steve Laroe  
U.S. Postal System Examiner  
Main Office  
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701

Re: Mail Service and etc.

Although we are sympathetic to the Munz Northern Airlines in the loss of one of their airplanes and pilot, we feel as a village, residents should not have to suffer by the results of its consequence.

Munz has been carrying almost totally passenger fares over our share of mail for the village this fall. We are aware of weather conditions, when we don't expect for their services. But when conditions improve, they fail to deliver. One mail takes over one month to travel from Anchorage to Point Hope.

When Munz announce their schedule over KOTZ Radio, for two flights to Point Hope, we would share these flights with Noatak, Kivalina, and Cape Lisbourne, when they suppose to be direct flights.

For our Point Hope Native Store there are three weeks supply of bread holding at Munz in Kotzebue.

Munz with Islander type airplanes could not possibly keep up with the mail and freights for Point Hope alone.

Mr. Laroe, we urge you to investigate Munz Airlines in their mail delivery service to the villages, perhaps they got into Wien's subcontract which overload themselves so badly and could not deliver. Certainly there is definitely wrong in mail delivery service at Kotzebue Munz Airlines.

Wish to hear from you in the immediate future.

Tigara Corporation, and  
City of Point Hope

cc: Tundra Times

## Critical of Don Young idea

The Honorable Don Young  
U.S. House of Representatives  
1210 Longworth House  
Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Young:

We noted with interest your proposal to the Legislature, presented last Monday, that a General Fund appropriation of \$5 to \$10 million finance a massive lobbying effort against the passage of HR 39. We believe such an effort, at this time, would be unwise.

At a time when the credibility of Alaska is at a low ebb in Congress, primarily due to the generally uninformed rhetoric of various groups and individuals who purportedly represent an "Alaskan position" on d-2 (generally) and HR 39 (specifically), a lobbying effort such as has been proposed would probably be interpreted as a waste of money (from a state which constantly tries to extract more money from the federal coffers). As well, it would constitute an admission that the State has been reduced to blind advocacy in opposition to one proposal without a responsibly developed alternative. Also, it would be an insult to the many Alaskans who support all, or at least parts of, the concepts embodied in the Subcommittee print (of HR 39) used for mark-up this month. In short, Con-

## Civil disobedience may not work on whaling issue

Dear Editor:

I read with interest the Tundra Times Editor's invitation to all our Native leaders to go on a whale hunt this spring. Also numerous articles in different newspapers on the same subject.

It really amazes me how and why our Government always seems to detract the rights of our people first before they will make any attempt to regulate the taking of any sea mammals by foreign nations.

Then I ask myself why our government want to destroy a tradition, a way of life, a ethnic heritage to appease other countries that have hunted the bowhead whale commercially and I believe were instrumental in depleting the number of whales in existence than the Alaskan Eskimo.

In school, I recall in American History, how I was taught how the American people severed their relationship from their mother country, England, and declared their independence with a document which was written with many beautiful words such as, equality, justice, government of the people, by the people and for the people and under God would not falter.

I ask myself why can't a government that uses as its foundation for government such well-written, just and profound documents such as the Declaration of Independence, Constitution of the United States, Lincoln's Gettysburg address, the National Anthem, the plaque on the Statue of Liberty, naming just a few.

Then I remember my sister bought me a book called "Profiles in Courage" by the late John F. Kennedy. Now I see things more clearly and come to the conclusion that the wheels of a democratic government only turn in Camelot and if you try to make them work in reality that there is a strong possibility you would die from a broken heart trying, or eventually be mentally or physically assassinated.

I read in these newspaper articles on the bowhead whale the Native leaders shouting for Native unity and civil disobedience. I sense a hint of revolution. Now I can surmise this would be the wrong approach; revolution, civil disobedience might create more impasses than there already exist.

So I ponder the idea of a workable solution for all the future travails of the Alaska Native and I find only three plausible solutions that would have to work hand in hand before it would be workable.

Now if we developed unity along with autonomy and using this unity and autonomy to develop a solid Native voting bloc in this state and with proper manipulation, organization and solidification this would give the Native the motivation and incentive to develop a Native community that could deal effectively with future problems that could and probably would arise such as the ban on the bowhead whale.

Respectfully,  
R.A. Siverly

gressman, were the State to act favorably on the proposal, we believe the effort would be counter-productive to a final resolution of the d-2 issue on terms generally acceptable to most Alaskans.

It is our belief that there is no Alaskan consensus on d-2 (save, perhaps, a majority which takes a knee-jerk stand in opposition to a "federal lock-up" of Alaskan lands). And we would submit that the reason for this is that there has been little responsible public discussion of the issue which might have served to develop consensus among Alaskans.

Organizations such as the Alaska Federation of Natives, regional non-profit corporations in the Bush and Rural CAP possess the interest and capability to assist in the development of consensus among their respective constituencies. We can do this, despite severely limited resources, because we have recognized the overriding imperative of achieving federal protection of Native subsistence options in any d-2 legislation which finally emerges.

All of this is not to suggest that it is too late to build Alaskan consensus on the issue (or at least parts of it; i.e. resource management). Neither do we suggest that the role of the Legislature in appropriating General Fund monies and providing some leadership on the issues is entirely inappropriate. It is our belief that the Congress would be receptive (indeed, would welcome) evidence that the State is taking steps to put its house in order and to involve its citizens in the formation of positive recommendations to be made to the Congress. What follows is a series of recommendations which, if followed, would strengthen the State's position in Congress.

1) Begin, in earnest, a series of State-funded workshops to discuss the most appropriate methods of decentralizing the decision-making authority of the Boards of Fish and Game. These workshops should be held throughout the State, adequate materials should be prepared and disseminated to the participants, a real effort should be made to notify in advance and prepare local people to participate, and costs for the workshops should be borne by the State.

(We have been involved in two meetings called by Commissioner Skoog to discuss this topic and applaud the Administration's initiative; however, the first meeting yielded only a consensus that another one was needed, while the second one quickly degenerated into a debate between those who favored decentralization and those who opposed it. Other meetings are planned, but there isn't any indication that the outcome will be any more positive. As well, in neither of the above instances did the State pay any transportation costs for participants, nor were adequate working papers made available.)

2) Hold similar conferences on other issues being addressed by d-2 legislation; i.e. land conveyance to Native Corporations and the State, easement policies, the proposed Land Bank, the environmental protection of all federal (public) lands through various administrative devices, the equated economics of "preservation vs. development," the actual proposals for various designations of d-2 lands, state land selection procedures and goals, etc.

3) Increase or initiate funding to appropriate management entities which rely, at present, almost exclusively on federal funds (i.e. the Divisions of

PLEASE TURN TO PAGE FIVE

# ● letters

**CONTINUED OFF OF PAGE TWO**

Sport Fish and Game within ADF&G, the Coastal Zone Management program, etc.), in order to demonstrate a good faith effort by the State to manage the lands and resources which are presently its responsibility.

4) Support, through adequate financing, State participation in the "interim management plan" called for by AFN President Byron Mallott last week, thereby adding credibility to the State's frequent assertion that subsistence uses are the number one priority of resource allocation decisions and that the State recognizes (and accepts) its partnership role with the federal government in these matters.

5) Recognize that the proposed public lands designations and management systems are, in fact, national concerns and their ultimate disposition is quite properly a subject of national debate and Congressional determination.

In our opinion, if any or all of the above suggestions were positively acted upon and forthrightly implemented, the "Alaskan position" in Congress and throughout the United States would be far more palatable.

Again, I express our sincere reservations about the wisdom of the approach you have suggested and reiterate our proposal that the State initiate a positive effort with its own citizens prior to funding a major lobbying effort in Washington, D.C.

Thank you for your attention to these remarks.

Sincerely,  
Phil Smith  
Executive Director  
RurAL CAP

cc: Tundra Times

## Liked Sadie Neakok story

Dear Editor:

That was a most excellent article on Sadie Neakok! She is undoubtedly one of the great Alaskans of all time. I first became acquainted with her when I was employed by the State of Alaska Health and Welfare Department in 1967 and 1968. I regarded Sadie as the "conscience of Barrow." Her biography should be a sequel to "50 Years Below Zero."

Sincerely,  
Lester Frank