

What others say...

Native access rights

To the editor:

The Miners Advocacy Council recently sent a letter to a number of villages, saying that a lawsuit by Trustees for Alaska threatens subsistence access to federal lands. This is not true.

Our lawsuit is not intended to affect Native access rights, and we do not believe that it will. The lawsuit challenges federal regulations that govern access for economic development activities, like mining. These regulations were issued under Title XI of ANILCA, the law that controls activities on federal land in Alaska.

Subsistence access to federal lands is protected by a completely different part of this law (Title VIII), which is not the subject of our

lawsuit.

The statements in the Miners Advocacy Council's letter are false and misrepresent our lawsuit. We have been working with the Tanana Chiefs Conference, Nunam Kirlut-sisti and villages in Interior Alaska and in the Yukon-Kuskokwim delta area to protect rivers and streams that are used for fishing, hunting, recreation and drinking water from placer mining.

We think the miners are deliberately trying to stop us from working with people who are affected by mining.

If you have any questions about this or anything else Trustees for Alaska is working on, please call us.

Very truly yours,
Patti J. Saunders

Concerns about ANWR

To the editor:

I was dismayed to read in your April 13th issue that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has decided to eliminate language referring to the core calving areas of the Porcupine Caribou Herd in its report to Congress on the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge Coastal Plain.

The agency did this, Sen. Murkowski stated, because "new research" shows there are no core calving areas. This would now mean there would be no need for special treatment of these areas to protect the caribou in the event of intrusion by man.

How convenient, Sen. Murkowski! And how terribly expedient for your purpose of having Congress open up the Coastal Plain for oil and gas development!

It reminds me of the nefariously untruthful practice of rewriting history that one finds in the Soviet Block countries. What the service has done is change the original language in the report to make it more attractive to the untutored minds of most politicians who have never been to ANWR, don't know the slightest thing about caribou behavior and probably have absolutely no concept of what "wilderness" is. And now the

USFWS whose charge it is to inform these representatives so they may make intelligent decisions, have changed the language so that the basis for an informed decision no longer exists.

Something else that greatly concerns me is the money the USFWS has used to study caribou behavior in ANWR over the past seven years. How much they have spent is anyone's guess, but why did they begin the research in the first place if at the end of the process key aspects of its findings are nullified?!!

What a shame! And what a terrible shame for the country — and for the state, if the state finally rubber stamps what the USFWS has done in spite of findings by its own biologists that core calving areas do indeed exist.

I can understand (even though I don't agree with it) the immense greed for profit of the oil companies and other corporations who stand to gain from the spoils they will rip and yank from the earth up in the ANWR, but I cannot buy into the conscious rewriting of history to achieve those ends!

Sincerely,
Frank J. Keim
Scammon Bay

'They gave it all away'

To the editor:

I am opposed to any more exploitation of our resources.

What little the original owners of Alaska receive is small. The Permanent Fund should not be shared with

the White Man.

Our children and grandchildren will some day say, "They gave it all away to the White Man."

Pat Kohler
Aleknagik