

"I may not agree with a word you say but I will defend unto death your right to say it." — Voltaire

Tundra Times



Owned, controlled and edited by Eskimo, Indian, Aleut Publishing Company, a corporation of Alaska natives. Published at Fairbanks, Alaska, weekly, on Wednesdays.

Address all mail to Box 1287, Fairbanks, Alaska, 99707. Telephone 452-2244.

Second class postage paid at Fairbanks, Alaska 99701.

Eskimo, Indian, Aleut Publishing Co., Inc. Board of Directors, Executive Committee: Howard Rock, President and Chairman of the Board; Chris Anderson, Executive Vice President; Mary Jane Fate, First Vice President; Betty Farni, Second Vice President; Jim Immel, Treasurer; Jimmy Bedford, Assistant Treasurer; Toni Jones, Secretary; Daphne Gustafson, Assistant Secretary; HOWARD ROCK, Editor.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Regular Mail (including Alaska, Canada and other states)	1 year \$15.00 6 months \$8.50
Air Mail (including Alaska, Canada and other states)	1 year \$35.00 6 months \$20.00

Member of the American Indian Press Association

Other Voices—

More than a land trade

Approval of the Cook Inlet land trade Monday by the Alaska House of Representatives virtually assures the complicated land transaction will receive final approval of the State Senate before the end of the week. If the Senate doesn't give its blessing to the package, the delicately negotiated settlement will have been a monumental waste of time.

The long-range importance of the agreement has gone unreported, largely as a result of the delicacy of the negotiations between the Cook Inlet Native Region, the State of Alaska and the Department of the Interior. But long after the specific details have been worked out on the Cook Inlet trade, its careful negotiation likely will still be used as the pattern from which other land trades in Alaska will be designed. As the first major land trade negotiated since the passage of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, it will be held up as the example until something better comes along.

Most important for the time being, however, is that the Natives in Southcentral Alaska finally have the opportunity to engage in land planning and development. Other Native regions have been so occupied for nearly two years, but the confusion over what lands would be available to Cook Inlet Indians produced the drawn-out negotiations.

Claims that the three-way trade is overly generous to the Natives have been heard and should be put to rest. There's no contention that the Natives in the Southcentral area aren't getting valuable lands. It simply needs to be remembered that the Natives are entitled to land of value, not the "glaciers and mountaintops" as former Cook Inlet President Andy Johnson described the Interior Department's initial selections on their behalf.

All Alaskans should look to the negotiations as a key to the settlement of future disagreements over Alaska's lands. In this situation everyone agreed that the Natives of the Cook Inlet Region were getting less-than-desirable lands. It really wasn't anyone's fault; there just weren't any selectable lands available within the boundaries established for the Cook Inlet group. So they negotiated a settlement.

We'll probably see the same sort of activity when the various national interest (d-2) land plans begin to fit into place. Someone will suggest that a portion of the land controlled by a Native corporation ought to be in a National Park, for example. The Native corporation, of course, is going to ask what it can expect in return for the release of its land.

The die is cast. Because Cook Inlet had the most pressing case, it, the state and the Interior Department made up the rules as they went along.

Assuming the over-all package gets the approval of the State Senate before the March 12 deadline, we should have an example from which to begin negotiating the future of lands trading in Alaska.

— DAILY NEWS-MINER

Letters from Here and There

Brown opposes legalized Prostitution

Alaska State Legislature
House of Representatives
March 10, 1976

Howard Rock
Tundra Times
P.O. Box 1287
Fairbanks, Alaska 99707

Dear Howard:

I recently received a copy of resolution number 1171 passed by the Fairbanks City Council on Feb. 9. The resolution appears to support HB 222, regarding prostitution.

Usually, I am a staunch supporter of the concept of home-rule. However, there are some issues which directly af-

fect the state's interests and must be addressed at a state level.

HB 222 has been offered, in part, to help "clean up" Fourth Avenue in Anchorage, and similar streets which are allegedly of ill repute throughout the state.

I think such reasoning is quite unrealistic, and I suspect that some members of the council agree with me.

I oppose legalized prostitution in Alaska for the same reason that I oppose legalized gambling. Either would attract a market from the Pacific Northwest and Canada that does not exist now. If it is financially feasible for gambling houses in Nevada to charter jet junkets from Fairbanks to Las Vegas and return, then it would be fi-

nancially feasible for such junkets to go from Seattle to Anchorage or Fairbanks and return. By creating a market in activities that are considered to be lucrative vices in other states, we could be providing a large economic incentive for those "businessmen" who deal in those services on an interstate level.

I think we all know who they are. They are here to some extent already, and there is no reason to encourage their activities.

Once these "interstate businessmen" discovered that a new market had been created for their services and wares in Alaska they would have a far more direct and immediate need to influence government here. Under HB 222 they would concentrate upon local government.

I see no reason to create an economic incentive for the syndicate to influence the governor, the Legislature, and those who govern at a local level in the State of Alaska.

I do not think that HB 222 will move from the House Judiciary Committee during the current session. If it is brought up I will vigorously oppose it, in committee, and on the floor of the House.

Very truly yours,
Rep. Fred Brown

STATE OF ALASKA

Office of the Governor

Juneau
View From Behind the Governor's Desk
No. 11

D-2 Land Issue
By GOV. JAY HAMMOND
March 4, 1976

There are certain hard inevitable facts Alaskans must be aware of regarding upcoming congressional decisions on national interest (D-2) lands in our state:

1. Congress will set aside, in Alaska, in 1977 or 1978, national interest lands. Current recommendations range from 36 million acres in the Hammond Administration's initial proposal to 105 million in the Udall bill.

2. Six hundred thirty-two non-Alaskan members of Congress would find it an easy vote to carve up maximum Alaskan acreage into slices for federal parks, refuges, or forests. They could, thus, do penance for environmental sins committed in their own backyards by demonstrating they'll "protect" Alaska.

3. Conservation interests will lobby Congress hard for large acreage set-asides in Alaska.

There are other facts of which Alaskans should be aware when considering an "Alaskan" approach to D-2:

— No public or private landowner can ignore his neighbor;
— No park is big enough to protect all wildlife year-round;
— No federal coastline can be managed independently of state tidelands;

— No Native corporation can risk major investments on its land without compatible management on adjacent public lands.

In Alaska today, state and private lands surround National Interest Lands. What occurs on each domain, of course, has significant impact on the other. What good does it do, for example, for us to impose maximum protection for fisheries at the upper end of the river on state lands, if the Feds build a high-reach dam on their lands down below? Conversely, if the state fails to assure some protection of fringe-area habitat, the Feds will take the land they have and lock it up forever to save remnant habitat.

Far better to have the state and federal government enter a cooperative management system. Without such system, nothing but the most chaotic management is likely to occur. Adjacent landowners, in paranoia, will attempt to gain the advantage.

When one considers the alternatives, I think concepts embodied in our D-2 proposal better meet the concerns of both Alaska and the nation.

We propose:

1. a flexible joint land management system for a large portion of D-2 lands . . . rather than a rigid system of exclusive use dictated by Congress;

2. an equally balanced Federal-State Land Commission with teeth and based in Alaska to make land decisions . . . rather than Congress trying to make them from Washington;

3. local input into land decisions ensured by area advisory boards . . . rather than no local input;

4. Alaskan decision-making, for the first time, over the use of large tracts of federal lands in our state . . . rather than living with decisions Congress makes for use of Alaskan land. (The state would place some of its land under the commission management to promote this opportunity);

5. Alaska veto authority over commission decisions on state land . . . rather than having no vote at all. (Federal commission members would have the same veto on federal lands);

6. Commission designation of prime resource values on the joint management lands . . . rather than Congress deciding in Washington;

7. emphasis on permission of compatible secondary uses . . . rather than prohibition;

8. agriculture, just as timber harvesting, mining and any other activity which did not do violence to the prime use would be permitted . . . rather than only a few uses permitted in parks or refuges under national interest classification;

9. daily management of lands by federal agency best suited for the job . . . rather than creating new bureaucracy;

10. flexibility to continue
(Continued on Page 6)

A Book Review— Alaska Geographic

A graphic appeal for international cooperation to protect an unsullied environment and a glittering look at a seldom seen past of the world come together in the current issue of the "Alaska Geographic," a quarterly publication for members of The Alaska Geographic Society, scheduled for release this week.

Canadian author/photographer Richard Harrington's coverage of the Antarctic is largely a collection of stunning photographs taken during three trips to the continent at the bottom of the world. It also looks closely at the impact of man's accelerating activity there but shows that existing treaties, if fully honored, contain sufficient guidelines to protect the area.

Harrington expresses concern about recent tendencies to politicize the region, however.

In the foreword, naturalist Roger Tory Peterson echoes fear of the trend, stressing that "the region of endless surprise" is unique and that it and "its peripheral islands should be preserved inviolate forever."

"Richard Harrington's Antarctic," which is being issued simultaneously by the publisher as a book, contains 198 photographs, most of them in color, plus location maps and a large-scale map of Antarctica and its surrounding islands.

Copies of the book or the Geographic issue are available from the publisher, Alaska Northwest Publishing Company, Box 4-EEE, Anchorage, Alaska 99509, and at local retail outlets. Single copies are \$8.95.