



Replacement Should Be Supportive

Secretary Clark's resignation leaves Native leaders hopeful for continued support on ANCSA 1985 report

By Sione A. Mokofisi
Tundra Times

Native leaders did not exactly mourn the loss of Interior Secretary William Clark when he announced his resignation last week, but they expressed satisfaction with his record and were hopeful that his replacement would continue to support Alaska Natives' interests.

Clark's resignation ended his tenure at Interior after serving for only 13 months. As executive officer of the powerful agency that holds important ramifications on Alaska Natives related issues, he was considered both a friend and a foe by Alaskans.

Clark pleased many Alaskans on issues ranging from offshore mineral leasing to land conveyances, but on such important issues to Natives, such as sovereignty, the former California Supreme Court justice soundly made an enemy.

While on a visit to Alaska last May Clark declared, "Sovereignty is a new concept in Alaska as I understand it. I think our view is there can be only one sovereign in the state and that's Alaska."

"It is clear that we can have only one state here and that is the State of Alaska," he said.

Alaska Federation of Natives President Jamie Leask was on her way to Washington, D.C. with a group of Native leaders to address the 1985 study with Clark, and other key people, when the Secretary announced his resignation.

"We regret his leaving," Leask said from Washington. "We had a good working relationship with him on several issues including the 1985 study, and preliminary talks about 1991. We are looking anxiously at his replacement, and we are hopeful of a smooth transition since there are several important issues that we expect to be working on with the Secretary."

Meanwhile, in Anchorage, Calista President and Chief Executive Officer Nelson Angapak said, "We feel we've lost a friend. It is our sincere hope that the next Secretary will be sympathetic and supportive of the Native community."

Aleut Corporation President Agafon Krukoff said, "We are looking forward for someone to continue the current policies, and maintain a balance perspective toward development and environmental concerns."



Sorry, this is not for sale! Cyrus Kinogak's collection of dried salmon at his family's fish camp outside of Bethel is readied for smoking. Like many Native families, the Kinogak's share of Bethel's subsistence lifestyle is threatened by the town's fast growth. See related story and photos on pages 8 and 9.

Photo by Sione Mokofisi

Anti Indian Rights Initiative 456 Passed

by Pat Zuend

(Editor's note: Pat Zuend is an Alaska Native freelance writer living in Bay View, Washington.)

It's happening again. Special interest groups are trying to change Indian treaty rights and the effects could reach to Alaska. The backers of recently passed Washington state Initiative 456 want to do away with all Indian rights and make Indians equal citizens.

According to Allan Olson, tribal attorney to the Swinomish Indian Tribe, "Initiative 456 is a disguised racial issue. Tribal sovereignty is the issue." The Indian tribes are taking control of their own land. They have established "zoning laws" and "water codes."

The fact that Indians are "taking control scares the heck out of 456 supporters," Olson says.

Last May, a few, supporters of Initiative 456 met with Olson and several tribal leaders.

"I-456 represents disenfranchised people who feel left out of the negotiation process, and by supporting I-456, 'People will have to listen to us,'" Olson summarized the oppositions views.

"They recognize constitutional problems, but claim that that is part of the strategy to draw reactions and get people involved in their concerns and to listen to them."

One constitutional issue raised by Initiative 456 is federal versus state jurisdiction over the management of fish, game, and natural resources.

I-456 asks the federal government to abrogate or void all treaties with Washington tribes. The State wants to assert exclusive authority over manage-

ment of fish, game, and natural resources.

HISTORY OF TREATY

The Treaty of Point Elliott was a peace treaty signed on January 22, 1855 by 92 tribal chiefs and sub-chiefs representing 22 major tribes with Isaac I. Stevens, first governor of the Territory of Washington.

The treaty was negotiated through interpreters who spoke "Chinook Jargon," a limited language used to commercially trade salmon and other items.

"The said tribes and bands of Indians hereby cede, relinquish, and convey to the United States all their rights, title, and interest to the lands and country occupies by them," the treaty began.

In exchange for the Territory of Washington, the Indians were given reservation lands and \$15,000 "to clear, fence," and cultivate the land, plus \$150,000

more paid out in annuities. The United States also agreed to employ a physician to serve the Native people.

"The right of taking fish at usual and accustomed grounds and stations is further secured to said Indians in common with all citizens of the Territory and of erecting temporary houses for the purpose of curing, together with the privilege of hunting and gathering roots and berries on open and unclaimed lands." The treaty stated.

BOLDT DECISION

The issue of sharing the harvest of salmon and steelhead 50/50 with treaty tribes has been a long-standing dispute in Washington state.

The 1974 decision of Federal District Court Judge George Boldt in *United States v. State of Washington* established treaty (Continued on Page Six)