

Indian rights best for all . . . without reservations?

Citizens of this country have always felt that one set of laws should be obeyed by all.

The white man and Indian now have separate laws concerning hunting and fishing, yet both claim to be citizens of this country. To us this is not right and should be corrected immediately.

The laws of the Indian seem best for all to adopt. After all, he was the first immigrant to this part of the country, has hunted and fished here longer than the white man and has been thought of as the great environmentalist. If he feels it is wise to hunt deer for 90 days, the white man should feel the same — it puts food on the table, regardless of whether it's called subsistence or hunting. If the Indian is comfortable spearing fish during the spawning season, the white man should feel just as comfortable with that practice and pursue it along with gill netting and any other methods the Indian deploys. We have no objections to the idea that it is all right to hunt from a vehicle with a loaded gun because it sure beats trudging through the woods all day and suffering from the elements.

Think of what it would do for the tourist business if we white men adopted Indian laws. Instead of the "mad scramble" of hunters hitting the woods for just nine days, everyone could select the time they wished to hunt that fit more into their line of work, etc. There would be a steady flow of tourists for 90 days rather than a flood of them for just the nine days. The BIA would have to foot the bill for law enforcement because it would have to provide wardens, lawyers, court costs, and so on. Just think of how much money that would save state taxpayers.

As you can see, there are some benefits to siding with the Indian. If you would like to join the Indian rather than fight him, and through legislation get rid of the white man's laws and adopt Indian laws, make it known in writing to the Chequamegon Hunting and Fishing Club, Clam Lake, Wis. 54517.

Because of the 1854 Treaty there can be no other choice than to join the Indians, for they have made it known they will not abide by the laws of the white man and it is their right to do so. We made our laws and we can change them, but a treaty is a treaty.

WILLIAM BRUNS
Chairman
Board of Directors
Chequamegon Hunting and Fishing Club
Clam Lake

Buddy Kaho's Oct. 27 letter shows how some Indians, non-Indians, Indian supporters and Gov. Earl like to carry on as if the Indian treaties clearly state that Indians were to have greater rights than all the other natives of Wisconsin. One has only to read the simple words of the treaties of 1837, 1842 and 1854 to see that this is not the case. Such a reading will also show that these treaties were not broken as these people claim. A handful of liberal judges have temporarily succeeded in giving the treaty words a different meaning that favors Indians.

It all began when the Indians' right to "fish in common with the rest of the population" was interpreted to mean: taking half the available harvest. All kinds of interpretations favoring Indians have since sprung up all over the country by similarly adding a different meaning to treaty words. Liberal judges say the state must not infringe on Indians' treaty rights in any way.

The Wisconsin Legislature was finally able to correct some of the Indians hauling around loaded guns and shooting from the roads. How that accommodation of the disabled was extended by the liberal Circuit Judge Gary Carlson of Taylor County is another example of how rights for the Indians are created.

Make no mistake about it, this country does a great deal for Indians that is not mentioned in these treaties either. A Bureau of Indian Affairs, almost totally staffed by Indians, spends 73% of the billions it gets on itself, counter-productive tribal governments and a reservation system that needs to be terminated. Clearly, with all the benefits Indians receive, they do not need to fish and hunt to subsist.

One would think the extensive suits the tribes have initiated (spelled out in a Sept. 25 story) would shut up the Kahos. Suits for half of Wisconsin's fish and game with the right to sell commercially, no restrictions on gill netting, spearing, shining or violations of trespassing on private lands. This will be followed by suits for control of Wisconsin mineral and water rights.

Wisconsin people do not need to stand for this. All it takes is for a majority of them to voice a loud and resounding outcry against this. It's very possible within our great system.

LAWRENCE KRAK
Gilman

THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

LUCIUS W. NIEMAN, FOUNDER 1882
HARRY J. GRANT, 1916-1963