

Letters to the editor

Chapter corruption

To Editor:

Thank you for the best laugh I've had in a long time. I read the ad on the back page of the April 21, sport section of your paper on the, "2nd Annual Standards of Conduct for Elected Officials and Ethics Conference". It's so funny.

Conduct and Ethics/elected officials... ha!ha! I'm just wondering if this an attempt to correct their misconduct or teaching them how to swindle the people of the resources allocated to the members of the chapters?

Let me tell you my observation from the time I was able to understand just how corrupt the Navajo Nation government is.

Chairmen and presidents have been known to steal money from the people.

Chapter officials have been known to steal money from the members. Workers have been known to drive under the influence of alcohol.

Officials and workers have been known to have affairs resulting in fatherless children.

The rude behavior of tribal workers.

Cannot get help because workers are on leave or in training.

This is just the tip of the iceberg in how bad our government is. And to know that in most cases nothing much has been done to put these responsible individual accountable. And every day we have many helpless, poor Navajo in need of these benefits.

The conference will be in Albuquerque. How many tribal vehicles will be at the casinos, who will be out drinking in the tribal vehicles, how much is it costing the tribe for this vacation. I mean training.

I find out the only way to get some help is to know someone in the government. I know because it's happening in my chapter of Nahata Dziil over here in Sanders. Here's some examples:

Sexual harassment of chapter official to worker.

Official getting paid for appearing at meeting for 15 minutes or so, and happened twice.

Officials hiring relatives and family.

Workers gave each other loans from chapter Diner profits.

Non-member getting scholarship assistance.

I'm a chapter member and this conduct angers me. I wonder sometimes where the other members are and if they even care.

I hope many readers read my comments. I hope they feel the need to observe and stand up and have their say. I realize I have offended many tribal members and workers, for those members and workers who are doing their job, I sincerely apologize. I know there are many dedicated workers within our government.

Sarah Jimmy
Window Rock

Fiction or non-fiction?

To Editor:

I've learned *Aim for the Mayor* is a fiction book out about Gallup and the incident back in 1973 that killed Larry Wayne Casuse. If it is so fictional, why is the writer using my brother Larry in it? Larry is a real person. I haven't read it and chose to not waste my hard earned money on someone making money using Larry's name. This writer is convinced my brother killed himself (as do all the people who ran Gallup in the '70s), so although I may be speaking before the fact, I assume the writer has in his book Larry committing suicide.

First of all, Larry was shot down by more than one person by either the Gallup Police force, McKinley County Sheriff Department or New Mexico State Police force, during an attempted abduction of the Gallup mayor in 1973. The reason behind the taking of the mayor was Larry found it in his heart to help the so called "drunk Indian" covering the streets of downtown Gallup. If you think the alcohol problem is bad now, you would freak out on how it was in the '70s. I was only eleven when this incident happened, but I guarantee you Gallup law officials from that decade made sure I remembered.

Larry wanted to help the Navajo, and for some reason felt the mayor was involved in helping keep the Navajo drunk. There was a number of liquor store owners who partnered up and operated a bar approximately 50 feet away from the Navajo reservation. As a curious young sister, I remember snooping through his briefcase and seeing all the ugly pictures he had of this bar which was named The Navajo Inn.

The taking of the mayor was an attempt by Larry to get people to listen to him. To get help for the alcoholic that was not only being condemned by the false people that owed Gallup, but were keeping these same people rich.

I do not in anyway condone with my brother's behavior, although I do understand and empathize the struggle he must have felt. He felt alone within a society bent of the sacrifice of human beings to make a buck. Now, once again, there is an individual making a profit off of a lie. Of course this writer has so called evidence representing Larry pulled the trigger on himself, although, he seems to forget the cover up which the people involved stuck by to not cause any more of an up war more in Gallup. Even if the writer didn't have Larry killing himself, I still dislike the fact he is making money using Larry's name.

I know Larry has made history and more will be written about him, but I want the truth told. I don't want a Gallup ex-lawyer from the '70s (a "false person to me") making a cent on his name. What I feel is this writer can write and do what he wants, but leave my brother out of it.

I'd like to send a special thank you to Emmett Garcia for being the only person I can remember who had it in his heart to send his condolences to my surviving family members.

Ursula Casuse-Carrillo
Gallup

Letters to the Editor policy

GALLUP — The Independent encourages letters to the editor, which are published twice weekly — Wednesdays and Saturdays.

Letters must include writer's name, address and phone number although only the name and community of residence will be published.

Letters may not exceed 500 words. Letters may be edited for space and clarity. The Independent may choose not to print any letter for any reason.

Anyone may submit a letter, and there is no charge for publication.

Letters may be mailed, delivered in person, faxed or e-mailed to: Editor, The Independent, P.O. Box 1210, Gallup, New Mexico 87305, (505) 722-5750 (fax); editorialgallup@yahoo.com (e-mail).

Margaret Thatcher plus 30

LONDON — There is a story, probably apocryphal, about Margaret Thatcher who became prime minister 30 years ago this week and led Britain's economic and political revival.

The newly elected Thatcher takes her all-male cabinet to dinner. The waiter asks her what she would like to order.

"I'll have the beef," says she. "What about the vegetables?" asks the waiter.

"They'll have the same."

The story says much about a woman who in many ways exuded more gravitas than most of her male contemporaries, which is why, in 1990, they conspired to dump her as leader of the Conservative Party.

Not since Winston Churchill — and not since Thatcher — has Britain had such a dominant leader; even Tony Blair could not measure up to the Iron Lady.

To gauge her success, one must recall Britain's condition before she took office. Like Jimmy Carter's America in 1979, people were talking about managing Britain's decline. As Robin Harris writes for The Heritage Foundation (www.heritage.org), "The pace and scale of this revolution justifies the description, even though the chief revolutionary herself was someone of very traditional instincts who always considered that she was restoring what had been lost, not imposing a utopian plan."

This is the definition of "conservatism." Thatcher understood proven principles. She wasn't looking for "new" things, but rather old things that had proven to be successful. She called on the British people to remember their history and to embrace it.

She was not indulging in nostalgia so much as she was taking from a living past in order to build a better future. In this, she was the mirror image of Ronald Reagan.

This is the key to leadership. Leadership doesn't lie in poll numbers, though all politicians take polls to measure the public temperature. Leadership is about convictions with ample references to past successes and the principles behind them. If one doesn't bake a cake without first reading the directions, how can a damaged nation be repaired without discerning what works and what doesn't? If a people forget their history — as too many in Britain and America have done — they are then susceptible to being snookered by politicians who propose something "new."

Given our self-centeredness, it is refreshing to recall what Lady Thatcher said about personal accountability and responsibility: "Disciplining yourself to do what you know is right and important, although difficult, is the high road to pride, self-esteem and personal satisfaction."

First, one must know what is "right." In our "anything goes" culture we are told that people who believe they have discovered "right" are wrong, because that requires judgment and someone's feelings might be hurt if they hold to another "tradition."

As for the notion of "fairness" and "spreading the wealth around," which is the philosophy of the Obama administration, Lady Thatcher said, "I



Cal
Thomas

do not know anyone who has got to the top without hard work. That is the recipe. It will not always get you to the top, but should get you pretty near." Today, in America and increasingly in Britain where Chancellor of the Exchequer Alistair Darling has proposed a 50 percent tax on "the wealthy," admitting he just plucked the figure "out of the air," hard work is to be punished and slothfulness subsidized.

About wealth, Lady Thatcher said: "It's not the creation of wealth that is wrong, but the love of money for its own sake." Republicans in America, now debating among themselves whether to appeal to "moderates" to rebuild their party, would do well to consider Thatcher's wisdom: "Standing in the middle of the road is very dangerous; you get knocked down by the traffic from both sides."

Britain, like America, is not in turmoil because it once embraced the conservative principles of Margaret Thatcher — principles that worked. Britain and America are in turmoil because they too quickly abandoned Thatcher's principles in favor of a superficial, "feel-good" philosophy. Using another food analogy, we want dessert before — even instead of — our vegetables, though we know what's best for us.

Lady Thatcher's official portrait will be unveiled this week and hung at 10 Downing Street. A greater honor would be for the British people to again "hang" her principles in their minds and hearts. It is something the Conservative Party leader David Cameron has pledged to do should he prevail in next year's scheduled elections.



Jack Kemp's futile quest

I remember Jack Kemp from way back, from his football days. He was the all-star quarterback for the Buffalo Bills in the game in 1965 in which Joe Namath made his first start for the New York Jets. The United States was at war and Lyndon Johnson was drafting every young man he could get his hands on for his buildup of forces in Vietnam, but neither Kemp nor Namath had to worry about that. Football injuries made them unfit for service.

Kemp and the Bills beat Namath and the Jets on that September afternoon in Buffalo, 33-21.

Kemp, who died on Saturday from cancer, would later be much better known for his long career as a conservative Republican politician. He had two very big ideas for his party. One was terrific, spot on. The other couldn't have been more boneheaded. The GOP being the GOP rejected the good idea and went hog wild for the boneheaded one.

Kemp's good idea was that the Republicans should vastly expand their tent, get past their narrow-mindedness and begin actively seeking the support of blacks and other ethnic minorities.

The GOP would have none of it. It was, after all, the party of the Southern strategy, and there was precious little that was racially enlightened about its conservative wing.

One of the writers who influenced Kemp's thinking about politics, William F. Buckley, was at the opposite pole of Kemp's progressive thinking about race. Buckley took a scurrilous stand in the aftermath of the Brown v. Board of Education decision that desegregated the nation's public schools. Whites, being superior, were well within their rights to discriminate against blacks, according to Buckley. "The White

community is so entitled," he wrote, "because, for the time being, it is the advanced race..."

Kemp was whistling in a hurricane.

The bad idea, advanced by Kemp with fanatical energy and devotion, was supply-side economics — "voodoo economics," as the elder George Bush so famously and rightly derided it. Supply-siders saw tax cuts as the answer to every prayer. Cut taxes, they argued, and watch the economy take off like a rocket.

What they never spelled out for the electorate was that most of the tax cuts would go to the rich, that the rich would harvest most of the money from the increased economic activity, and that the radically reduced tax revenue would send government budget deficits streaking toward the moon.

Kemp professed not to be worried about the deficits. He seemed to have believed that somehow everything would work out. The ultra-militants to his right, people even further out in their orthodoxy than Kemp, were delighted by the deficits. They wanted to "starve the beast," reduce the government's revenues to the point where elected officials would have no choice but to cut programs and services that benefited people who were not rich. Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid were primary targets.

"Our goal," said Grover Norquist, "is to shrink government down to the size where we can drown it in the bathtub."

Norquist, a driving force behind the George W. Bush tax cuts, once



Bob
Herbert

called John McCain a "tax-increasing Bolshevik." We are talking about weirdness of a very high order here, and that weirdness dominated the economic policies of the United States for years.

Working people were told they should sign onto this craziness because the economic benefits of supply-side tax policies would ultimately benefit everyone. As every scheme imaginable was developed to bolster the fortunes of the rich, ordinary people were left in the humiliating position of waiting for some of the goodies to trickle down to them.

We've seen how it all worked out.

The way to look at the endless theoretical and intellectual posturing of the right is to look at who actually does well when the so-called conservative policies are implemented, and who doesn't. Inevitably it's the rich who benefit.

Jack Kemp meant well, but the great irony that cloaked his entire career was that it was not possible to achieve the ends he sought using the means he pushed with such zeal. He wanted to help the middle class and the poor. He wanted the nation's inner cities to thrive, and he wanted America's prosperity to be broadly shared.

But he chose as his vehicle the party of the rich. The changes he advocated and helped shepherd into law went far beyond correcting excesses in the tax code. They radically transformed the economic system in ways that proved a boon to those who were already wealthy, were harmful to the very people he wanted to help and eventually left the overall economy in ruins.

In Saturday's column, I mistakenly referred to Jim DeMint as the governor of South Carolina. He is a U.S. senator.

Independent

LPS 010-605 1094 1099-8052

John K. Zollinger
Chairman
1964-2007

Robert C. Zollinger
Publisher

Barry Helfner
Managing Editor

THE GALLUP INDEPENDENT CO. Gallup, NM 87305 (505) 863-6811 FAX (505) 722-5750
Grants-Milan: Toll-Free (505) 287-9226

Additional News Offices

DINE BUREAU Window Rock, AZ 86515

Karni Franco (505) 876-7218 • Kate Hahn (505) 876-6666 Fax (505) 876-3417

GRANTS/MILAN/CIBOLA BUREAU Grants, NM 87020

Jim Tiffin (505) 283-4560 Fax (505) 287-4660 • Helen Davis (505) 287-5627 Fax (505) 285-4678

Published daily except Sundays and New Year's Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving, and Christmas by the Gallup Independent Co. at 500 N. 4th St., Gallup, NM 87301. World Wide Web: <http://www.gallupindependent.com/>
-gallupind/ E-mail: gallupind@cia-p.com. Subscription rate: home delivery by carrier or motor route \$11.50 per month. Single copy 50¢ weekdays and \$1.00 weekends. By mail \$204.00 a year; \$102.00 for one month; \$17.00 a month 2-month minimum. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE INDEPENDENT, P.O. Box 1210, Gallup, NM 87305-1210.

This newspaper printed on part recycled paper and is recyclable

The desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose.

-Isaiah 35:1