

Spring 2021

Iñupiat Resistance and Adaptation in the North Slope Borough to United States Colonization

Jessica R. Ferson
Bard College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.bard.edu/senproj_s2021



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Recommended Citation

Ferson, Jessica R., "Iñupiat Resistance and Adaptation in the North Slope Borough to United States Colonization" (2021). *Senior Projects Spring 2021*. 86.
https://digitalcommons.bard.edu/senproj_s2021/86

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Bard Undergraduate Senior Projects at Bard Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Senior Projects Spring 2021 by an authorized administrator of Bard Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@bard.edu.

Iñupiat Resistance and Adaptation in the North Slope Borough to United States Colonization

Senior Project Submitted to
The Division of Social Studies
of Bard College

by
Jessica Rita Ferson

Annandale-on-Hudson, New York

May 2021

Acknowledgments

To My parents who inspired a love of learning in me and taught me the importance of hard work

To my Academic and Senior Project advisor who met with me every week, and thoughtfully listened to my concerns and questions. I am incredibly grateful to you

To my Bard College professors who I have had the pleasure and honor of learning from. The faculty at Bard college, especially the Political Science Faculty, has expanded my understanding of the world, people and politics in ways that I have never imagined

To my very Best Friends Hannah and Siraj who got me through this process and life overall

Thank you.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....1

Chapter 1
History of the Iñupiat People in the North Slope Borough and Initial Phase of United States
Colonization6

- Life before European Contact
- Russian Period
- Why The United States Bought Alaska
- The Beginning of the U.S Era
- Christianity
- Additional Important 20th Century Legislation

Chapter 2
Iñupiat Resistance and Adaptation to United States Colonization in the Twentieth Century
.....18

- Arrival of the U.S. Navy and its impact on the Iñupiat People
- Statehood and the Alaskan Native Claims Settlement Acts
- Formation of the Borough
- Iñupiat Subsistence Lifestyle and Government Interference
- Additional Important 20th Century Legislation
- Changing Language
- Education

Chapter Three:
Resistance to Colonization in Recent Times in Response to Climate change.....49

- Climate Change and the Borough today

Conclusion.....57

Bibliography.....58

Acronym Key:

U.S. - United States

NSB - North Slope Borough

ASNA - Arctic Slope Native Association

NARF - Native American Rights Fund

NARL - Naval Arctic Research Laboratory

ANCSA - Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act

PET4 - Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4

TB - Tuberculosis

ONR - Office of Naval Research

TEK - Traditional Ecological Knowledge

IWC - International Whaling Commission

UIC - Ukpeaġvik Iñupiat Corporation

ASRC - Arctic Slope Regional Corporation

AFN - Alaska Federation of Natives

NMFS - National Marine Fisheries Service

AEWC - Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission

BWCA - Barrow Whaling Captains Association

NOAA - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

ANCILA - The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act

ANWR - Arctic National Wildlife Refuge

BOEM - Bureau of Ocean Energy and Management

OCSLA - Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act

SIZONet - Sea Ice Zone Observing Network

List of Key Dates:

Mid 1600s - First contact with Russian fur traders

1799 - Fur trading Company: The Russian American company was created

1823 - Monroe Doctrine Established

1860 - Report written by Russian Naval officer detailing the failing state of the Russian colony

1866 - Stoeckl was instructed to open Negotiation with The U.S regarding the purchase of
Alaska

1867 - The United States purchased Alaska from Russia

1871 - Congress terminated treaty-making with Indigenous peoples

1884 - The Organic Act (elaborate as needed?)

1884 - District Act

1890 - Arrival of first Presbyterian missionary in Barrow

1898 - Homestead Act

1900 - Missions Act

1918 - The flu that contaminated and killed many in the villages and communities of North Slope

1920s - Introduction of Western medical care to North Slope

1923 - President Harding established Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4

1944 - Establishment of the oil exploration program, PET4

1946 - Reverend Roy Ahmaogak was ordained

1953 - The U.S. Navy leaves Alaska and shuts down the oil exploration camp

1957 (July 7) - Alaska gained statehood

1959 - Utiaqvik, then known as Barrow, became a first-class city

1964 - Formation of the Arctic Slope Native Association (ASNA)

1965 - ASNA filed a land claim for 58 million acres of Alaska's Arctic

1966 - Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, issued a land freeze

1968 (July 18) - Atlantic Richfield announced that it discovered oil at Prudhoe Bay

1969 (February 11) - Three major oil companies announced the construction of a pipeline across Alaska

1969 (April) - Alaska announced that it would sell 400,000 additional acres of land

1971 - Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA)

1972 - Formation of the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation (ASRC)

1973 (?) - Edward vs Mortinson

1977 - Founding of the Alaskan Eskimo Whaling Commission (AEWC)

1980 - The U.S. Navy shuts down NARL

1980 (December) - Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANCILA)

1984 - Old NARL buildings were turned over to UIC

1986 - North Slope Borough created the North Slope Higher Education Center

2016 (October) - City name changed from Barrow to Utqiagvik

Introduction

The Northernmost city in the world is known as Utqiagvik located in Alaska, once known as Barrow, and is part of the Continental United States. It is a place far removed from the lower forty-eight states in terms of its environment and culture. Many would not envision the town of Utqiagvik when they think of America, but this town in the Northernmost part of the world has a unique place in American history. It is a whaling town that is deeply spiritually connected to the whale and to the hunt. It has maintained its traditions throughout 130 years of U.S. colonization and continues to face that legacy of colonization today. In this paper, I explore the relationship between the United States and the Iñupiat people in the town of Utqiagvik at the North Slope Borough. Before doing so it is important to introduce the Iñupiat people who reside at Utqiagvik in the North Slope Borough, Utqiagvik, and the systems of knowledge they use to survive.

Throughout history, the peoples residing in the Arctic north have been referred to as Eskimos which many Indigenous peoples of Alaska consider offensive. It's a commonly used term referring to the native peoples of Alaska and other Arctic regions, including Siberia, Canada, and Greenland.¹ Some are on the fence about how they feel about the term, but there is a general consensus that it is a colonial name imposed by non-Indigenous people stripping individuality away from unique cultures and tribes.² Ultimately the most important way to refer to a person or group of people of Indigenous descent is to listen and ask what they prefer, but for the sake of this paper, I will be using what is considered to be the most respectable and widely

¹ "Inupiaq," Languages - Inupiaq | Alaska Native Language Center, accessed May 5, 2021, <https://uaf.edu/anlc/languages/inupiaq.php#:~:text=The%20name%20%22Inupiaq%2C%22%20meaning,particularl y%20in%20the%20northern%20dialects.&text=The%20plural%20form%20of%20the,of%20the%20North%20Slope%22>).

² "Inuit or Eskimo: Which Name to Use?," Inuit or Eskimo: Which name to use? | Alaska Native Language Center, accessed May 5, 2021, https://www.uaf.edu/anlc/resources/inuit_or_eskimo.php.

agreed-upon way to refer to Indigenous people of Northern Alaska. Alaskan Natives increasingly prefer to be known by the names they use in their own languages, such as Inupiaq or Yupik.³ Iñupiat is the plural term to refer to people who identify as Inupiaq.⁴ Iñupiat's direct translation to English is real people. Inupiaq is not just the name for a person of the Iñupiat people but also the name for the language spoken by the Iñupiat.⁵ In other Arctic regions, Indigenous peoples who were also once called the Eskimo, are known as the Inuit and Yupik. These peoples reside mainly in Greenland and Canada and are not called Iñupiat because they speak Inuit and therefore are known as Inuit.⁶

Utqiagvik is the largest city (and the borough seat) of the North Slope Borough in the U.S. state of Alaska and is located north of the Arctic Circle. Utqiagvik was incorporated as a first-class city, which is defined as a city that has a population of ten thousand or more at the time of organization, in 1959 (north slope site). As of 2015 4,933 residents live in Utqiagvik, of which sixty-three percent are Iñupiat Iñupiaq. The median age of residents in the borough is twenty-six (north slope plan). -The majority of the workers (61 percent) that live in the North Slope Borough work for the local government, which includes the city, Tribal, and the borough, (NSB Borough plan, page 271). There are also some state employees that work for the Alaska Department of Health and Human Services and the Alaska Court System (NSB Borough plan, page 271). Most of these jobs are in Utqiagvik, the borough seat of government. (NSB plan, cap 13, page 4). In 2016, 10 percent of residents were employed at the North Slope Borough School

³ "Inupiaq," Languages

⁴ "Eskimo, Inuit, and Inupiaq: Do These Terms Mean the Same Thing?," Alaskan Natives, accessed May 5, 2021, <https://www.alaskan-natives.com/2166/eskimo-inuit-inupiaq-terms-thing/>.

⁵ "Eskimo, Inuit, and Inupiaq.

⁶ "Eskimo, Inuit, and Inupiaq.

District, Iḷisaġvik College, ASNA, or other education or health-related organizations (NSB Borough plan, page 271). In Utqiagvik especially, there are workers in the tourism industry and support services for scientific research. These visitors support municipal services in Utqiagvik that the resident population might not have been able to support on their own.

Utqiagvik is a modern community but whaling and subsistence hunting remain an important part of the resident's lifestyle and culture.⁷ Fifty- five percent of all residents are employed by the public sector while other residents run businesses that assist oil field operations as well as the federal government.⁸ The North Slope remains the largest petroleum-producing region in Alaska.⁹ Whaling hunting and other subsistence activities are how the Iñupiat sustain themselves. Subsistence activities are not oriented toward sales or profits but rather, are focused on meeting the nutritional and clothing needs of families and communities. Some parts of the harvest are used for a variety of clothing, skin boats, hunting implements, and traditional arts.¹⁰ Many residents "who work full- or part-time continue to hunt and fish for much of their food" maintaining their subsistence lifestyle while also working in another sector of the economy.¹¹ A local member-owned cooperative, named Barrow Utilities and Electric Cooperative, provides utilities to residents in Utqiagvik.¹² The community houses several churches, schools, and a community college named Iḷisaġvik College.

⁷ "The North Slope Borough," Official Website Of The North Slope Borough Northernmost Municipality in the United States of America, accessed May 5, 2021, <https://www.north-slope.org/>.

⁸ North Slope Borough.

⁹ The North Slope Borough Comprehensive Plan 2019-2039 § (n.d.).

http://www.north-slope.org/assets/images/uploads/NSB_Comprehensive_Plan_2019-2039_Reduced.pdf.

¹⁰ Comprehensive Plan , 14.

¹¹ North Slope Borough.

¹²

Traditional Ecological knowledge

Understanding traditional ecological knowledge is vital to understanding the relationship that the Iñupiat people have with their land, the history of interaction between the United States government and the Iñupiat people, and ongoing scientific collaboration between the two in contemporary times. Traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) as defined by the Bureau of Ocean and Energy Management of the United States is a “body of evolving practical knowledge based on observations and personal experience of Indigenous residents over an extensive, multi-generational time period” that looks different for every Indigenous tribe and nation.¹³ The term traditional ecological knowledge encompasses the multitude of knowledge systems that Indigenous peoples around the globe have used for millennia to survive and live. Traditional ecological knowledge is not a new science, and nor does it seek to replace it. Western science and traditional ecological knowledge are two separate and distinct modes of thinking.¹⁴ Traditional ecological knowledge is extremely diverse in its meaning and application. It can be different even among tribes who live very close to each other.¹⁵ Traditional ecological knowledge is shared through kinship and household networks, and it is not evenly distributed throughout Indigenous communities as it is a form of learning built on experiences. It is how subsistence societies are able to survive.

Although life has changed significantly the Iñupiat have maintained the subsistence lifestyle throughout the centuries and continue to ensure that it is there for their posterity through the passing down traditional ecological knowledge to the younger generation. The Iñupiat have

¹³ James J. Kendall et al., “Use of Traditional Knowledge by the United States Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to Support Resource Management,” *Czech Polar Reports* 7, no. 2 (January 2017): pp. 151-163, <https://doi.org/10.5817/cpr2017-2-15>.

¹⁴ Kendall, *Traditional Knowledge*, 4.

¹⁵ Kendall, *Traditional Knowledge*, 4.

resisted colonization and maintained their culture while eventually becoming a recognized and established voice in Arctic sciences and the fight against climate change.

My first chapter will provide an in-depth look at the history leading up to the American colonization of Alaska, Utqiagvik, and the North Slope borough. This chapter is important in that it explains the colonial framework in which the United States was able to use Iñupiat land without consent for resource extraction. Chapter two explores specific examples of what this resource extraction looks like, how it shaped the political organization of the Iñupiat people, and how they adapted to a multitude of changes in the 20th century. The Third Chapter examines the legacy of the colonial presence and interference that the Iñupiat experienced in the 20th century while looking at a changing climate's significant role in this legacy. I then go on to examine how the Iñupiat are dealing with climate change and a new more hopeful era of collaboration.

I argue that since the United States Purchase of the Alaskan Territory from Tsarist Russia U.S. policy has been guided by self-interest that has exploited and neglected the interests of the Iñupiat people. The goal of this paper is to explore the American colonization of Alaska, its impacts on the Iñupiat people, and what that colonization means for them today. Despite the immense obstacles faced by the Iñupiat people since the beginning of their relationship with the United States they have adapted and persevered while creating political organizations that serve their own ends. The people of the North Slope practice self-determination while maintaining their culture. As the Indigenous systems of knowledge are gaining more appreciation around the world the knowledge that the Iñupiat possess of their land can be an avid tool in the fight against climate change.

Chapter I: History of the Iñupiat people in the North Slope Borough and Initial Phase of United States Colonization

This section examines the history of the Iñupiat people dating from pre-European contact to the early days of Iñupiat life after the U.S. purchase of Alaska. By providing this background I set up the background for understanding Iñupiat resistance in the following chapter as well as the general history of colonization in Alaska. Understanding Russia's involvement in Alaska provides an answer as to why they sold Alaska to the United States, and why the United States wanted to purchase the territory. The lives of the Iñupiat who lived a world away from both Washington D.C and Saint Petersburg were subject to both governments' actions. Something more on this note. The early history illustrated in the following chapter reveals that the Iñupiat people and Indigenous peoples of Alaska are part of a history in which the white saw Indigenous peoples and their territories as something to be solely exploited for their gain. This history leaves The United States with the complexities that come with navigating decolonization and righting the injustices and crimes committed against Indigenous peoples of the past.

As the chapter comes to a close I explore colonization in the early 20th century bringing the story of the colonization of the Iñupiat closer to the Indigenous peoples in the lower forty-eight states. Foreign disease and religion became a part of Iñupiat history.

I. Life before European Contact

The arrival of Europeans as a colonizing force around the world set into motion the destruction, settlement, and transformation of a multitude of cultures and peoples. This is no different in the case of the Indigenous peoples in the land we now know as Alaska. The

Indigenous people who reside in Utqiagvik are descendants of the aboriginal peoples who inhabited Alaska twelve thousand years ago.¹⁶ Some villages on the North Slope have been occupied for thousands of years, and the land throughout the North Slope is rich with archaeological evidence of human life that is thousands of years old. Life for these people revolved around subsistence hunting, tool making, and sophisticated family networks.¹⁷ Dog sleds were the main median of travel from as early as 1600 A.D. Iñupiat culture was kept alive through storytelling, oral history, and community meetings. Life remained largely the same until 1875 when: “the local economies were significantly altered by a combination of several interrelated factors, including European contact and the introduction of metal tools, traps, and guns to support and intensify fur trade; a reduction in human population due to disease, famine, and warfare; and a reduction in the numbers of whales” which would begin with Russian contact.

18

II. Russian Period

The first European Nation to have a significant influence on the lives of aboriginal inhabitants of Alaska was Imperial Russia. These Russians did not form any notable relationship with the Iñupiat nor did their colonization penetrate the North Slope in any extensive manner unlike America's eventual impact. Nonetheless, it is important to understand Russia's role in Alaska in order to understand why and how it led the United States to purchase Alaska, and therefore its relationship with the North Slope Borough. Russian rule mostly focused on the

¹⁶ Claus-M Naske and Herman E. Slotnick, *Alaska: a History of the 49th State* (Norman Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994) 1.

¹⁷ Naske, *49th State*, 1.

¹⁸ “The North Slope Borough Comprehensive Plan 2019-2039,” The North Slope Borough Comprehensive Plan 2019-2039 § (n.d.), http://www.north-slope.org/assets/images/uploads/NSB_Comprehensive_Plan_2019-2039_Reduced.pdf. 6.

coastal areas in Southern Alaska as that sphere was pertinent to the Maritime fur trade. Russia did not become established in Alaska through any particular state interest but rather in protection of private individuals taking part in the fur trade.¹⁹ Settlement of Alaska by Russia never exceeded seven hundred persons. Despite this small number, Russia's involvement in Alaska is a key part of the story in the colonization of the Indigenous inhabitants of Alaska as well as a valuable territory to be bargained for between world powers.

To understand Russian colonization of the Indigenous peoples of Alaska I will explore their role in the territory in greater detail. Danish Navigator Vitus Bering, serving Russia, made Alaska known to the Western World.²⁰ Russian presence in Alaska brought disease, weapons, religion and different cultures to the territory. There is no exact date available as to when the first Russian fur traders made their way to Alaska, but it is believed to be around the mid 1600's.²¹ Russians were in Alaska due to the Maritime fur trade. Russia was not the only Western power involved in the fur trade as English and American had a much smaller presence. Russian fur traders worked their way east from Kamchatka along the Aleutian Islands to the southern coast of Alaska. This trade boomed around the beginning of the 19th century but began a long decline in the 1810 due to over hunting.

The arrival of fur merchants and traders had a negative impact on the Indigenous populations on the coast of Alaska. The people that had the most exposure to the Russians were the Aleutians. These merchants were accountable to no one and abused the Aleutian people while decimating the animals for the fur trade.²² Over the years the Aluetians were eventually

¹⁹ Naske, *49th State*, 20.

²⁰ Naske, *49th State*, 23.

²¹ Richard Somerset Mackie, *Trading Beyond the Mountains: the British Fur Trade on the Pacific, 1793-1843* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2014).

²² Naske, *49th State*, 28.

subjugated by the Russians as their hunters exhausted the population of animals on one island and then moved on to the next repeating their actions.²³ By the 1770s the Russian government became more interested in Alaskan affairs, and Russian influence in Alaskan began to extend beyond the private sphere.²⁴ In 1799, the Russian American Company was established to gain the benefits of a single fur trading company. It gained royal permission to do so.²⁵ Paul the First, Tsar from 1796-1801, granted this request for a monopoly for the new Russian American Company because the emperor and his advisers believed that a single company would strengthen their position in Russian America.²⁶ This monopoly gave the Russian American company the power to take possession of all existing Russian settlements and create new ones.²⁷ These settlements never had enough settlers for labor or access to food which caused them to rely on foreigners for resources. They also feared attack from tribes who they had not conquered. Americans provided support to the Russian settlements, but the Russians felt the Americans infringed upon their territory by trading with the natives which would become a deeper fear as the century progressed.²⁸ Meanwhile fur trading settlements were established and the situation of the Aleutians marginally improved as they were taken better care of by Russians. However, they lost the freedom to travel and exist in a traditional manner. In the 1820s the Russian Navy took over control of Russian Fur Trading Company's assets, their settlements and then established an infrastructure for the Aleutians such as schools and hospitals.²⁹ The establishment of the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, encouraged Americans to encroach upon what the Russians considered their

²³ Naske, *49th State*, 30.

²⁴ Naske, *49th State*, 30.

²⁵ Naske, *49th State*, 30.

²⁶ Naske, *49th State*, 31.

²⁷ Naske, *49th State*, 36.

²⁸ Naske, *49th State*, 40.

²⁹ Naske, *49th State*, 55.

territorial interests. Eventually Russia ceded portions of its territories to the Americans. Over the years, labor conditions continue to deteriorate despite periods of fluctuation where the Russian Settlements thrived.

III. The U.S. purchase of Alaska

As early as the late 1850's there was interest on both the part of the Americans and the Russian governments in selling Alaska to the United States (U.S.)³⁰ Russian officials and diplomats did not want a strained relationship with the United States, which was growing more likely as regulations and rules about the particulars of trade within Alaska created tensions between the Russians and Americans.³¹ By 1858, Russians were beginning to seriously consider selling Alaska if the Americans made another offer. In 1859, they did just that and Senator William M. Gwin, who advocated for the sale of Alaska, conveyed the president's wishes to Russian Diplomat and Ambassador to the United States Eduard de Stoeckl regarding the Alaskan purchase of the territory.³²

The Russian Foreign Ministry houses a report addressed to Russian Diplomats written in 1860 by an unknown author who had been in Russia and Alaska, likely a Russian general.³³ The report "paints in black colors the great misery the Russian American Company had brought on the natives of Alaska, the harm it had done to that territory, and the injury it had caused to Russian commerce" while emphasizing that the company only cared about profits that would

³⁰ Frank A. Golder, "The Purchase of Alaska," *The American Historical Review* 25, no. 3 (1920): p. 411, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1836879>. 4.

³¹ Golder, Purchase of Alaska, 5.

³² Golder, Purchase of Alaska, 6.

³³ Golder, Purchase of Alaska, 6.

solely benefit shareholders.³⁴ The report also mentions that the Americans who were trading and living near Alaskan territory felt anger towards the Company which the writer believed was straining the relationship between The U.S. and Russia.³⁵ Lastly, the report mentioned the relentlessness of the United States' desire to expand. Apparently the warnings detailed in the report fell on deaf ears as Alexander Gorchakov, a Russian diplomat and statesman, could not see value in selling the territory to the Americans and instructed Stockel to keep negotiations open.³⁶ However, the reports forecasted the necessity of Russia to sell Alaska to America. These concerns set the stage for the United States to purchase Alaska.

Ultimately the Russian Representative Stoeckl met with the American Secretary of State William H. Seward. They agreed that the sale would be mutually beneficial to the two countries. Secretary Seward was an ardent expansionist who had attempted to purchase several territories throughout the Caribbean and even contemplated the purchase of Iceland and Greenland.³⁷ When they met again a day or two later, the Secretary Seward was somewhat non-committal and reported that President Johnson was not enthusiastic but was willing to leave the affair to the judgment of the Cabinet.³⁸ Seward consulted his colleagues and they authorized him to negotiate. Stoeckl and Seward came to an agreement and the United States agreed to purchase Alaska for seven million and two hundred thousand dollars on March 30th, 1867.

Acquisition of Alaska involved numerous negotiations and attempts from some parties within the U.S. Congress to block the transfer of money to Russia.³⁹ The Senate viewed the treaty

³⁴ Golder, Purchase of Alaska, 7.

³⁵ Golder, Purchase of Alaska, 7.

³⁶ Golder, Purchase of Alaska, 8.

³⁷ Anderson, Buying Iceland.

³⁸ Golder, Purchase of Alaska, 11.

³⁹ Golder, Purchase of Alaska, 13.

of Alaska as an annoying interruption as the impeachment of Johnson was underway, and was regarded as an effort on the part of the administration to cover its blunders at home with a spectacular triumph in the field of diplomacy.⁴⁰ The impeachment trial of Johnson and claims made by the heirs of an American man that said Stoeckl had arranged a treaty with him years earlier who felt that they were rightfully owed money, slowed the passage of funds to Russia. Another problem in the process of ratification of what was generally opposition to Seward. Senators even came to the Russian minister Stoeckl in Washington D.C and asserted that they would vote against the treaty for no other reason than because it bore the Secretary's name.

IV. Why The United States Bought Alaska

There is no singular clear answer as to why the United States purchased Alaska. It is important to recognize that the decisions of officials far removed from the lives of the Indigenous peoples of Alaska would play a key role in deciding their future. The American public's perception of the purchase, noted by Stoeckl, was not popular and “was regarded by many as a worthless and an expensive investment” that was far removed from the daily life of the American public.⁴¹ Seward was particularly interesting in buying Alaska and some reports indicate that he is the reason for its purchase. Yet Secretaries of state alone can not make purchases of large tracts of territory.⁴² There were many actors at play as “ Seward had to secure the approval of President Johnson and his cabinet, of two- thirds of the Senate, and of a majority of the House of Representatives" before the purchase could proceed.⁴³ To get through the House and the Senate

⁴⁰ Thomas A. Bailey, “Why the United States Purchased Alaska,” *Pacific Historical Review* 3, no. 1 (January 1934): pp. 39-49, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3633456>. 45.

⁴¹ Golder, Purchase of Alaska, 15.

⁴² Bailey, 39.

⁴³ Bailey, 39.

there must be at least some measure of approval on behalf of the American People. When the press and the American people learned of the purchase of Alaska the general reaction was bewilderment but not resistance.

Despite this bewilderment the American people responded generally favorably to the purchase of Alaska.⁴⁴ Secretary Seward did have some influence on the public perception of Alaska as he engaged in a campaign of education which according to several newspapers did sway public opinion.⁴⁵ Although senators opposed the treaty on grounds of Seward's involvement they did not want to go against public opinion.⁴⁶ The media also expressed their opinion regarding the purchase of Alaska :

“In fact, a number of newspapers called upon the senators in no un- certain terms to lay aside partisanship and vote for the good of the country. As a result of these developments, it was generally observed by April 6, 1867, almost exactly a week after the purchase had been announced, that the chances of ratification, which at first had seemed poor, were decidedly better”

Illustrating how the people themselves came to view the purchase of Alaska favorably. The thought of the Indigenous people in Alaska was surely of little concern to the American public as they contributed to the erasure of Indigenous peoples in the lower 48.⁴⁷ The American mindset that favors expansion can perhaps in part explain the favorable attitude towards the purchase

In addition to Seward and Stoeckl, Charles Sumner, a United States senator from Massachusetts, played an important role in the ratification of the Alaska treaty. As Chairman of

⁴⁴ Bailey, 42

⁴⁵ Bailey, 43.

⁴⁶ Bailey, 45.

⁴⁷ Bailey, 46

the powerful Senate committee on foreign relations Sumner was in a position to make or break the treaty.⁴⁸ When the treaty reached the floor of the senate Sumner gave a three hour speech in favor of the treaty. His speech highlighted the resources of the territory, unwillingness to affront Russia, fear of democrats capitalising on the failure of the treaty and sensitivity to growing awareness of public opinion.⁴⁹ All of these reason listed in his speech pushed the treaty towards ratification. Finally on April 9th, 1867 the Senate ratified the treated thirty seven to two. The two negative votes came from New England that Feared competition of fishing in Alaska (Bailey 47). Ultimately the United State’s friendship with Russia, the general positive opinion of the public and the possible benefits of the territory paved the way for further colonization of the Iñupiat.

V. The Beginning of the U.S Era

During the Russia era Russians had, as detailed in the earlier sections, limited interactions with the Iñupiat of North Slope through the whaling trade. The Native American Rights Fund states that the Russians had approached the North Slope but “ had been rebuffed by the Eskimos and, because of the horrific climate, they did not push their exploration further and instead retreated south.” which would be another factor pushing major changes to the Iñupiat lifestyle to later in the century.⁵⁰ Their subsistence activities and way of life had gone on unchanged during the Russian era and for several years into the U.S purchase of Alaska.⁵¹ The treaty signed by the United States did not give them the land itself but only the rights to control trading and to tax the

⁴⁸ Bailey, 45

⁴⁹ Bailey, 46

⁵⁰ “‘THE FIFTH DISASTER’ - The Colonization of The North Slope of Alaska,” *Naive American Rights Fund: Announcements* 3, no. 1 (January 1975). 2.

⁵¹ THE FIFTH DISASTER, 2.

proceeds from the territory.⁵² The Organic Act in 1884 provided a civil government for Alaska that appointed a commission to examine the Indigenous peoples residing in said territory, what lands should be reserved for use by the United States, what could be apportioned to settlers and if education should be provided to the Indigenous peoples.⁵³ Indigenous peoples of Alaska would be at a disadvantage as congress terminated treaty making with Indians in 1871, therefore no treaties were made with Alaska Native people in turn limiting the legal avenues available for the Iñupiat to resist colonization in the future.⁵⁴ The organic act began to set up a form of government in Alaska without the consent of its original inhabitants:

“The passage of the first Organic Act in 1884 created the District of Alaska and established a District Court. The Act provided for a judge, clerk, several commissioners, and a marshal with four deputies. The Act also designated Alaska a mining District which provided that “the Indians and other persons in said district shall not be disturbed in the possession of any lands actually in their use or occupation or now claimed by them, but the terms of which such persons may acquire title to such lands is reserved for future legislation by Congress.”⁵⁵

Which essential meant that the United States was now in control of what would happen to Iñupiat land. Other changes came along with the 1884 District Act, which allowed Miners to claim land, The Townsite Act, or a Homestead under the 1898 Homestead Act. allowed settlers to claim land for their own as well.⁵⁶ The Indigenous people of Alaska were beginning to

⁵² THE FIFTH DISASTER, 3.

⁵³ “Federal Indian Law for Alaska Tribes,” Early Years in Alaska after Purchase | Federal Indian Law for Alaska Tribes, accessed May 5, 2021, https://www.uaf.edu/tribal/112/unit_1/earlyyearsinalaskaafterpurchase.php#:~:text=The%20passage%20of%20the%20first,of%20the%20State%20of%20Oregon.

⁵⁴ Early Years in Alaska.

⁵⁵ Early Years in Alaska.

⁵⁶ Early Years in Alaska.

experience what Indigenous peoples in the lower 48 were already feeling in full force. These acts are some of the first significant measures of U.S. colonization changing Iñupiat life in Alaska.

The colonization of the Iñupiat people at North Slope was similar to Indigenous people's across the Americas in another aspect: disease and Christianity. Colonizers brought "measles, whooping cough, diphtheria and the tuberculosis" to the North Slope (north slope article 3). The integration of the native peoples and settlers meant that Indigenous peoples were exposed to the foreign disease at a higher rate than before contact. The flu of 1918 is an example as it affected the North Slope: "in 1918 only a few villages on the North Slope remained intact - most of the rest of the villages and camps had lost all but a few individuals." and although the flu killed many Americans it begs the question of whether it would have reached the North Slope without colonization. 3 It was not until the 1920s, when the Presbyterian mission doctors and hospital introduced Western medical care to the region, that the Iñupiat population was able to begin recovery from the devastation of the disease introduced by the White man (nsb plan, cap 1, 8.) White people not only brought their disease but the vices of their own culture. The arrival of white men changed the ways of living for the Iñupiat from how they built their houses, to the introduction of alcohol from the god they worshipped (north slope 3). As the erosion of Iñupiat culture ensured many turned to drink.

VI. Christianity

Before Christianity, Shamanism was practiced on the North Slope and by the Iñupiat people.⁵⁷ The first Presbyterian missionary to arrive in Barrow was in 1890. As the Russians had limited contact with the Iñupiat the Orthodox Church did not convert any of their population but

⁵⁷ Arctic Slope Regional Corporation. *History of the Iñupiat People of the North Slope*. YouTube. Arctic Slope Regional Corporation, 2020. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s5pqeOwbDQc>.

they did convert Aleutians.⁵⁸ After 1890, Churches sought land and acquired it through the Missions Act of 1900, which allowed a religious denomination to acquire up to one square mile of land in Alaska.⁵⁹ This act caused more missionaries to make their way to the North Slope. The missionaries were from the Presbyterian Church and altered fundamental aspects of traditional Iñupiat culture such as housing, social interactions, settlement, and subsistence patterns (NSB plan, cap 1 9).

Some of the work that the Presbyterian Church did showcases the positive aspects of the United State’s purchase of Alaska. They helped the Iñupiat to recover from the 1918 flu and to build infrastructure. Later in the 20th century, The Presbyterian Church continued to aid in the development of the North Slope Borough. Presbyterian Iñupiats used “contacts within the national church hierarchy, to obtain funding to aid in development of the borough.” showcasing Christianity major role in shaping the Iñupiat of the slope. One of the most far-reaching impacts of the church is the development of the Inupiaq into a written language. Iñupiat “Reverend Roy Ahmaogak, who was ordained in 1946, translated the New Testament into the Iñupiat language in the mid-1960s” which established Iñupiaq as a formal written language (NSB, cap 1, 9).

Chapter Two: Iñupiat Resistance and Adaptation to United States

Colonization in the Twentieth Century

In this section, I will examine the history of Iñupiat resistance and adaptation to U.S. colonization in the 20th century by examining several major events and changes in their communities. I will also specifically focus on the Iñupiat people residing in Utqiagvik, the city

⁵⁸ Naske, *49th State*, 58

⁵⁹ Early Years in Alaska.

seat of the North Slope Borough. Looking at Utqiagvik more specifically in this chapter will illustrate the complex relationship the Iñupiat people formed with the United States in the 20th century. The four events I will be looking at are: the arrival of the Navy and establishment of the Naval Arctic Research Laboratory, the introduction of Alaskan statehood, The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and government regulation of Iñupiat subsistence hunting in the 1970s. Each event had a profound impact on the Iñupiat people of the North Slope and Utqiagvik that reshaped the Iñupiat's relationship to their environment.

The arrival of the Navy changed Utqiagvik irrevocably as it played a major role in developing its economy and introducing the Iñupiat people to outsiders. The Navy's exploration of oil began an era of resource extraction from Iñupiat land. It established an apparatus in which the Navy would better navigate the Iñupiat land in order to gain the resources they sought. The collaboration between scientists and the Iñupiat resulted in a dramatic shift in their environment in turn extending the use of Iñupiat traditional ecological knowledge past their community to Navy personnel, scientists, and outsiders. This is important in that it marked a change in who benefited from Indigenous knowledge. Although the Iñupiat in Utqiagvik benefited from the Navy's presence in some capacities it is important to recognize that it stemmed from colonization and imposition on their land that forces today's generation to reconcile with the complicated legacy of colonization.

Alaskan Statehood and the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act played a different role in shaping the Iñupiat's relationship to their environment as they both stripped The Iñupiat of land that they had access to for a millennia. The positives of these events are harder to see except perhaps that the Iñupiat collaborate and work together to form political organizations to resist the

colonization of these acts. On a similar strain, statehood allowed the United States to attempt to regulate the subsistence hunting activities of the Iñupiat resulting in Iñupiat revolt against these regulations. Each factor is connected to each other in some way but ultimately all are extensions of colonialism that natives people have had to adapt to. Although the tragedy of these events cannot be erased by the positives found in Iñupiat resistance it is important to recognize the great strides the Iñupiat have gone to protect their culture, their language, and way of life throughout the twentieth century.

Arrival of the U.S. Navy and its impact on the Iñupiat People

In the 1940s the Iñupiat lifestyle was not unlike that of their ancestors. Their lifestyle was dominated by whaling, hunting, fishing, and trapping.⁶⁰ The Navy established the Naval Arctic Research Laboratory, NARL, operated by the Office of Naval Research for oil exploration. In 1923 “President Harding by Executive Order established Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 in northern Alaska, the new reserve covered about half of the foothills and coastal plain of that great region and aggregated about 35,000 square miles,” which solidified specific interest in the area for oil exploration.⁶¹ Little attention was paid to northern Alaska until The United States became involved in WW2 which increased the United State’s need for petroleum access. The decision was made to initiate in 1944 a major oil exploration program called Pet 4 in northern Alaska. Pet 4 allowed for the Navy to come to Utiaqvik and allowed for the establishment of the Naval Arctic Research Laboratory.⁶² The Pet 4 program also Hired the Iñupiat which would set

⁶⁰ Brewster, Karen. “Native Contributions To Arctic Science At Barrow, Alaska.” *ARCTIC* 50, no. 3 (1997). <https://doi.org/10.14430/arctic1109>.

⁶¹ Brewster 1.

⁶² Brewster 2.

the stage for their later work at NARL. NARL produced a plethora of arctic research and was widely regarded for its work. By 1950, The NARL was supporting a variety of arctic research projects of scientists from a substantial number of colleges and universities.⁶³

The Navy's arrival in Utqiagvik would shape the future of the community. The changes came in the form of infrastructure, jobs, discrimination, and research. The town would be inundated with Naval personnel, barges, and heavy equipment as the Navy constructed a village of Quonset huts and laid a gravel runway 6 km north of town. The arrival of the Navy expanded the economy in Utqiagvik.⁶⁴ Utqiagvik gained a modern gravel airstrip, experienced a recent construction boom, New hospital facilities, nurses' and doctors' quarters, schools, and teachers' and apartment complexes. Prior to the Navy's arrival, there were few jobs in Utqiagvik. Residents worked at the hospital, the school, the Native store, the weather bureau, or the church, but wages were low.⁶⁵ The establishment of these facilities illustrates the merging complex relationship the Iñupiat had to colonization as there were positives of U.S. presence in Utqiagvik

The Navy was prejudiced against the Iñupiat people living in Utqiagvik. Some of this prejudice stemmed from the Navy's people's disapproval and judgment of the Iñupiat's style of living.⁶⁶ The colonial mindset of superiority came with the Navymen and researchers. At first, it was not easy for the Natives to get jobs. The Navy had reservations about hiring them because of the prevalence of tuberculosis and the perception that they were undependable workers.⁶⁷ After the establishment of a healthcare program, TB testing, and a general improvement of living

⁶³ Brewster 1.

⁶⁴ Brewster 1.

⁶⁵ Brewster 1.

⁶⁶ Brewster 1.

⁶⁷ Brewster 1.

conditions did more opportunities for employment arise.⁶⁸The Iñupiat people became contracted as laborers, equipment operators, mechanics, and carpenters, as well as guides and assistants on the survey, seismic, and mapping crews for the Navy.

One Iñupiat woman who was respected in her community had to translate and interpret when an Iñupiat person was hired.⁶⁹She recounts the difficulties of telling her fellow Iñupiat that they would not be paid equally to the Navy Men and researchers for doing the same work because they had a lower level of schooling. This difference in wages is another illustration of the superiority the white men believed they had at NARL. This divide created tension right off that bat and was exacerbated by isolation. The Iñupiat went to the camp to work, but rarely socialized with the Navy people. Navy personnel were required to stay on the military base unless granted special permission to visit the community which was difficult to acquire⁷⁰. This interaction signals a shift in how the Iñupiat people had to interact with outsiders beyond perhaps what was expected of them during the height of the fur trade, and therefore a shift in the colonial relationship between the United States and the Iñupiat people.

The Navy left in 1953 and shut down their oil exploration camp at Utqiagvik after they determined that their oil exploration program was no longer profitable.⁷¹ This shift showcases how the United States government used the Iñupiat land to establish bases to search for resources that were not theirs to take. The Navy's interest in scientific research in the Arctic remained as they wanted to know more about the environment that the military had a strong interest in.⁷² The

⁶⁸ Brewster 1.

⁶⁹ Brewster 2.

⁷⁰ Brewster 3.

⁷¹ Brewster 3.

⁷² Brewster 8.

Navy wanted to explore how its personnel could operate in the Arctic and cold weather conditions. The scientists and research center would remain and grow in turn continuing the relationship between the Iñupiat and scientists. NARL and the scientists that would pass through NARL would play an important part in shaping the political relationships between the United States and the Iñupiat. Many scientists would study the Iñupiat, including research that was numerous in their scope and purpose including ethnographic and biologic research projects. After the Navy left, the transition to a research facility led to the hiring of much of the Navy population. The precedent was already set during the Navy's PET4 program. The Iñupiat's experience working at the Navy facility before it transitioned to a research facility made it evident to NARL researchers that they had specialized talents that would make the research facility a success.⁷³ Their involvement in scientific research increased once these talents were recognized. The relationship between NARL and Iñupiat people was unique because it combined two knowledge systems in order for western scientists to work together.

Differences in cultures and prejudice remained at NARL. There are positives and negatives of the interactions between the Iñupiat and NARL. Many scientists viewed the Iñupiat as undependable. Some scientists and staff and NARL had difficulties with the Iñupiat and absenteeism. Another writes that the Iñupiat needed to be supervised frequently "for there are so many little things that they are unfamiliar with and do not know how to do — things that anyone who has been his own handy man around a home does without realizing that there is a wrong way to do them or that people have never seen done." which was disrespecting cultural differences. Some relationships formed between Researcher and Iñupiat were positive.⁷⁴

⁷³ Brewster 8.

⁷⁴ Brewster 3.

Dr. Laurence Irving, a physiologist from Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania and the Lab's first director said "The sharp observation of our Eskimo assistants has been invaluable. Combined with their keen observation, their accurate memory and ability to report observations literally is making available to us gradually the careful results of their serious study of this region" illustrating his high regard of the Iñupiat.⁷⁵ Dr Irving was particularly strong advocate of Indigenous knowledge as he said the "discussion of their animals and country has led me to pleasant acquaintances and friendships that I deeply appreciate, It is my feeling that by methodically seeking to increase the transfer of the unique Eskimo information to our science, our culture would be enriched" illustrating that not only was information exchanged but bonds made. Dr. Max Brewer, whose 15 years at NARL made him the longest-serving director, from 1956-1971, also recognized Indigenous talent and hired more Iñupiat during his tenure as director.⁷⁶ Their high regard for the Iñupiat did seem to be the standard throughout Narl's History.

The experience of Iñupiat employment at NARL showcases both obvious negatives and positives perhaps with negatives outwitting the positives considering many scientists did not acknowledge Iñupiat assistance in their projects despite the word of the NARL directors. Many scientists owe their lives to their Iñupiat guides; but they also owe their successful projects and careers to the Iñupiat who shared their knowledge about the Arctic. The more than 1500 scientists and technicians who passed through NARL were not held to a standard for acknowledging local assistance.⁷⁷ Some scientists gave thanks or credit in their final reports,

⁷⁵ Brewster 3.

⁷⁶ Brewster 5.

⁷⁷ Brewster 3.

although this often was a poor reflection of the amount of work and assistance the Natives had actually provided. Others made no mention of their Native assistants at all. Only a handful went as far as recognizing the knowledge and contributions of their Native collaborators and publicly praising them for their accomplishments. Overall the interactions can teach us about collaboration in the present day and can be seen in the relationship of two hunter to NARL in particular that illustrate what happens when people with distinct knowledge systems collaborate with respect.

Approximately 300 Iñupiat worked at NARL during its 33 years of operation.⁷⁸ The hunters formed relationships with Navy personnel and scientists as illustrated in the previous paragraph. The exchange of TEK and the introduction of outsiders can be seen in the case of two Iñupiat Hunters: Simon Paneak and Harry Brower, Sr.. Paneak learned to speak and write English when he was a young man living by a coastal trading post, and worked with Director Laurence Irving for twenty years developing a special bond. Paneak and Irving were close friends and traveled. Irving considered the Iñupiat as equals and in the field considered them to be experts. His positive attitude toward the Iñupiat helped the positive relationship between him and Simon to work. Paneak was compensated for his work which allowed him to provide for his family, and he also wrote that He appreciated both his friendship and their scientific collaboration.⁷⁹ Irving and Paneak collaborated and co-authored papers together which was rare for the time. Because of his relationship with Paneak, Irving became a strong advocate for Native knowledge: It is my feeling that by methodically seeking to increase the transfer of the unique Eskimo information to our science, our culture would be enriched

⁷⁸ Brewster 3.

⁷⁹ Brewster 8.

Born in Barrow in 1924, Harry Brower, Sr. was the youngest son of the famous whaler and trader Charles D. Brower, author of *Fifty Years Below Zero*.⁸⁰ Over the course of his life, he became a successful hunter, trapper, and whaling captain. He was respected and known within his own community for his generosity, his willingness to help others, his extensive knowledge of arctic animals, and his survival and traveling skills. Director Brower first hired Brower as a carpenter in 1957 but when he learned how much Brower learned about Animals he spent more time in the field.⁸¹ Brower spent twenty five years at NARL, and he gained status as an expert within the scientific community. Harry Brower always spoke proudly about his NARL days and was pleased with the good retirement benefits he received.⁸² Brower helped establish a pattern of trust between scientists and hunters. Many Iñupiat hunters had developed many insights into the behavior of spring migrating bowhead whales, some were reluctant to share their knowledge with scientists for fear that their bowhead information would be used against them by the federal government, the IWC, or both. Brower helped to trust researchers and share information . Mr. Brower was always willing to assist scientists and spent many hours carefully explaining how he and the other hunters knew that the above points were correct. His own personal observations were especially helpful.⁸³ Harry Brower knew a great deal about whales and whale behavior. Sharing this knowledge benefited science and also helped protect the Iñupiat right to continue their subsistence whaling when, in the late 1970s, the International Whaling Commission (IWC) threatened to stop it.⁸⁴ Not only was Mr. Brower was very patient in telling and retelling personal

⁸⁰ Brewster 8.

⁸¹ Brewster 5.

⁸² Brewster 3.

⁸³ Brewster 6.

⁸⁴ Brewster 7.

experiences but he kindly persuaded other senior hunters to share personal hunting experiences and to discuss TEK ⁸⁵. In 1988, Harry Brower and Kenneth Toovak were recognized for their contributions to Arctic science. The

It is clear when scientists were respectful of the Iñupiat and recognized that were just as knowledgeable, if not more, then everyone's work was benefited. Despite thNARL being established without consent the lives of Iñupiat people were indelibly changed by the research facility that would shape the community in both good and bad ways. The adaption of Iñupiat people to Narl and their success with scienitis showcases their adaptation to colonization of their lands and their good nature to work with the people coming to their land. As illustrated above, the Iñupiat worked with scientists at NARL when they could have very well shunned them. Many scientists developed close relationships and friendships with the Iñupiat people as illustrated by the Story of Harry Brower. Many Iñupiat enjoyed sharing their work and working with scientists. It's unfortunate that despite the good relationships noted above that many scientists did not acknowledge the work of the Iñupiat, and that many scientists throughout the country neglect to center and acknowledge idigenous knowledge systems.

In 1980, the Navy shut down the Naval Arctic Research Laboratory. The Navy decided the research facility was too expensive and no longer wanted to support scientific research. ⁸⁶In 1984, after much deliberation and negotiation, the old NARL buildings were turned over to Barrow's village corporation, the Ukpeagvik Iñupiat Corporation (UIC). Ukpeagvik Iñupiat Corporation, or UIC, is one of about 200 Alaska Native village corporations created under the

⁸⁵ Brewster 7.

⁸⁶ Brewster 6

Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 (ANCSA) in settlement of aboriginal land claims. The change in management of the NARL facility marked a new period in Utiaqvik's history.

Despite this change in use and ownership, Utiaqvik residents still call the area "NARL": the acronym has outlived the institution.⁸⁷ The North Slope Borough has become a leader in the effort to involve local people in the design and conduct of scientific studies, recognizing that this collaboration allows them to influence and learn from projects and to show that local people have meaningful knowledge to contribute.⁸⁸ Since 1985 the Borough's Department of Wildlife Management has conducted research out of the now UIC-NARL Facility.⁸⁹

Although NARL is no longer a primary research facility, science continues at NARL. UIC encourages visiting scientists to use the facility and provides logistical support when necessary. The former NARL facilities also house the Department of Wildlife Management of the North Slope Borough, the Iñupiat-controlled regional government in Northern Alaska. Staff members conduct publicly mandated projects, such as the bowhead whale census, fish studies, subsistence harvest studies, and marine mammal toxicology research. College level natural science courses offered by Ilisagvik College, the North Slope's community college, are also held at UIC-NARL.⁹⁰ Barrow's standard of living improved and the lives of its residents were altered forever by the influx of money, supplies, building materials, outside goods, the air service, and the contacts with outsiders associated with the Navy and NARL. The story of the relationship between the United States and the Iñupiat people can be seen through the history of NARL. A building that was one imposed on the Iñupiat people that changed their way of life is now used to

⁸⁷ Brewster 3.

⁸⁸ Brewster 8.

⁸⁹ Brewster 8.

⁹⁰ Brewster 7.

benefit the community and admired by the western scientific community. The transformation of the NARL facility into an institution that solely benefits the Iñupiat showcases the Iñupiat's adaptation to colonization. The land that was essentially used without their consent was turned into something productive for their community.

Statehood and the Alaskan Native Claims Settlement Act

92 years would pass until the territory of Alaska gained statehood in 1957. Statehood was the beginning of a decades-long struggle to keep their land and hunting rights. The White population living in Alaska sought to be free from the control of the federal government and the corporate interests in the 1950s. This population perceived “the federal agencies and fishing and mining interests as being entities which were holding back Alaska's basic social and economic development” and viewed them as a threat to their sovereignty (Native Settlement Interests 4). Due to feelings of the White population Alaskans sought statehood in the 1950s that would provide the maximum local governmental control. Additionally, The discovery of the Swanson River oilfield in the 1950s finally gave the territory the tax base it needed to become a state which also played a role in Alaska becoming a state.

The statehood act did not effectively address Iñupiat land claims or rights. In the 1950s Alaska developed “single units of local government in which all local executive and administrative functions were vested for geographic areas defined by mutual economic and social interests. The framers of the Alaskan Constitution called these units “boroughs” and intended to avoid what they considered the faults of previous state constitutions (Native Interests 4). Another important aspect of the Constitution of Alaska was its provision that outlawed

discrimination based on race. At the time of statehood- about 175,000 people one-fifth of whom were Natives voted on the constitutional, referendum (north slope piece 4). On July 7, 1958, Alaska became a State. Despite the prohibition outlawing of discrimination based on race, the establishment of statehood was detrimental to the Iñupiat in that it furthered the colonization process. It was meager provision when one considers the land they would lose over the second half of the century. The statehood act made it a certainty that most of the land being used by the Iñupiat would be taken from them. The oil field reserves that the Navy had explored in the 1940s would become more accessible to Alaska through statehood. In the Statehood Act, royalties from Federal oil and gas leases on Native lands would be claimed by the United States essentially disregarding what was said in the Alaskan constitution about respecting Native land rights. Going back to 1924 the federal government had staked out a large petroleum reserve of 23 million acres on the North Slope shortly after the Eskimos had pointed out oil seams to government officials in the land around Point Barrow" which would create the Navy's interest in Utiaqvik. Despite the positives of NARL, the laboratory was set up without consent as the United States viewed the territory as their own through the purchase in 1867. In addition to the oil reserves, and before statehood, the federal government decided to declare the entire North Slope an Arctic Wildlife Refuge which forced the Iñupiat people in the North Slope to adjust the boundaries of their hunting.

Not only did the likelihood of petroleum extraction put the quality of air and water at risk, but it was also further endangered by the potential of atomic testing. The United States government wanted to detonate an atomic bomb at Point Hope. "The Atomic Energy Commission wanted to demonstrate the peaceful use of atomic energy by creating a large harbor

precisely on the village site” increasing anxiety amongst residents in the north slope. Point Hope is located near the end of a triangular spit, which juts 15 miles into the Chukchi Sea 248 miles southwest of Utqiagvik. Atomic testing had already done damage to the slope due to previous testing that was affecting the animals with radiation and therefore seeping into the food that the Iñupiat people were eating. On top of the threat of radiation another blow came to their food supply when the federal government decided that to control hunting Eider ducks they would stop the Iñupiat from doing so (north slope page 5). The Iñupiat were able to get the federal government to back off and spur the Iñupiat into action

The Iñupiat had decided to change their nature and to fight. Eskimo culture, with its nonaggression, courtesy, and consensus, was being abused by white entrepreneurs and an incredibly thoughtless trustee. The cultural values of sharing, self-confidence, and presumption of goodwill in others were precisely what was at odds with what was not needed if the land, the whale, and the Iñupiat way of life were to survive the colonial onslaught (north slope native fund piece 6). It was a difficult transition that took a terrible personal toll on the Iñupiat leaders as it was in their nature to be courteous and not aggressive (page 6 north slope). In response, The Iñupiat formed a group in 1964 called the Arctic Slope Native Association (ASNA). Formed in 1965, by original founders Samuel Simmonds, Guy Okakok, Sr., and Charles ‘Etok’ Edwardsen, Jr., ASNA was originally created to help protect the lands of the Arctic Slope region, as its membership claimed aboriginal title to 56 million acres of the petroleum-rich lands encompassing the entire north slope. In 1965 under the leadership of Eben Hopson, Sr. as its first Executive Director, ASNA filed a land claim with the U.S. Department of the Interior for 58 million acres of Alaska’s Arctic. Over time, Native groups filed claims totaling 172 million

acres, about one-fourth of which the state had also selected. In 1966 the claims filed by ASNA resulted in a land freeze issued by the secretary of interior Stewart Udall. The land freezer prevented the transfer of further lands granted to the state of Alaska by the statehood act. The state officials did not respond well to the land freeze and Governor Hickle objected to it because Alaska would receive 90% of royalty revenues from Indigenous land.

The precariousness of the native grip on their land became even more fragile s when on July 18, 1968, Atlantic Richfield announced that it had discovered oil at Prudhoe Bay on the Arctic Slope. The discovery of this oil brought in petroleum companies looking to exploit this resource through drilling development and pipeline destruction. People looking to profit off its discovery brought equipment to mine the oil (north slope page 7). The industry and Alaskan government decided to make plans for an 800-mile trans-Alaskan pipeline but Indigenous land claims put this in jeopardy as well as raised questions about leasing the land. After receiving state permission from the appropriate authorities, on “February 11, 1969, three of the major oil companies announced that they had decided to build a \$900 million pipeline across Alaska” which would spark protest amongst the Iñupiat (north slope 7). In April 1969 the state announced that it would sell 400,000 additional acres of land adjacent to the Prudhoe bay field. The revenue made from the sale did not go back into the north slope which is “an area larger than the 36 of the 50 states which was without a hospital, a high school, roads or sewage and water systems.” In order to settle the question of access to oil on Iñupiat land, a settlement would have to be reached. This would lead to Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

Four years of debate ensued regarding how much cash Alaska would receive and how much land they would retain. In 1969 the state of Alaska auctioned lease rights to Prudhoe bay

for 900 million dollars to oil companies without the consent of the Iñupiat residents of the North Slope which led to protest. AFN and ANSA increased lobbying efforts in 1970 in Washington DC for congressional legislation to Settle Alaska native land claims. The oil discovery at Prudhoe Bay provided the government with the first real incentive to provide a legal framework to reach a federally legislated settlement. ANCSA filed the Edward vs Mortensen lawsuit claiming ownership of the entire North Slope of Alaska including all of Prudhoe bay.

ANCSA was signed into law in 1971 by Richard Nixon. The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) granted Natives title to nearly forty million acres of Alaskan land and provided them one billion dollars in direct compensation, in exchange for the extinguishment of all Native claims to Alaskan lands based on aboriginal use and occupancy (John F. Walsh). Before the signing of ANCSA, the U.S. government wanted approval from Alaskan Indigenous peoples. The AFN gathered delegates from all regions of the state to vote, and all regions agreed except for the Iñupiat. The ASNA wanted it to be distributed based on land lost, and not population, as that would favor certain areas more than others. Such as the interior, which had a larger population and would receive most of the monetary benefits. The AFN helped work out the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act and “asked for conveyance to Native villages of fee simple title to 40 million acres of land with mineral rights to be held by Native regional development corporations, and cash compensation in the amount of \$500 million” which was a low request considering the natives technically owned one hundred percent of the land and it was valued in the billions (page 9 North Slope). The ASMA would only be allowed to select five million acres of land and only after the federal and state governments made their land selections. They knew it had taken virtually all of their 56.5 million acre Slope to sustain them in the past”

and were worried about what it would mean for their lifestyle in the future (page 9 north slope). Eventually, the delegates organized by the AFN approved the act with a majority vote.

To ensure the best use of the vast body of land finally awarded under the Act, as well as to distribute financial compensation among the Natives, ANCSA established a system of Native corporations (John F. Walsh). They established the corporation for several reasons: to settle Alaska Native land claims, Congress proposed the regional corporation concept, and ASNA's focus then became securing the land and cash settlements required to compensate the Iñupiat for the loss of original lands. The Arctic Slope Regional Corporation was formed in 1972. ASRC, based in Utqiagvik, is a private and for-profit regional Native corporation that represents the business interests of its approximately 13,000 Iñupiaq shareholders that primarily live in the eight North Slope communities. It was established through the ANCSA in 1972. ASRC is the largest Alaskan-owned company, employing nearly 12,000 people worldwide. The Corporation's operations are strongly based in natural resources, holding title to approximately five million acres of land. (NSB, cap 1, pg 27) Enrollment in the corporation was restricted to any Alaskan of $\frac{1}{4}$ Native blood, who alive on December 18, 1971. The ANCSA was amended in 1991 so that an interested party who was born after this date could join.

Two years later the ramifications of this act were realized with a final decision on the Edward vs Mortinson case—the sectioning of land and the monetary settlement. The Edward vs Mortinson case determined that the passage of ANCSA had extinguished any prior land claims the Iñupiat had to the land. This meant that the natives only had control over the land determined by the points in ANCSA making the ASRC only entitled to lands stipulated in ANCSA. Fifty-five million acres was stripped down to five so revenue could be made off oil found in the

North Slope. The federal government reserved the land that had not already been taken by the state government. The National Petroleum Reserve included 23 million acres, and the land that was declared the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge included nine million acres. The final monetary settlement given to the North Slope was only 22 million dollars paid over ten years. A measly sum when compared to what they lost. The native community, according to the ASRC, believes that ANCSA only settled land claims. In contrast, U.S. government officials believe that it settled their sovereignty, allowing them to self-govern, and determined hunting rights. The monetary settlement and land conveyances are complete, and ANCSA has decided that no Indian country exists in Alaska.

Formation of the Borough

When it became apparent that the proposed settlements would leave ASNA without valuable resources such as Prudhoe Bay, ASNA began to explore another option - the creation of a borough under Alaska state law. To counter the United State's infringement on their land and culture they used the Alaska state constitution to benefit their interests. They began the process of establishing the north slope as its own local government or borough in order to protect themselves from corporate, state, and federal interests (northslope ten). These interests were connected to the Native Settlement Act by establishing a local government so that they would be able to regulate development "that threatened their way of life, and impose taxes to finance education and other of their needs as a people" and begin to develop according to their own cultural guidelines (North slope 10).

The legal process to become a borough would take about a year and face some bumps along the way. One issue that arose was opposition from "seven of the world's largest oil

companies with substantial investments at Prudhoe Bay filed a lawsuit to stop the Iñupiat formation of “the incipient North Slope Borough” illustrating how entrenched colonialism had become as a part of their lives. Their land was no longer a means for survival but a tool for others to exploit and make millions. The oil companies cited hollow reasons such as technical deficiencies in the record, that the new borough's assembly would not be properly apportioned or that the companies would have to bear the tax burdens and would get no benefit from the local government (slop 11). The election to certify the North Slope as borough passed but the oil companies continued to oppose it. This force was preventing The North Slope from exercising self-determination. The opposition from the oil companies came to end when “ the Superior Court issued a memorandum decision on January 19, 1973” that agreed with the Iñupiat on one very point rejecting all the claims of the oil companies. After one appeal on behalf of the oil companies. and with assistance from NARF, the Iñupiat emerged victoriously.

Unfortunately, the oil companies did not relent and eventually sued Alaska. In turn, the state called a special session which was extremely rare. Due to the pressure placed on the state by the oil companies, the legislature placed limitations on the power of the North Slope borough to tax the oil companies (page 13 north slope). It is remarkable how after so much effort to reach self-determination and winning on the side of the law the oil companies were able to succeed. NARF was instrumental in aiding the Iñupiat in winning the legal battle to establish a borough. Although the oil companies did relent in their quest to stop Utqiagvik from becoming a borough and caused immense difficulty for the native people the Iñupiat people achieved something incredible, and challenged the almost one-hundred-year relationship with the United States. As the Utqiagvik website says, “It was the first time Native Americans had taken control of their

destiny through the use of municipal government. It was, and remains, one of the boldest moves ever made by an Indigenous people to regain control of their lives and future.” Transition sentence to connect to next section. -The NSB also has the ability to tax oil and gas infrastructure within its borders. This revenue allows the borough to build roads, operate schools, and fund other public services such as health clinics and fire departments.

Iñupiat Subsistence Lifestyle and Government Interference

ANCILA protects subsistence rights. Throughout these changes in statehood, the subsistence lifestyle of the natives living in Utqiagvik and in the North slope remained an integral part of their way of life only changing with new technology. The Iñupiat view the North Slope lands as a garden that has nourished them for a millennia and the animals keeping them alive. Iñupiat are able to survive the incredibly harsh environment of the North Slope through cooperation amongst themselves. To ensure survival, the Iñupiat are a hunting society but they respect and cherish the animal they use for survival recognizing the nourishment they provide. The fishing, whaling, and hunting areas of the NSB cover over a 94,000 square mile area. Hunters must cover considerable ground to harvest marine mammals and terrestrial animals. As such, the use of snowmachines, boats, and ATVs are efficient tools and, therefore, money for these vehicles, their maintenance, and repair, and fuel, along with rifles and ammunition, is a requirement for subsistence living (NSB, cap 4, pg 14). Almost the entire coastline of the borough is used for marine mammal hunting, extending at least twenty-five miles offshore. A combination of traditional skin boats and motorized boats are used for riverine and marine

subsistence activities. Snow machines are also commonly used during the winter months for hunting marine mammals from the sea ice. (cap 4) These activities are costly and the Iñupiat use wages from their jobs to sustain their lifestyle in a more timely and effective manner. The ASRC provides time off to its employees to participate in the subsistence hunt. They also use other parts of animals they catch to practice the hunt. The Iñupiat use seal skins to cover the boats used for spring whaling. Women in the Iñupiat sew the skins together and also prepare parkas and other items of clothing to keep hunters warm. They purchase equipment such as snowmachines, ATVs (boats, sleds, parts, and fuel), tools (ammunition, firearms, nets, floats, and harpoons), and food preparation and storage materials (knives, smokers, freezers, pots, and pans) (NSB, cap 4, pg 14). Although they use modern materials to catch Loss of wage income related to decreased oil development and revenues on the North Slope, over time, may reduce the ability for residents to afford modern hunting equipment. The whale hunt is a long process that brings the community together and faces many dangers such as treacherous sea ice and polar bears.

While caribou, fish, and waterfowl are part of the subsistence diet, the bowhead whale is the foundation of the Iñupiat diet. The coastal villages of Point Hope, Point Lay, Wainwright, and Utqiagvik participate in whaling hunting and typically begin annual spring whale hunts in early May (NSB, cap 1, pg 10). The bowhead whale (*Balaena mysticetus*) is considered to be the most important marine mammal by Iñupiaq residents of the North Slope (Galginaitis 2014). The whale is made distinct by its “ponderous, bow-shaped head from which it derives its name” (preston 9). Bowhead whales are gigantic in size, this is in part why they are revered, and connect the Iñupiat to the ocean and the Arctic (Galginaitis 2014). There is a deep spiritual connection that the community has to whales as they believe that during the hunt a whale will recognize that the

Iñupiat have worked hard and sacrificed much during the hunt. In the view of the community, it will then offer itself knowing that they will take good care of the flesh it gives them, that the feeling of the crew is good, that they will store it in clean cellars and share it throughout the community. Whaling ties the community together through its communal nature and the food it produces from the harvest (Galginaitis 2014). There is deep beauty in this view and illustrates the importance of subsistence hunting and coexisting with the art while reaping nourishment from it. The TEK that allows for hunters to obtain whales and nourish the community is a testament to the deep difference between how much of the country views and eats meat which is without regard. There is immense joy and pride when the Iñupiat catches a whale. The kill is a sacred moment and prayers of thanks are given as the journey to bring the whale back to shore is also arduous and exposes the Iñupiat to the elements. TEK is shared throughout every bit of the process as older crew members teach younger crew members how to properly hunt and catch a whale. The communal effort is followed to the very end of the process.

When food is scarce the food provided by the whale ties the community together through a system of sharing (preston 7). Traditional knowledge passed down through the years showcases exactly how the whale should be prepared The whaling season shapes the year for the Iñupiat. It is their major source of food - a good catch can provide full stomachs for months. (5) The food will even help beyond the village as “most of the whale products are consumed by members of whaling villages, up to 10,000 Eskimos and Indians living in the interior supplement their diets with whale meat” (preston 7). Whale meat, substituted by other meat such as rabbit, provides the Iñupiat with a balanced diet. Once the whale is on the shore dangers are not abated as ice could be broken up by shifting winds and people could be cast into the sea. The Iñupiat believe that if

whale meat is lost from the diet then they can not survive on rabbit meat alone and the addition of commercially supplied food increases rates of diabetes (Preston 8). The loss of the bowhead whale from the Iñupiat diet can not be quantified. It holds immense spiritual, nutritional, and cultural value. To lose the bowhead whale would be to erase a large part of Iñupiat culture. It also serves the Iñupiat people with jobs and taking away that which they need to survive means they have to seek other employment which often pulls them away from their community (Preston 9).

The establishment of statehood would affect the native relationship with the bowhead whale as the state of Alaska, now connected to the United States and its affiliation, would be able to control their subsistence hunting. The subsistence harvest in Alaska is regulated by the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and because that agency has regulatory control over whales in U.S. waters it could have a say about whaling in traditional Iñupiat hunting grounds. Alaska is also subject to IWC regulations. The IWC originated in 1946, when fourteen nations, including all major whaling nations, formed the International Whaling Commission (Preston 16). Through “The Whaling Convention Act of 1949 incorporated the IWC regulations into the United States Code” therefore through statehood Alaska and the native people who reside there are subject to these regulations (18 Preston). In 1977 the IWC determined that the BCB stock was extremely low in population size. Worries over the impacts of subsistence hunting and the small population size had the IWC set the subsistence harvest quota to zero. On December 7, 1977, the IWC changed its position to permit subsistence hunting by Alaskan natives of a limited number of Bowhead whales, but the controversy was not settled (Preston 28). In December 1977, the IWC amended its Schedule to the Convention to allow a limited taking of Bowhead whales

from the Bering Sea stock: 12 whales landed or 18 whales struck, whichever occurs first. In April 1978, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) established a village-by-village quota scheme (Preston 29). The NMFS provided strict guidelines as to how and when one could fish bowhead whales as an Indigenous person in order to provide security for an endangered population.

This declaration caused great concern among the bowhead whale-dependent Native people of the coastal areas of northern and northwestern Alaska (Adams 1979). Intense negotiations between the involved Native Alaskans and the U.S. government (NMFS) resulted in a U.S. request for a special IWC meeting letter in that same year (December 1977). (page 2 harry piece)

In response to this marked increase in outsiders' involvement with their bowhead subsistence harvest, the hunters formed the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission (AEWC). At the time of its founding (1977), the AEWC represented bowhead whale hunters in the villages of Gambell, Savoonga, Kivalina, Wales, Point Hope, Wainwright, Utiaqvik, Nuiqsut, and Kaktovik. (page 3)(page 3 harry piece). The Alaskan Eskimo Whaling Commission (AEWC) was created on September 1, 1977, in Barrow, Alaska. "For the first time in recorded Eskimo history, Alaska Eskimo whaling captains from nine remote whaling villages gathered in one place to discuss the ways in which the Eskimo community might respond to the International Whaling Commission's ban on subsistence hunting of the bowhead whale." The group felt an urgency to correct the misinformation surrounding their hunting methods (33 preston). The group had three stated goals:

- (1) insure that bowhead whale hunting was conducted in a traditional, non-wasteful manner;
- (2) To communicate to the outside world the facts concerning bowhead whale hunting, the way it was done, the centrality of the hunt to the cultural and nutritional

needs of the Eskimo, the Eskimo's knowledge of the whale, and the reasons why any moratorium on such hunting would have disastrous impact upon the Eskimo community; and (3) To promote extensive scientific research on the bowhead whale so as to insure its continued existence without unnecessary disruption to Eskimo society (34)

The AEWEC required whaling captains to register with their organization as well as record data about how many whales were harvested and their size. Other reports necessary to advance scientific knowledge may also be required by the AEWEC (Preston 34). The AEWEC specified that to hunt bowhead whales only traditional methods should be used including harpooning, darting, and shoulder guns while also adhering to certain methods. If whalers violated the guidelines set by the AEWEC may prohibit them from hunting and fine them (Preston 35).

The formation of this group can be seen as an act of colonial resistance. The depleted whale populations were the result of 300 years of whaling by European nations. Until 1914 Unrestricted commercial whaling greatly reduced the bowhead whale population leaving only five small recognized populations (harry specific paper page 2). “Most European nations participated in a 300-year slaughter which began in 1611 and ended as a commercial venture in 1914. The peak catch occurred in 1701, when Dutch and German whalers took 2,616 animals.” The burden of overfishing should not be borne by people whose culture and lifestyle are dependent on whaling. Now, although conservationists were not malicious they were misguided in restricting Indigenous whaling efforts. The AEWEC felt that bowhead population size estimates based primarily upon visual sightings by observers at the seaward edge of the shore fast ice off Barrow were unreliable, and were strongly biased downward (source). The AEWEC and individual hunters believed that the census estimates of approximately 2000 bowheads were much too low based on their own experience as hunters, and on the general knowledge of the

bowhead whale handed down from generation to generation (“Traditional Knowledge”). (page 3) (harry piece).

The importance of TEK in this situation is illustrated in Harry Brower Jr.’s words: “We don’t have our certifications and credentials like scientists, But to even prepare to hunt whales is to be intimately familiar with the seasonal cycles of the Arctic" illustrating western scientists and officials disregard for Indigenous people’s relationship with their environment and bias towards western science as the only mode of understanding the environment (). The formation of the AEWG was to assert the importance of traditional ecological knowledge. The AEWG also felt that future census efforts to obtain estimates of population size and trend must withstand rigorous peer review and provide clear and convincing data to a wide audience (scientists, Eskimo hunters, conservation groups, industry personnel, etc.). (page 5 harry piece). Their input to scientists would determine what would be considered interference in their subsistence lifestyle. An example of interference includes the use of “active sonar,” projecting a pulse under the water to detect whales (such as in detecting a submarine), which would similarly be rejected by hunters as interference. (page 7) . . . These studies over three years (1978-1980) involved the detailed examination and sampling of spring and fall harvested whales, which required participating NARL scientific personnel to gain the support of the AEWG, the Barrow Whaling Captains Association (BWCA), (page 3 harry piece)The AEWG has also become a strong advocate for minimizing industrial impacts to the whale’s habitat (Ahmaogak 1989; Brower and Stotts 1984). (page 3). Recognizing that the views of the AEWG and its hunters were largely ignored (as was the hunters’ traditional knowledge specifically related to bowheads) and recognizing that harvest quotas set by the IWC would be largely based upon available scientific evidence, the AEWG

successfully negotiated with NMFS to take over the task of censusing spring migrating bowheads off Barrow. (page 5) The AEWC recognition of how their data would be treated showcases their use of the system to their

To this, the AEWC functions as a non-profit corporation, with the goal of protecting bowhead whales, their habitat, and Native subsistence uses of bowhead whales (NSB, cap 6, 18). The AEWC has immense influence regarding decisions about bowhead whales on the local, regional, national and international interests. Since 1981, AEWC has managed the bowhead whale subsistence hunt locally through a cooperative agreement with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) at the U.S. Department of Commerce (NSB, cap 6, 18).

The AEWC oversaw a census effort in 1981 but then turned over responsibility for subsequent census efforts to the North Slope Borough. [See more about this transition.](#) This assignment of responsibility was reasonable since the NSB (approximately 88 000 square miles or 228 000 square kilometers area) is the regional government for northern Alaska and among its administrative units was a division (now known as the Department of Wildlife Management) whose staff had the technical expertise to conduct a scientifically sound bowhead census effort (Albert 1988). (page 5 harry piece)benefit. AEWC also works with the oil industry to develop the Good Neighbor Policy and Conflict Avoidance Agreements for oil and gas exploration and development activities in waters offshore the North Slope Borough

Summary of how their hunting is different. They are not the problem when it comes to the treatment of animals but our capitalist systems and corporations needing ever more resources are. In addition to outside hunters coming in and disrespecting the animal population. -Sport hunters are considered non-Iñupiat or non-resident hunters who arrive alone or in groups also

pose a threat to migratory patterns of caribou. They disrupt the herd with poor shooting practices upsetting migration patterns and sometimes only take the antlers which is deeply disrespectful to hunters.

Additional Important 20th Century Legislation

Two other notable laws showcase Iñupiat adaption and resistance adds more fluff. Another important piece of legislation in the late 20th century was The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANCILA) which was passed in December of 1980 after several years of congressional debate (NSB, Cap 1, 12). The act included the creation of Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve as well as additions to ANWR, both of which were critically important to the Iñupiat. The act also allowed Arctic Slope Regional Corporation to exchange lands within the region, grant future pipeline rights-of-way across certain public lands and allow the future subsurface title to village corporation lands within NPR-A and ANWR. (NSB, cap 1, 12). Some analysis about these laws. Public Law 98-366, known as the Barrow Gas Field Transfer Act of 1984. This act was in response to the federal duty to supply energy to villages of the North Slope that was becoming too expensive to go on (NSB cap 1, cap 8, pg 12). The act filled a need to provide a steady energy supply to villagers and federal facilities in the Barrow area. It allowed there to be a steady energy supply to villages and federal facilities (NSB cap 1, cap 8, pg 12).

The formation of political groups as a response to federal and state legislation that interfere with and hinder the Iñupiat way of life illustrate their resistance to colonization through the twentieth century. Planning and thorough governance has been an important part of the North Slope Borough since its inception and are part of this resistance. On its website, the North Slope

Borough contains plans that entail the management of its territory up until the year 2039 continuing its tradition of planning and self-determination through people-guided governance. The first plan was created in 1983, and both that plan and the current plan aim to address the impact of development on the community, and the development of resources such as energy, conservation, and transportation (north slope plan). The plans serve as a comprehensive planning tool that is used in instances when evaluating land-use proposals, community development, infrastructure investments, and serving community needs. These plans serve as an illustration of self-determination in which the residents of North Slope are in charge of their land and resources.

Changing Language

Beyond responses to policy, the what to the Iñupiat language is a what example of colonization and Iñupiat resistance and adoption to colonization. Through self-determination, the Iñupiat have been reclaiming their culture through education. Loss of language is a consequence of colonization's effect on Iñupiat education. Go into the history of education here and then connect it to language. The number of fluent Iñupiaq speakers on the North Slope is declining rapidly which is a result of colonization. Iñupiaq is considered an endangered language and the North Slope borough places immense importance on "expanding fluency" to maintain their cultural values (NSB, cap 1, 20). The Iñupiat's relationship with their language is a relationship with their culture and by extension their land. The Iñupiat are continuing their self-determination by working to reclaim their language through a variety of programs and therefore education.

There is importance in language. This can be seen in the changing of the name from Barrow to Utiaqvik. In October of 2016, a slim majority of city voters decided to change the city's name from Barrow to Utqiaġvik. "Utqiaġvik" means place. Many view the change to the name as a reclamation of their culture (name article source). That's Sir John Barrow, a civil servant in the British Royal Navy who was a big supporter of Arctic exploration. He never traveled to Alaska but Capt. Frederick William Beechey did and honored Barrow by naming a point after him, according to historical accounts. The biggest supporters of the name change were young people, while the older residents were generally opposed to the change. Many older residents did not want the change as they grew up in Barrow but have always known that town is called Ukpiagvik which means the place where the snowy owl rests. They felt that too many documents, signs, and titles would have to be changed which would be a big adjustment. Utqiaġvik means a place to gather wild roots (Second article). There is even more controversy when it comes to what the exact name should be called. Some want the traditional name Ukpiagvik instead of Utqiaġvik. Some say that snowy owls were never hunted while others do. "Harcharek, the council member, researched old documents and believes Utqiaġvik is correct for greater Barrow. That name gradually become the accepted one over Ukpiagvik, an elder said at a conference in 1978, transcripts of which are cited by both sides." City council member Qaiyaan Harcharek said,

"Here are some folks that are afraid of change and change is oftentimes a daunting task and I believe it stems back to how well of a job that the missionaries and the Western folks in BIA schools, how good of a job they did at assimilating our people. And so, Barrow's name came from Sir John Barrow from Frederick Neitzsche naming this area

after a buddy of his and that took. And I think it has deeper meaning to that than that our people were severely punished from speaking our traditional language for many years. And a lot of those folks that are around today don't have that internal oppression where they're afraid of that.

Education

The creation of education at NARL and schools showcases immense cultural significance as children are no longer sent away to be schooled. In 1986, the North Slope Borough created the North Slope Higher Education Center, a cooperative effort between the North Slope Borough and the University of Alaska Fairbanks. The North Slope Higher Education Center's Board and the North Slope Borough Assembly changed the institution's name to Arctic Sivunmun Iḷisaġvik College in 1991 to reflect its transformation into a community college.

Chapter Three: Resistance to Colonization in Recent Times in Response to Climate change

Climate change is an ongoing form of colonization and the latest change that the Iñupiat will have to adapt to. The questions remain if the effect of climate change will force Iñupiat to abandon aspects of their culture that they have previously been able to maintain through onslaughts of colonization. Similar to the rest of the colonization process climate change is being imposed upon the Iñupiat with little they can do to change their situation as it is up to a government that was imposed upon them more than a century ago to make change. The Iñupiat lifestyle contributes virtually nothing to carbon emissions yet they will be the first suffer warming climate's effects. Climate change is already being experienced by the Iñupiat on a daily basis. It is a force that they will have to navigate with no prior history to draw but perhaps their strength to adapt to any change.

Climate Change and the Borough today

The Iñupiat have had, and continue to have, a tremendous capacity to persevere and adapt to change. Throughout outside influences on the North Slope, ranging from wage labor and resource scarcity during the eras of commercial whaling, fur trading, reindeer herding, military installations, and oil and gas development, the Iñupiat have retained their hunting, fishing,

gathering, and sharing skills, and most importantly their social networks. Climate change is another aspect of colonialism that the Iñupiat have to adapt to. Utqiagvik in Alaska is among the fastest-warming cities in the nation thanks to human-induced climate change.⁹¹ In 2019, Utqiagvik's average temperature was 20.8 degrees; and four out of the five warmest years on record for Utqiagvik have occurred in the past five years showcasing the warming climate in one of the warmest places on earth.⁹² The exceptional rate of warming is largely driven by a loss of nearby sea ice in the Chukchi and Beaufort seas, which is itself tied to climate change.⁹³ As the northernmost city in the country, Utiaqvik will feel the recession of ice the most profoundly.

The land and the people that now encompass the North Slope Borough has changed immensely over the centuries and even just in the thirty-five years since its creation. Climate change is bringing yet another era of change. There is no more profound of a change, the recent, dramatic retreat of Arctic sea ice. The North Slope Borough 2018-2039 Plan, which is cited earlier in this paper, addresses technological advancements, development, and climate change for the next 30 years (North slope plan). The plan is kept up to date to address changing circumstances that the Borough may face including climate change through the lens of its economy, infrastructure, and the NSB's relationship with the United States government. The issues the Borough explores in its 2019 plan include: dependence on fossil fuels, not enough infrastructure, lack of recreation, lack of cohesive management in some areas of the borough, uninterested youth, substance abuse, and general loss of language and culture.⁹⁴ Not all of these

⁹¹ Matthew Cappucci, "America's Northernmost City Just Recorded Its First Record-Low Temperature in 13 Years," The Washington Post (WP Company, April 30, 2020), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/weather/2020/04/30/americas-northernmost-city-just-recorded-its-first-record-low-temperature-13-years/>.

⁹² Cappucci America's Northernmost City.

⁹³ Cappucci America's Northernmost City.

⁹⁴ "The North Slope Borough Comprehensive Plan, 76-79.

issues are connected to climate change as of now, but as time goes on they could be exacerbated by a warming climate. A warming climate will change the Iñupiat way of life.

The actual physical effects of climate change are already being felt and seen by the Iñupiat people. Climate change is bringing yet another era of change. There is no more profound of a change, the recent, dramatic retreat of Arctic sea ice. The ice melt caused by climate change affects every aspect of the Iñupiat lifestyle and the hunt. As the ice melts the hunt for whales and caribou becomes more difficult as the waters become more treacherous and the ice patterns more unpredictable. A generation ago, the first “shorefast” ice would form in October, creating miles-wide platforms from land to sea that were stable from early November until mid-July. Shorefast is sea ice that is "fastened" to the coastline, to the seafloor along shoals, or to grounded icebergs.⁹⁵ These platforms allowed for ease of hunting. Now, the shore fast ice firms up later in the fall, and it breaks up weeks earlier in the spring. As the climate changes the animals also grow more scarce. The warming climate affects the subsistence process even after the hunt is completed. Once the food is attained climate change affects its storage. It causes traditional underground ice cellars to fail in turn causing the meat within the cellars to rot.⁹⁶ Subsistence hunting makes up a huge part of the Iñupiat culture so as climate change erodes the hunting process the cultures deteriorate along with it. The problems that the slope faces in terms of substance abuse, loss of culture, and uninterested youth may be exacerbated as their connection to hunting becomes harder to maintain. The difficulty of addressing these problems is exacerbated by the North Slopes’ relation to oil and natural gas.

⁹⁵ Maddie Stone, “Why Climate Scientists Depend on Alaska's Indigenous Communities Now More Than Ever,” Gizmodo, October 11, 2017, <https://gizmodo.com/why-climate-scientists-depend-on-alaska-s-Indigenous-co-1798335127>.

⁹⁶ “The North Slope Borough Comprehensive Plan, 83

Due to Slope's history with Oil interest, as detailed in the previous chapter, the North Slope economy is in part reliant on fossil fuels.⁹⁷ The NSB's main revenue source is from oil and gas leasing of their lands.⁹⁸ The Borough and Iñupiat people are put in an interesting position as fossil fuels and certain aspects of development were forced on the community through colonization. Before European contact, the Inupiat were self-sufficient living in relative harmony with nature. The economic paradigm that plagues many tribes and Indigenous peoples throughout the United States is a reliance on the very extraction methods that are ultimately destroying their resources and home. This dependence is in direct contrast with their goals to stop climate change which poses an immense threat to their subsistence lifestyle, food security and safety. The lack of access to renewable and alternative energy sources while also attempting to modernize compounds the issue of addressing climate change.⁹⁹ Despite the difficulty of this predicament, The NSB is committed to ensuring that any leasing and development activity is done in an environmentally and culturally responsive way, with minimal impact on its residents' traditional and subsistence way of life.¹⁰⁰ The NSB recognizes the difficulties that reliance on oil and natural gas causes and sees the lack of access to renewable resources as an issue their community faces¹⁰¹. In the comprehensive plan, the borough sets out many solutions and proposals to address their issues with climate change at the forefront of their minds. The community will need to partner with scientists, the state and federal government to adjust to their changing environment. The shift to renewable energy is an issue that the North Slope will have

⁹⁷ "The North Slope Borough Comprehensive Plan, 177.

⁹⁸ "The North Slope Borough Comprehensive Plan, 310.

⁹⁹ "The North Slope Borough Comprehensive Plan, 178.

¹⁰⁰ "The North Slope Borough Comprehensive Plan, 310.

¹⁰¹ "The North Slope Borough Comprehensive Plan, 52.

to navigate for years to come, and will require collaboration on many fronts. This collaboration has already begun on many fronts.

Scientists interested in Climate change come to the North Slope to conduct research continuing the paradigm of scientific research since the days of NARL. Despite decades of scientist and Iñupiat relationships the perfect formula of respect and balance between Western science and TEK has not been established. A history of colonization and disrespect pervades the interactions between outsiders and natives. The relationships and time required to gain the true benefits of sharing traditional ecological knowledge can take years.¹⁰² Many scientists are not willing to put in the time required to build a rapport with a village. This causes many scientists to come and go leaving the communities feeling like they do not get much out of the relationship and exchange. Scientists working with Indigenous knowledge, meanwhile, struggle with skepticism from the academic community. This remaining skepticism highlights the superiority that has been ingrained in our culture over the centuries due to colonialism. Traditional knowledge is an integral part of Iñupiat culture teaching and passing down “wisdom and experience acquired continuously over thousands of years” through elders, hunters, gatherers, whaling captains, community leaders, and others.¹⁰³ Traditional ecological knowledge is forever expanding through contemporary experiences as environments and natural patterns change.¹⁰⁴ Despite gaining recognition of traditional knowledge as its own distinct system many are still skeptical of its uses. Yet, more and more scientists are recognizing the valuable role that

¹⁰² Stone

¹⁰³ North Slope Plan.

¹⁰⁴ North Slope Plan.

traditional ecological knowledge can and must play in learning about and protecting our environment.

As there is gaining recognition of how valuable and important TEK is amongst the scientific community and policymakers there is one more step made to decolonization. An important example of a governing United States institution collaborating with TEK is illustrated in the Bureau of Ocean Energy and Management's work with the Iñupiat. The Bureau of Ocean Energy and Management is a good example to observe an organization incorporating Indigenous learning systems into their decisions and respecting the input of Indigenous peoples. Section 20 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA) confirms BOEM the authority to develop and oversee research to inform environmental review, management, and policy decisions for the development of resources of the OCS Meaning that the United States government has control over the areas many hunters rely on for subsistence living.¹⁰⁵ Like other acts in this text, The United States purchase of Alaska and ensuing statehood are the reason why the Iñupiat resources have to be managed federally. The BOEM states that it treats "traditional knowledge and science as distinct and complementary knowledge systems" and does not worry about whether or not it should be integrated into their policy decisions.¹⁰⁶ The BOEM believes expected outcomes of using both traditional and scientific knowledge include: improved decision-making through the more complete and inclusive application of the available information and increased involvement of people in resource management decisions that may affect their way of life.¹⁰⁷ BOEM gains access to traditional ecological knowledge through written letters and comments during community meetings, public hearings, and discussions with Indigenous hunters and fishers.

¹⁰⁵ Kendall, Traditional Knowledge, 17

¹⁰⁶ Kendall, Traditional Knowledge, 20

¹⁰⁷ Kendall, Traditional Knowledge, 21

BOEM analysts review social science publications for traditional knowledge findings and incorporate these in assessment documents where appropriate.

BOEM, through its government-to-government relationship with Alaska Native tribes and Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) Corporations, formally consults with tribal and ANCSA leaders to hear TEK.¹⁰⁸ The United States has policies and executive orders requiring federal agencies to consult with tribes and ANCSA Corporations when an agency's actions have tribal implications.¹⁰⁹ BOEM's environmental analysis process uses traditional knowledge to describe and delineate the affected environment, formulate alternatives, and design mitigation measures to avoid or reduce potential adverse impacts to the human environment (Ristroph 2012). Agency actions include regulations, proposed plans, proposed legislation, or other policy statements that may have substantial direct effects on one or more Alaska Native tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Alaska Native tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal government and Alaska Native tribes.¹¹⁰ An example of the BOEM incorporating traditional ecological knowledge was on the issue of anthropogenic noise. Native people expressed concerns about anthropogenic noise from seismic exploration, vessel traffic, aircraft, and drilling disturbs whales and other marine mammals, causing them to deflect their movement patterns farther out to sea. It is of great concern to the Indigenous people in the Arctic as it affects their food supply, and can result in more expensive and dangerous subsistence hunting trips during which subsistence hunters may be exposed to greater risks due to rougher seas, shifting ice, shipping traffic, and stronger offshore currents. There is also concern that oil spills, even if the probability is low, could taint

¹⁰⁸ Kendall, Traditional Knowledge, 25

¹⁰⁹ Kendall, Traditional Knowledge, 25.

¹¹⁰ Kendall, Traditional Knowledge 2

or damage wildlife resources used for subsistence purposes and cause hunters and fishers to avoid contemporary harvest areas. North Slope Borough has voiced concerns that their traditional knowledge of marine environments and subsistence resources is not regularly considered and applied to energy development decisions that can affect their lives. Overall this process outlined by the Bureau of Ocean and Energy Management showcases what a respectful collaboration should look like. Exchanges about climate change and a shifting climate can be informed by this process. As climate change becomes an increasing threat to the Iñupiat lifestyle it is important to recognize that it is an ongoing form of colonization.

Conclusion:

The United States Purchase of the Alaskan Territory from Tsarist Russia and through this purchase U.S. policy shaped the North Slope through its extractive processes. The Iñupiat have persevered throughout the past 180 years to hold onto their land and culture. Through the initial phase of the U.S purchase of Alaska to Statehood, the Iñupiat people had to adapt to enormous change that was unexpected and continuous and as the colonial onslaught. This initial phase led to statehood. The laws and acts that followed Statehood forced the Iñupiat to confront their nature and fight back. All the while navigating relationships with scientists at NARL. This paper sought to explore the American colonization of Alaska and how the Iñupiat adapted and

persevered while creating political organizations that serve their own ends. Through Traditional Ecological Knowledge the Iñupiat were able to maintain their culture and continue to do through the modern day. The exchange of TEK between scientists, agencies, and Iñupiat people provides a guide for what future collaborations surround climate change can look like.

Bibliography

- “The Alaskan Fur Trade - ENCOUNTERS : ALASKA.” ENCOUNTERS. Accessed May 5, 2021.
<https://www.encountersalaska.org/the-alaskan-fur-trade#:~:text=The%20commercialized%20Alaskan%20fur%20trade,of%20luxurious%2C%20waterproof%20fur%20garment.>
- Anderson, Anna. “From Iceland - That Time The United States Was Thinking Of Buying Iceland.” *The Reykjavik Grapevine*, May 6, 2016.
<https://grapevine.is/mag/articles/2015/04/20/that-time-the-united-states-were-thinking-of-buying-iceland/>.
- Arctic Slope Regional Corporation. *History of the Iñupiat People of the North Slope. YouTube*. Arctic Slope Regional Corporation , 2020.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s5pqeOwbDQc>.
- Bailey, Thomas A. “Why the United States Purchased Alaska.” *Pacific Historical Review* 3, no. 1 (1934): 39–49. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3633456>.
- Brewster, Karen. “Native Contributions To Arctic Science At Barrow, Alaska.” *ARCTIC* 50, no. 3 (1997). <https://doi.org/10.14430/arctic1109>.
- Cappucci, Matthew. “America's Northernmost City Just Recorded Its First Record-Low Temperature in 13 Years.” *The Washington Post*. WP Company, April 30, 2020.

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/weather/2020/04/30/americas-northernmost-city-just-recorded-its-first-record-low-temperature-13-years/>.

“Federal Indian Law for Alaska Tribes.” Early Years in Alaska after Purchase | Federal Indian Law for Alaska Tribes. Accessed May 5, 2021.

https://www.uaf.edu/tribal/112/unit_1/earlyyearsinalaskaafterpurchase.php#:~:text=The%20passage%20of%20the%20first,of%20the%20State%20of%20Oregon.

Golder, Frank A. “The Purchase of Alaska.” *The American Historical Review* 25, no. 3 (1920): 411. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1836879>.

“Inuit or Eskimo: Which Name to Use?” Inuit or Eskimo: Which name to use? | Alaska Native Language Center. Accessed May 5, 2021.

https://www.uaf.edu/anlc/resources/inuit_or_eskimo.php.

“Inupiaq.” Languages - Inupiaq | Alaska Native Language Center. Accessed May 5, 2021.

[https://uaf.edu/anlc/languages/inupiaq.php#:~:text=The%20name%20%22Inupiaq%2C%22%20meaning,particularly%20in%20the%20northern%20dialects.&text=The%20plural%20form%20of%20the,of%20the%20North%20Slope%22\).](https://uaf.edu/anlc/languages/inupiaq.php#:~:text=The%20name%20%22Inupiaq%2C%22%20meaning,particularly%20in%20the%20northern%20dialects.&text=The%20plural%20form%20of%20the,of%20the%20North%20Slope%22).)

Kendall, James J., Jeffrey J. Brooks, Chris Campbell, Kathleen L. Wedemeyer, Catherine C.

Coon, Sharon E. Warren, Guillermo Auad, et al. “Use of Traditional Knowledge by the United States Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to Support Resource Management.” *Czech Polar Reports* 7, no. 2 (2017): 151–63. <https://doi.org/10.5817/cpr2017-2-15>.

Mackie, Richard Somerset. *Trading Beyond the Mountains: the British Fur Trade on the Pacific, 1793-1843*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2014.

Naske, Claus M., and Herman E. Slotnick. 1994. *Alaska: A History of the 49th State*. N.p.: University of Oklahoma Press.

The North Slope Borough Comprehensive Plan 2019-2039 § (n.d.).

http://www.north-slope.org/assets/images/uploads/NSB_Comprehensive_Plan_2019-2039_Reduced.pdf.

“The North Slope Borough.” Official Website Of The North Slope Borough Northernmost Municipality in the United States of America. Accessed May 5, 2021.

<https://www.north-slope.org/>.

Stone, Maddie. “Why Climate Scientists Depend on Alaska's Indigenous Communities Now More Than Ever.” Gizmodo, October 11, 2017.

<https://gizmodo.com/why-climate-scientists-depend-on-alaska-s-Indigenous-co-1798335>
127.

“‘THE FIFTH DISASTER’- The Colonization of The North Slope of Alaska.” Naive American Rights Fund: Announcements 3, no. 1 (January 1975).