Goodbye, Great White Father-Figure

George W. Rogers

> In front of the Cathedral at Rheims stands one of the most beautiful works in Gothic art, the statue of a king. The gaze under the calm brows seems to delve searchingly into the thoughts of the observer, the fingers of the left hand still linger hesitatingly on the cord of the cape, but the right hand is already outstretched in firm decision. Let this be a symbol of the relation of the white race to the Eskimos — in Greenland, in Alaska, everywhere.[1]

These are the final words of the doyen of Danish Eskimologists, Kaj Birket-Smith in his classic work on the Eskimo. The message intended by Birket-Smith undoubtedly is, "Little brown brothers, you're in." As the Eskimo, Indian and Aleut of Alaska struggle in today's vicious cross-currents of social and economic change, all that is required is to reach up and grasp the outstretched hand of welcome and help. But the choice of symbols says much more. There is the hesitating left hand which says "...but on the other hand" and the unconscious choice of a beautiful work of Gothic art, a King figure at that, to represent the white race. In fact, this is the Great White Father incarnate or at least made tangible. For the last one hundred years it has been the dominant figure both in the minds of the native and the white missionary or government agent when they think of their relationship. It is part of the explanation of why the two Alaskas, native and non-native, are poles apart in social and economic well-being.

In the final volume of his comprehensive study of administration of programs for the indigenous peoples of the circum-polar lands, Diamond Jenness concluded that by 1965 Alaska's Eskimos had advanced much further toward equal participation with the white man in Alaska's development than had Canada's Eskimos, and had reached a level comparable to that of the Greenlanders before the First World War. Since that war he finds that the Greenlanders "have changed from a

hunting people living precariously on sea mammals to prosperous fishermen, and politically from a colonial people with little voice in their own affairs to self-governing citizens of a Danish province." To reach a comparably high level the Alaskan Eskimos need more education and training in order to earn larger incomes and improve their present living conditions. What education and what occupations pose baffling problems, but of one thing Jenness is certain.

> They sorely need leaders from their own ranks, not just the one or two individuals they have already thrown up, but an elite corps trained in modern skills and familiar with the day-to-day pattern of America's social and industrial life. They need this vanguard to draw them out of their semi-isolation and merge their activities and interests with those of white Alaskans. In Greenland, the reader will remember, Denmark began to create the nucleus of just such a corps as early as the mid-eighteenth century, when she set out to build a cultured native clergy to whom she could entrust the education of their fellow-countrymen... in Denmark she has trained many Eskimo professional men and skilled workers, from all of whom, as well as from the clergy, she has demanded the same standards as for Danes born and brought up in Europe. Alaska's Eskimos have lacked these opportunities until quite recently. Nearly all their teachers in the north have been short-term exiles from the United States, ignorant of the language and way of life of their pupils, and neither eager to promote their speedy assimilation nor interested in the future of Alaska itself. Comparatively few Eskimos have visited the United States; fewer still have received any higher education and training there or obtained regular employment.[2]

This paper is concerned with two sets of factors implied in these two quotations which are common to all native groups. The strong race segregationalist elements within the dominant white society are obvious factors inhibiting the native's increased participation, but other inhibiting factors come from the attitudes of those who are nominally concerned with desegregation and integration. These are embodied in the legal definitions of the Alaska natives as wards of the federal government and the paternalism represented in the Great White Father figure. It is represented in the policy of assimilation which seeks to make the native over in the image of the white man without his consent or even awareness of what is being attempted.

The second general inhibiting factor to be dealt with concerns the lack of true native leadership and new teachers.

Evolution of Government-Native Relationships — The First Hundred Years

The initial and abiding pattern of native-federal government relations was set forth in Article 3 of the 1867 Treaty of Cession which made the "uncivilized tribes" of Alaska "wards" of the federal government.[3] The Organic Act of 1884 brought the first civil government to Alaska and directed the Secretary of the Interior to select "two officers, who, together with the governor, shall constitute a commission to examine into and report upon the condition of the Indians residing in said Territory; what lands, if any, should be reserved for their use; what provision shall be made for their education..." This was never carried out, but in 1884 the Presbyterian missionary, Sheldon Jackson, was appointed the first General Agent for Education for Alaska and was given an appropriation of $25,000 and the charge to meet the United States' "moral obligation" to its new wards to "fit them for the social and industrial life of the white population of the United States and promote their not-too-distant assimilation."[4]

Funds for native programs steadily expanded into multi-million dollar annual budgets as health and welfare functions were added to education and all responsibility finally turned over to the Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1931.

Today the Alaska native has the same citizenship rights as the non-native and shares in the same range of governmental programs at all levels — federal, state and local. Because he is classified as an "American Indian," however, the federal government still plays the dominant role in his affairs. The array of special programs available to Alaska natives and the amounts spent on them are impressive.

> As aboriginal people of Alaska, Natives are eligible for a wide range of special federal services, just as Indians are in other states. They may, for instance, attend the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs day or boarding schools; and they may obtain tuition, transportation, and subsistence allowances from the Bureau for vocational training or college studies. They may receive assistance from the Bureau in finding jobs, borrowing money, devising economic development programs, acquiring surplus federal property, and in other ways. They may receive welfare payments from the Bureau when they are destitute, if they are not otherwise eligible under state welfare programs for the

> blind, disabled, old or those having dependent children. From the Division of Indian Health of the U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, they may obtain medical and dental care, and share in constructing water and waste disposal facilities. And through Interior's Bureau of Land Management they may obtain title to townsite lots or Indian allotments from the public domain... Federal spending for Alaska's Natives by the two agencies serving American Indians, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Division of Indian Health of the Public Health Service, will total about $43 million in fiscal 1968.[5]

The growth of these special programs has been more impressive than progress toward the initial objectives of assimilation "in the not-too-distant future." In effect, the established pattern of government-native relationships became very early frozen into that of a dual system of schools and social services, racially defined, which continues into the present. The original objective of rapid assimilation for most of the time over which this system was developing was lost sight of under the day-to-day business of program administration and the native's adjustments to their existence as part of his new way of life. The fact of wardship and the objective of assimilation have not proven to be very compatible elements. Beyond that, the underlying policy has not always been one of assimilation, but has sometimes swung around to some varieties of segregation. Whatever the policy orientation or the form of administration, however, the pattern of the relationship has always been paternalistic with the government or the missionaries attempting to change the native into something other than what he was. This might be for his ultimate good, for the old ways were gone or fatally disrupted, but he had little voice in the determinations.

During the Russian period the policy was enunciated, if not implemented, of creating a new breed of Russian-Americans by intermarriage. Eventually the aboriginal population would be directly and biologically absorbed into the blood stream of Mother Russia.[6] The initial United States policies were northern versions of the philosophy which lay behind the Indian Allottment Act and the programs of converting the plains Indians and others from mounted warriors and hunters to dirt farmers.

A major reversal came in 1933 when John Collier, as the newly appointed Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs,

announced his plans for a "new deal" for the American Indian. He found that the earlier attempt to force the move of these people from their traditional cultural base to that of the dominant white culture in one major jump without any transition had resulted in cutting them adrift, destroying their old institutions before they could understand or accept the new. The administration of the General Allotment Act of 1887, which provided for allotment of reservation lands to individual tribal members, had resulted in an eroding of the land and resource base of the Indians as sharp trading and unscrupulous white land grabbers used the Indians as middlemen in acquiring title to reservation lands. More and more Indians simply crowded into declining land areas. The basic elements of the "Indian New Deal" were to enlarge the land and resource base to a size able to support the population and to restore the aboriginal institutions which could become a means of local democratic expression and self-determination.

As applied to Alaska, this resulted in a rather heavy-handed campaign to create large reservations for native groups, including marine as well as land areas, the diversion of most of the native loan funds to the purchase of defunct private salmon canneries in anticipation of the time when the native would finally "own" the salmon resource through these reservations, and the incorporation of village governing and development bodies on tribal lines which were alien to the indigenous organization of the Alaskan natives. In short, the prescriptions for change, like the former policies, were designed for the Indians of the continental United States, not for Alaskan natives. The reservation movement was stopped by court action and the rest of the programs lost their drive and simply drifted into the present. What had been accomplished was a further sense of segregation of the native people which was, of course, far from the intent of Collier.

When the national administration embarked on its War on Poverty in 1964, the Alaska native was overwhelmed by a babel of voices, government workers and federally-funded private consultants following banners with strange devices. Not because he was native, but because of his economically depressed situation, which in Alaska is virtually a native monopoly, he came under the scrutiny of a range of social sciences whose practitioners

sought to shape him and his problems to fit the sets of diagnoses and remedies they brought with them.

There were also some immediate benefits. VISTA workers made their appearance, and for the first time isolated villages had a white man or woman in residence who devoted full-time to learning, rather than teaching. Neighborhood Youth Corps were adapted to the village situations, and institutes and programs for training native teacher aids and orienting teachers for the bush schools were sponsored at the University of Alaska and Alaska Methodist University.

A new breed of disguised government agency appeared to implement programs drawn from the burgeoning arsenal of the War on Poverty; the "federally funded, non-profit, private corporation." The principal representative of this type of organization is RurALCAP (Rural Alaska Community Action Program, Inc.) funded by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity to conduct a range of anti-poverty programs in Alaska's rural areas (i.e. in Native Alaska). Its board of directors is made up of government and private agency administrators, and "representatives of the poor." Its educational programs range from Head-start, a learning program for preschoolers in thirty-five villages, to Operation Mainstream, a program to provide work experience and training to adults engaged on community projects funded by the U.S. Department of Labor. Through interlocking directorships and other means, it exercises some control, influence or co-ordination over the operation of a number of similar federally-funded corporations: the Alaska Training and Planning Center, Inc., guided by directors of Community Action agencies; Community Enterprises Development Corp., funded to stimulate the formation of co-operatives and other development enterprises; nine regional development corporations; Alaska Village Electric Cooperative, Inc., funded by a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity and a loan from the Rural Electrification Administration and with loans to individual householders from the BIA; and Alaska Planning and Evaluation Center, Inc. co-ordinating planning and providing review evaluation of effectiveness of all these programs.

There were other places in which program planning functions now resided. The State Rural Development Agency (originally

established in 1954 as a premature attempt to deal with the Native problem) took a new lease on life. The State Department of Economic Development and the Alaska Housing Authority also took greater interest in funding for rural or remote area community and economic development planning. The Economic Development Administration (U.S. Department of Commerce) made a grant to the Alaska Federation of Natives to plan for local and regional economic development. This was part of the attempt to involve the native people directly in the planning and administrative functions of programs. Most established agencies took on an anti-poverty, native development cast. Farm Home Administration and Small Business Administration considered "economic opportunity loans." Adult education and training programs (Adult Basic Education, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, Manpower Development and Training, Apprenticeship and Training), funded and operated under guidelines established by federal agencies, functioned in co-operation with or through State agencies and the Alaska Federation of Natives. Faced with these new competitors, the Bureau of Indian Affairs overhauled what had been fringe programs dealing with economic or industrial development and began to create new machinery for the purpose of encouraging native participation, in an advisory capacity, in administration of its programs. Late in 1967 it established village advisory boards to encourage local participation in the BIA educational programs and agency advisory committees at Nome, Bethel and Fairbanks. It also stepped up its program of giving preference to native applicants for jobs and in 1969 could report that more than half its permanent employees were natives (I can recall the difficulties and objections surrounding the hiring of the first native by the BIA in the early 1950s).

This proliferation of new programs, agencies and administrators has brought forth predictable complaints and criticisms from natives and non-natives alike. Since the mid-1960s the villages of Alaska have had their seasonal influx of social scientists, singly or in inter-disciplinary teams, making studies or conducting surveys to determine such things as "community viability," village social structure, labour skills inventories and an apparently annually changing list of similar strange and confusing visible and invisible things. Overlapping is the continuous procession of

federal, state and anti-poverty agency employees holding meetings or instructing village representatives on the latest changes in program guidelines as laid down by the ultimate funding agency in Washington, D.C. Then comes the follow-up review and inspection tours of senior officials and contract "evaluators," and ultimately the Congressional sub-committees. There may have been a loss of privacy, but there was also a loss of isolation. Quite aside from official intent, there have been side benefits. The regular flow of visitors has provided a subsidized tourism with resulting improvement in air service and communication for remote village areas and additional sources of income and knowledge of the outside to the villagers. The visitors have also been an informal and unofficial source of advice and assistance to those who were beginning to put together the emerging native political movement.

The present is not the ideal vantage point from which to review and evaluate this flux of new programs, but a few clear advances can be noted. The VISTA volunteers are beginning to form the basis for a new breed of young school teachers who go into the remote village post out of a sense of dedication to a cause rather than the lure of higher pay and an exciting interlude in their longer-run career. The native VISTA associates and participants in the Neighborhood Youth Corps have given evidence of creating bridges between the youth of both cultures which may eventually lead to the development of the elite corps which Diamond Jenness sees as a prerequisite to the real economic, social and political development of the Alaska native.

Changing the Patterns of Government-Native Relationships

One hoped for consequence of these last developments, according to a federal official, is a reduction in the relative importance of racially defined federal programs, such as those of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Division of Indian Health.

> Though their contributions have been enormous over the many decades when the responsibilities of government to villagers were almost exclusively theirs, a continuation of such racially defined government institutions is incongruous with belief systems of American democracy. From time to time critics of these agencies have called for their abolition and the transfer of their funds to the state for its administration, but as has

been noted in connection with school transfers, Native citizens themselves may reject such proposals.[7]

Another change in the pattern is the beginning of consciously planned involvement of the natives in "their programs," but often this appears as not more than a token of what is intended. It is done in too self-conscious a manner or at a level too far removed from people who are the subject or concern of the programs. Although they claim to speak for all natives, the top echelon of officers of the Alaska Federation of Natives and other native groups who have been invited to share management functions do not necessarily have a continuing and intimate relationship with the rank and file of villagers they left behind. Furthermore, the native reaction to these well-intentioned efforts is frequently one of appathetic acceptance or conscious role-playing.

Long ago many of these people came to accept their federal and state governmental relationships simply as part of the facts of life to which they had to adapt, much as they would adapt to a change in their physical environment and resource base. In the past these have represented drastic changes requiring devestating adjustments. Heavy-handed attempts to enforce school attendance disrupted the seasonal movements of families in pursuit of their subsistence economies or their participation in commercial trapping and fishing, and the arbitrary administration of national programs designed to meet needs of an urbanized industrial society in some cases turned the village society inside out by making unwed mothers and the aged the principal sources of income and rendering the able-bodied male economically redundant. But having invested a generation or more to working out adaptations, there appears to be a reluctance to accept opportunities for change. Efforts of the Territorial government during the 1940s to effect transfer of educational programs from the BIA under terms of existing machinery which would continue federal financing were initially resisted by the bureaucrats.[8] When the process was finally implemented during the 1950s and 1960s the obtaining of community consent to transfer arose as a barrier to plans agreed upon by federal and state officials. A 1969 report comments, "For a variety of reasons — often relating to a fear of the loss of other Bureau services — villagers may reject the opportunity of having state instead of federal administration. This year eleven

schools were scheduled for transfer, but only four communities agreed to allow such transfers to take place."[9]

The new programs may represent more enlightened approaches, but to the native they present a bewildering and sometimes basically conflicting array of specialized attempts to deal with fragments of their problems as analyzed by social scientists, generalized by legislative counsel, interpreted by public administrators and evaluated and reviewed by politicians. All of this is beyond comprehension, so you do not ask questions, but simply accept what is offered, make what appear to be appropriate responses (as one Eskimo once told me, "we enjoy making up answers to the white man's questions") and put it all into use in the ongoing business of survival.

To other natives, government-native relationship is a pernicious form of paternalism and patronization which corrupted or destroyed the spirit of their people and held them back. Over all these programs there was the stigma of perpetually "being helped" and the frustration of never being allowed to do things for themselves and having little to say about what was done. This was the subject of repeated resolutions and demanded reforms made by the Alaska Native Brotherhood and Sisterhood going back to the 1920s, and is a vital element in the new native political movements. With the recently launched anti-poverty program as well as the older ones in mind, the Eskimo editor of the *Tundra Times* opened his June 28, 1968 editorial: "There is far too much paternalistic attitude toward the native people of Alaska and it is not only the Bureau of Indians Affairs brand either we have heard about." He finds this "sickening attitude" to be " not only an insult to the intelligence of the native people, but a deterrent on their efforts to develop." The editorial ends on the note which the government- native relations have contributed to the new politics, "There is something wrong in the efforts to change — to assimilate the native people. Breaking the sinews of their own spirit is not going to do it. Perhaps it would be better to give the native people a free hand to solve the problem in their own way."

It is the new native political movement arising in the mid 1960s which has had the greatest impact upon the established patterns of government-native relationships. But before proceed-

TABLE 1

ALASKA NATIVE[a] POPULATION POLITICAL POTENTIAL — 1960

	Total Alaska	*Southeast*	*Southcentral*	*Southest*	*Interior*	*Northwest*
1. Total population — all races	226 167	35 403	108 851	21 001	49 128	11 784
2. Total population excluding defence[b] personnel and dependents	150 681	33 917	66 920	16 500	22 664	10 680
3. Native population	43 081	9 242	5 514	14 314	4 638	9 373
— as % 1.	19.0	26.1	5.1	68.1	9.4	79.5
— as % 2.	28.6	27.2	8.2	86.8	20.5	87.8
4. Legislative representation[c] by regions — 1960	60	14	20	8	10	8

SOURCES: U.S. Bureau of Census, 1960 and unpublished worksheets. State of Alaska, *Session Laws of Alaska, 1960,* Military dependents from data in Government Statistical Corporation, *Alaska Economic and Fiscal Data, 1963,* Alaska State Development Corporation and civilian population reported on military reservations in Census Worksheets.

a. *Native* includes Alaskans of aboriginal stock (Indians, Aleuts, Eskimos).

b. *Defence* includes members of armed forces or their dependents stationed in Alaska.

c. *Legislative representation* allocated by election districts in House of Representatives and place of residence for members of the Senate, 1960 Session.

ing to discuss these developments, some measurement of the general magnitude of the native political potential should be given. The 1960 census reported a total of 226,167 Alaskans of which 43,081 (or 19 percent) were natives. The census for 1970 put the total population at 302,173 of which 51,528 were native. The arithmetic of politics, however, does not stop at this point. Some 32,489 of the non-natives were members of the armed forces stationed in Alaska during 1960 (an estimated 31,700 in 1970) accompanied by a slightly larger number of dependents. Voting records from districts in which defence personnel and dependents are stationed as compared with other districts indicate that per capita participation in elections is lower than the Alaskan average, which would be expected as terms of military duty are generally limited. If the non-native population of voting age is reduced by the number of persons in the armed forces (as a rough non-voting factor), a better idea of the political potential of voting natives can be seen than provided by population comparisons. Furthermore, the regional distribution of this potential varies and provides room for political manœvre in the nature of representative democracy. In terms of numbers of representatives in the state legislatures, the two regions with the heaviest native populations (southwest and northwest) were over-represented in 1960 with 26.7 per cent of the members of the legislature and only 14.5 per cent of population (table 1). In the 1969 legislature, five of the members were natives, and a significant number of the white members owed their presence to the support of the native voters.

A *Time-Life* writer visiting Alaska during the politically important year of 1966 found other factors tipping the scales in favour of natives in politics.

> The natives have always had one thing going for them: they were stable. The white body politic, on the other hand, had always been, as it still is, in a state of flux, its highly mobile members being more sojourners than residents. Hence the natives have the potential of being a political force of greater power than their numbers might indicate. The 1960 census revealed that they had an additional advantage: their rate of increase was higher than that of whites by 13.3 people per 1,000 and had risen nearly 40 per cent since 1950 — in comparison to a non-native increase of only about 30 per cent. Baring a sizable in-migration of whites, it seemed inevitable that the native's percentage of Alaska's total population would also increase, giving them proportionally greater weight at the polls. Now the beginnings of native unity and the emergence of a

native leadership meant they could turn their special advantages to better account.[10]

Native politics emerged, or burst forth, in two distinct stages and two quite different political modes. The Indians of southeast Alaska had a head start because of their aboriginal political unity when the Territory was created in 1912 and responded by making the two party system work to their advantage. When the other native people emerged as a political force some fifty years later, it was not in this same earlier context of party politics as a continuing and changing form of bargaining, but contemporary politics as dogma, protest and revolt.

Native Political Development — the Indian and Eskimo Modes

Implementation of the Organic Act of 1912 found the native people of southeast Alaska prepared to participate in the resulting system of party politics and representative government. The aboriginal heritage, proximity to or partial assimilation into the new white communities and the commerical fishing economy and the previous three decades or more of education and leadership training provided by Sheldon Jackson and other very practical minded missionaries, made the transition a relatively natural experience. Even the schisms in their aboriginal society could be accommodated. One of the two most influential families and their followers became Republicans and the other major group followed suit by becoming Democrats and the rivalries of the past were continued with all their aboriginal enthusiasm under the rules of the newly introduced American two party system. They also recognized that the party system was more than simply a device for competitive exercises. The Alaska Native Brotherhood, founded in 1912, followed by the Alaska Native Sisterhood (women had the vote in the Territory of Alaska before it was granted generally in the United States) became effective bargaining instruments for promoting common interests of the native people of the region within the political system and in dealing with the federal bureaucracy, after winning in 1915 the means to apply for citizenship and voting rights. The annual conventions became arenas for working out internal rivalries and arriving at a temporary semblence of unity from which to formulate clear statements of policy objectives for the next year. When conditions looked favourable

for success they might sponsor some of their own members to run for seats in the legislature, but more generally all political candidates were invited to attend the conventions and those offering the most favourable terms would be assured of voting support, a factor which no white political hopeful could afford to ignore. These people had an earlier reputation as hard-headed traders and this carried over into their political bargaining. Attendance of representatives of the federal bureaus was almost mandatory in order to be presented with the Indian version of programs and policies which should be pursued, to call them to account for past shortcomings and otherwise make the will of the Indian people known.[11]

The political mode of the southeast Indian from about 1912 to 1960 was not one of revolution or even protests, but of learning the intricacies of the established system and how it could be manipulated or influenced. One by-product of this was that these Indians became skilled parliamentarians. I have attended ANB sessions at which a panel of elders who apparently had *Robert's Rules of Order* by heart would back the chairman through sticky spots in the heated debates by citing chapter and verse determining each point of order. Largely because of his reputation as a successful legislative chairman, Frank Peratrovich, the only Indian delegate to the 1955-56 State Constitutional Convention, was elected vice-president and piloted that body through the stormy debates and crosscurrents of conflicts of interest and sectional differences with a skill and impartiality which none of his white brothers could have approached. Typically, the Tlingit-Haida land claims, which came about when the United States government in 1907 appropriated most of their lands for the Tongass National Forest, were put forward and pursued through the tortuous legal machinery provided. The seemingly endless steps included passage of a special act by Congress in 1935 allowing the Tlingit and Haida to sue the government, initial decisions in 1947 and 1959 by the U. S. Court of Claims holding that they were entitled to compensation and the 1966 decision setting an initial value on the 20 million acres taken.[12] Even when plans to establish a large pulp mill at Ketchikan provided them with an opportunity to short-cut the process by posing a threat to this project, they agreed to the compromise of the Tongass Timber Act of 1947, which permitted

sale of timber from the lands in dispute with receipts to be held in a special fund until title was eventually determined.[13]

Politics was something in which these people were involved, but the older political leaders were not in any sense men who depended upon political office for their livelihood. Prior to Statehood, election to the Territorial Legislature was a source of economic loss (through suspension of normal income generating activities during the session) rather than gain, as reimbursement was a token flat payment for assumed out-of-pocket and travel expenses only, rather than a salary (minimum $6,000) as now provided. These older leaders established their reputations and followings on the basis of successful careers outside politics and assumed the responsibilities of leadership either out of a sense of *noblesse oblige* or to satisfy urges for the exercise of power. In part this might be traced to the aboriginal system of earning rank and its privileges through achievement, and in part to the fact that their formal education had been by or under the influence of the Presbyterian missionaries of the earlier decades of this century and the close of the last. The organization of the Alaska Native Brotherhood and the Sisterhood was inspired by the desire to promote assimilation, the first of several objectives listed in the constitutions of the two being "to assist and encourage the Native in his advancement from his native state to his place among the cultivated races of the world."

These forces no longer dominate the contemporary scene and the younger generation of Indians appear to identify more with the new breed of native political leaders and their programs than with the "Establishment" values of their elders. In an angry review of the contemporary native political situation, a young native recently wrote that although the ANB had "championed many of the past Native causes" it has "largely forgotten its role in Alaska" and because of its conservatism is driving out its young potential leaders as dangerous radicals. "Under the foggy and fumbling leadership of Rev. Walter Soboleff, the ANB has been plagued by its own lightweight leadership, and has been unable to recognize the genius of its young men... The old Tlingits are sometimes more willing to take a Chamber of Commerce kind of candidate from the White power structure rather than one of their own young, brilliant creations. Alaskan political history

will in most cases show this kind of behavior to be anachronistic, rather than typical."[14] The language and temper of the writer reflect that of youth almost anywhere today, but his is not without hope. The writer makes clear that he finds in the emerging Eskimo leadership and an alliance with them of the liberal Tlingit young men in the statewide Alaska Federation of Natives the leaders and organization that "will not settle for a second-class kind of citizenship or a second-class kind of life for their people." It is in this "Eskimo" politics, as he classifies it, that the second mode of native politics is being made manifest today. Through natural political instinct and understanding of the white man's character, and strong unity in bargaining for their common interests, the Indians of southeast Alaska were able to exert political influence beyond that indicated by weight of numbers. In contrast, the numerically superior Eskimo, Aleut and interior Indians, because of their geographical and social isolation, their remoteness from major economic developments prior to World War II and their lack of traditions of strong leadership and cooperative action beyond small family units, exerted limited political influence even in elections in regions where they were overwhelmingly in the majority. Until the mid-1950s, for example, all members to the House and Senate of the Territorial Legislature from the northwest region were elected by a handful of white residents of the town of Nome. The native Alaskans not only had no political voice, but because they did not exercise their right to vote, they could be ignored by politicians. During the 1940s the ANB and ANS conducted missionary activities outside their region, but aside from bringing in the Indians at Copper Center, were unsuccessful in attempting to broaden their base to include all Alaska natives.

World War II not only brought the twentieth century to these people, but started their real political education. When faced with induction into the armed forces and invited to join the Alaska Territorial Scouts (the forerunner of the present Alaska National Guard), the northern native was for the first time seriously instructed in the nature and rights of his position as a United States citizen. During the war the Scouts companies and units in the villages, with weekly drill and instruction, provided a concrete evidence of this and became the first political rallying points for these people. The Alaska Statehood movement of the

1950s accelerated this political education and several Eskimos were elected and served with distinction in the Territorial Legislature.

During the 1960s the first broad and effective leadership and political organization began to take shape among these still relatively politically impotent Alaskans. The Association of American Indian Affairs and the young VISTA workers who served in the villages alerted the Eskimo, Aleut and interior Indians to the threats to their future inherent in the State land selection provisions of the Statehood Act, plans for the Atomic Energy Commission's "Project Chariot" in Northwest Alaska, the huge Rampart Canyon dam (the 10,600 square miles of reservoir would have inundated most of the lands of the interior Indians and adversely affected the traditional way of life of Indians and Eskimos downstream) and private leasing of vast tracts of oil and gas lands in the Arctic; informed them of their legal rights and educated them in matters of political organization and tactics. From 1962 *The Tundra Times* edited by an Eskimo, Howard Rock, has become a means of informing the non-native community and voicing the protests and hopes of the native community.

The new breed of leader began to develop among young men who had their aspirations raised by exposure to more "outside" experience and formal education than their fathers had received and who were determined to survive economically and see their people become a vital part of the larger world beyond the village.

At first on a scattered basis, new native associations began to appear in response to what were considered to be outside threats or to advance local developments. In 1960 the Fairbanks Native Association and the Cook Inlet Native Association were established. In 1962 representatives of interior villages formed the Tanana Chiefs' Conference, an association was formed in northwest Alaska (largely as a reaction to the Atomic Energy Commission's plans for a testing area) and villages in the Yukon-Kuskokwin deltas formed the Village Council Presidents' Conference. In 1964 a group was organized to represent the Yukon Flats villages in opposing the Rampart Dam project proposed on the Yukon River and the 1962 Northwest association collapsed

for lack of continuing support (the Atomic Energy Commission plans were also abandoned). This last group has since been replaced by two new associations, the Arctic Slope Native Association and the Northwest Native Association. About the same time the Kuskokwin Valley Association in the Bethel area was formed. Despite local differences in specific matters, land rights was a cause common to all and the filing of land claims the universal tactics. In October 1966 eight separate associations (four dominantly Eskimo, one Aleut and three Indian) joined together in the united front of the Alaska Federation of Natives, which has since become the instrument through which the land claims are being pursued, the new political leaders developed and the geginnings of native participation in program management carried out.

The new leaders are more absolutist in attitude and have not exhibited the same willingness to compromise in the interest of long-term gain as the older, more pragmatic leaders. The new objectives also appear to seek a new native identity far beyond the former objectives of simply advancing from traditional native life into that of the white man. Their basic tactics go outside the established political machinery, as demonstrated by the use made of the potent economic weapon of land claims. It would be easy to discover something of the national civil rights movement and the protest spirit of the times which seem dominated by the dangerous and almost universal search for more direct or immediately responsive political forms to replace the cumbersomeness of the representative system. But the resemblance would be a passing one at best. An offer by Alaska Negroes to make cause with their movement was firmly rejected by the Alaska Federation of Natives. In an interview with an outside journalist, one leader firmly stated that "to natives, discrimination is not really a big problem. We are more concerned with education, sanitation, and political action."[15] The apparent contradiction in this statement carries in it the subtle difference between the Negro-white attitude toward race, on the one hand, and that of the native, on the other. But it is too soon to draw firm conclusions concerning the ultimate nature and the future of this new political mode. The most that can be done at this point is to examine its two tangible manifestations — the native land claims cause and the current crop of new native leaders.

Alaska's Land, and Native Protest

In June 1968 the U.S. Bureau of Land Management summarized the status of Alaska's lands as follows: 272 million acres were still within the public domain open to entry, location and settlement under the general land laws of the United States. Of this, 250 million were under protest by native groups. 85 million acres were withdrawn by the federal government and reserved for particular uses and agencies. Of this amount 75 million acres were under native protest. Six million acres are patented lands no longer owned by the federal government but by private individuals of the State of Alaska. Of these, 3 million acres are under native protest. Finally, 12 million acres of land have been selected by the State of Alaska under the terms of the Statehood Act and are in the process of review or changing ownership. Of this amount 11.9 million acres are under native protest.[16]

The land claims made by the organizations now represented in the Alaska Federation of Natives are based upon the assertion of their right to own lands used and occupied by their ancestors. Some of the claims were first filed over thirty years ago, but most were recorded in a brief period from late 1966 to the first few months of 1967. Because of the conflicts arising, the Secretary of the Interior, in December 1966, halted action on the disposal of all public lands until Congress passed legislation defining the rights of the native claimants. The rights of native Alaskans to the lands "in their use or occupation or now claimed by them" are protected in the language of the Organic Act of 1884, but there is still disagreement as to whether this constituted an across-the-board recognition to such title.[17] In 1935 the Tlingit and Haida Indians brought suit against the United States for 20 million acres of land appropriated for federal reserves; in 1947 and 1959 the U.S. Court of Claims held that the Indians were entitled to compensation and in September 1966 the Commissioner recommended a $16 million payment which the Indians found inadequate. The court held the Indians had title, but the settlement was to constitute an extinguishment of such title. Several bills have been under consideration for the solution of the remaining claims, among them versions drafted by the Department of Interior, Alaska Federation of Natives, the State of Alaska and several proposed

by individuals. The official policy of the United States was clarified by President Johnson in a message to Congress on March 6, 1968:

> I recommend prompt action on legislation to: Give the native people of Alaska title to the lands they occupy and need to sustain their villages. Give them rights to use additional lands and water for hunting, trapping and fishing to maintain their traditional way of life, if they so choose. Award them compensation commensurate with the value of any lands taken from them.[18]

The matter is now suspended in the limbo of Congressional hearings and controversy over the amounts of lands and compensation to be granted and the forms of administration. In the meantime, however, in the interest of promoting good relations with their possible future landlords, the petroleum companies have followed the practice of employing one token Eskimo on each drilling rig on the North Slope, making grants for native and ecological studies, and the non-native community in general is taking increasing notice of and interest in their native neighbours and their problems.

One of the apparent contradictions of this period is the coincidence of the rise of the native land rights movement with an apparent acceleration of the movement of the people from the lands in question to the two main population centres of Fairbanks and Anchorage since the date of the official 1960 census. A 1967 study of the economic base of the Fairbanks area, for example, speaks of Indians and Eskimos moving into the city at the rate of "several hundred per year," and a 1967 estimate of native population by places puts the native population for the Fairbanks election district at 2,556 as compared with 1,268 in 1960 and the Anchorage election district at 4,539 as compared with 2,107 in 1960.[19] For the most part, unfortunately, these immigrants from the "other Alaska" are merely exchanging rural for urban poverty. The 1967 survey found that "a very high proportion of Indians and elderly people in the Fairbanks area are among the abject poor. Eskimos tend to be less poor and Negroes are found in the lower middle class with incomes between $7,500 and $10,000 annually. Most Causasians are among the affluent with annual incomes in excess of $10,000."[20]

Whether the native people continue on their ancestral lands or migrate into the new development centres of the state, their

problems will remain unless the basic economic conditions of poverty and political conditions of wardship are changed. This is the movement's underlying meaning, land merely being a convenient and tangible shorthand symbol for deliverance from the "Native problem." The real objectives were given in the following report of the participation by one of the most effective of the new young leaders in a 1967 land problems forum.

> Hensley said the native associations which have filed land claims have several objectives among them securing the claims, acting as political organizations and educating the people. "We in Western Alaska," he said, "have given away our votes for years, putting big men into office and getting little in return. For all too long we have not had the benefit of our numbers." He said natives were not trying to hold up the development of Alaska with their claims. "Our contention is, "Hensley said, "that if we do have a legal claim to the land, we want to be part of that development. In other countries, the benefits of development have not filtered down to the people. We are not trying to develop a racist state. We are not trying to drive anyone out of the state. Land claims have to be put on the basis of race because this is how the law has developed." He decried "Western standards being applied to villages just coming into the 20th Century. It is in helping the villages in making the adjustment," Hensley said, "that the native associations are performing their educational functions. In my view," he said, "life will be very hard in the next 20 or 30 years, until a cash economy is developed. We want to encourage this development, but at the same time, we want to be able to say, 'Hunt and fish if you want to.' If there are no hunting lands, it will make the coming years more difficult:"[21]

A legal analysis of native land titles reflects another aspect of Native Alaska being dealt with by this movement.

> Protection or wardship of Native-use areas has continued for 83 years since the Act of 1884 spelled out federal policy for Native land rights. The question of whether the Natives who became increasingly sophisticated, were in need of or wanted such protection was never resolved. Native land rights might have remained in congressional limbo — except for the vast land claims filed by Native groups in 1966-67... The land claims are an indication of the increasing independence of the Alaska Native and of their growing disenchantment with the government's philosophy of wardship.[22]

Beyond this there is the unifying force of the issue, as expressed by one young native writer:

> At last a great, single cause has happened along that serves to unite the historically factioned groups of Indians, Eskimos and Aleuts in the

> state. Working together as a single force through a new organization, the Alaska Federation of Natives, the village people are attempting to press land claims. The validity of the claims or subsequent good that land or money grants to these forgotten villages is overshadowed by a greater benefit — the fact that at last Alaska's village people are united in one great crusade.[23]

The matter of monetary compensation and other economic goods, of course, is not entirely without attraction. The Tyonek Village story has presented a case study of what riches Alaskan natives might get from the exploitation of resources on their lands. The Tyonek village is located across Cook Inlet from Anchorage. In the 1960 census it was reported to have 187 inhabitants who lived in the poverty and squalor typical of the isolated bush village. In 1908 and 1915 the federal government had withdrawn 26,000 acres of land from the public domain to establish school facilities for the village, and in the late 1950s it became apparent that the reserve was potentially rich in petroleum. The Secretary of Interior, as trustee for the Indians, made arrangements with the oil companies to lease the lands and put the money in escrow for the benefit of the villagers. This was done without the consent of the Indians who brought suit against the Department. The suit was dropped when the Department's solicitor held that the land was a reservation for purposes of the 1927 mineral and oil leasing act and the Tyoneks could lease the land and use the money as they saw fit. The approximately $13 million initially received was used to completely remodel the village and the balance invested in real estate in Anchorage.[24]

There is another aspect of the Tyonek case, the irony of which has not been lost on the natives. In the eyes of the white community a large part of the natives' inferior status is due to their relatively heavy dependence upon welfare and relief programs. The stigma seems to lie in the fact that these payments are not made in exchange for work. Income that is not earned must be degrading. Almost every committee of Congress has come back with quotations from natives to the effect that they would rather work than receive welfare. The largess showered on the Tyoneks, like welfare and relief, was not earned income, but somehow it transformed them immediately into respectable and admired citizens of Alaska. White bankers and businessmen, who before would never have admitted them into their offices,

now seek their patronage. When visiting Alaska as a member of a U.S. Senate sub-committee, the former Hollywood song-and-dance man, then U.S. Senator from California, George Murphy, sang the praises of the Tyoneks as an example of what the native "can do for himself" if he would only "lay off the bottle."[25] Suddenly, they are respectable in the eyes of the white community simply because they are wealthier on a per capita basis.

The New Men in Native Politics

The creation of the political movement based upon land claims can be an instrument for the necessary raising of the native self-esteem by making them aware of their strength and their ability to control their own destiny. But political instruments, like the psuedo-native corporations and agencies created in the past under the direction and ultimate control of white administrators, will fail in their purpose of achieving social and economic control if they are not placed in the hands of leaders who represent their people. Diamond Jenness, in the passage quoted earlier put the development of an elite corps of leaders among the natives themselves as a prerequisite for their full participation in the total development of Alaska. The appearance of true native leaders would be the final blow to past dependence upon the Great White Father.

As discussed above, there have always been leaders, but since the mid-1960s there has appeared a whole new breed. These are younger men, better educated and more knowledgeable about the non-native world beyond the village than had been the earlier leaders. In discussing the possibilities of the emergence of a native leader who could be successful in a state-wide political campaign, the young native writer quoted previously looked over the present prospects: "What kind of person will this new leader be? In all probability it will be a Tlingit or an Eskimo. ... Among the new, young Tlingit leaders are some very possible state-wide candidates. Two who are very obvious to most Alaskans are John Borbridge of Juneau, now working for the Public Health Service in Anchorage; and Byron Mallott, who, at 25, is the past mayor of Yakutat, a former local-government aide of the Governor's Office, an unsuccessful candidate for the State House just last November (he lost by 19 votes) and the

Grand Vice-President of the ANB. Borbridge could make a statewide race in a few years; Mallott in a few more. Either one would be a credit to Alaska and their people. Ironically, both are considered radicals by the conservative ANB... Neither the Athapascans, Aleuts or Haidas (of whom the numbers are small) seem to have men of this quality coming up in the ranks. As for Eskimos, it is a different story... Included in this group are Willie Hensley, a 29-year old law student and legislator from Kotzebue; Moses Paukan, a young mayor from St. Mary's; John Nusinginya of Barrow; Robert Newlin of Noorvik and many others. Of these, Hensley will unquestionably be ready and willing to make a statewide bid in the next few years, and that bid may be successful because he has a lot of charismic urban appeal."

There are indeed "many others," but this is suggestive of the type who are finding a new and fulltime career in Alaska politics. That Willie Hensley, and some of the others, do have "charismic urban appeal" is reflected in his description as a delegate to the 1968 Democratic Party National Convention as given in a press service's standard personal interest pot-boiler. "With his neat blue suit, button-down collar and striped necktie, William Hensley looks like almost any other delegate to the Democratic National Convention. Several things, however, distinguish him from other delegates. For one thing, he is an Eskimo. For another, he lives in Kotzebue, a village of 2,300 persons in Alaska — 35 miles within the Arctic Circle and only 150 miles from Siberia. At 26, in hornrimmed glasses and darkly handsome, Hensley is a leader of his people and, like most spokesman for minority groups, a man with a cause." The reporter may not have realized how far Hensley also departs from the native's stereotype of the leader of his people as the great hunter or man who excels in the things having meaning to the traditional Native way of life. "While many Alaska natives speak no English, Hensley is cosmopolitan. He attended high school at Harrison Chibowee Academy near Knoxville, Tennessee, and was graduated in 1966 from Georgetown University. He also has visited Eastern Europe as an exchange student."[26] Unlike the older political leaders, Hensley is a fulltime politician. He is executive secretary of the Northwest Alaska Native Association, was elected to the Alaska Legislature in 1966 (the resulting annual salary of $6,000 gives him the core

of financial freedom), chairman of the board of the Alaska Village Electric Cooperative and a part-time consultant to University of Alaska programs. His natural abilities, intelligence and education have earned him a position of general respect among his legislative colleagues and other Alaskans.

As pointed out by a visiting journalist in 1966, however, this is only part of the white attitude. "Other whites reacted resentfully to young opportunists like Willie Hensley... To their way of thinking, if he had been born a Negro instead of an Eskimo he would be a 'Black Power' advocate. Indeed, during the 1966 campaign, it was difficult to leave a conversation with Hensley without the feeling that he really did not want a settlement of the controversy, either by cash payment or an assignment of acreage, but preferred to keep the matter, and his own political career, at a boil."[27] This observer elsewhere makes amply clear his understanding that much more than mere dollars and land are involved, but the quotation given above out of context does reflect a widespread reaction among the still dominant white population to the native's attempt to make a basic adjustment of the balance of power within the State of Alaska which fairly reflects his numerical position and his aspirations.

It is too early to draw conclusions concerning these new young men. Are they truly native leaders or merely political personalities? In the present age of political image-making this question is difficult to answer at any level of politics. But it is a crucial one in the present state of the native's development. The white reporter's characterization of Hensley as a "young opportunist" is unfair as a condemnation. What modern political figure has not been an opportunist, at least at some critical point in his career? But when a wholly sympathetic writer characterizes him as having "a lot of charismic urban appeal" more serious doubts arise. This may be a major asset in winning support among the majority of Alaska's population, the urban non-native, but how does this "appeal" effect his relationship with the rank and file of the native people. Hensley and many of the others named as having the greatest political potential are men of only fractional native blood. They are further set apart from the general native population by reason of their better educations, higher incomes, and increasing absences from the village life. As the native popula-

tion becomes more mobile, these differences will diminish as differences. But if the development of the native people does not move forward, the leaders will be separated from their following and no longer be leaders but a latter day button-down collar version of Uncle Toms utilized by the federal and state governments to administer programs for natives. Through contracts with the federal poverty and economic development agencies, the AFN and its officers may begin to move in that direction. The editor of the *Tundra Times* in writing on various forms of paternalism which hold back the native's development, took a hard swing at those whom he feels have done this. "There are, of course, some of our own people who thought they have attained the white status and having attained it, began to look down on their own people. There is no more despicable person than that type and their own people can do well without them."[28]

In all places and all times, the leader is a product of many forces. The new young native men in politics are a product of their own personal abilities and motivations. They are a product of the discontent and desire for change among their people. They are a product of the times which have brought forth the sort of national programs which can support them and their causes. What they will become will be a product of their continuing relationship with people, now that they have set themselves somewhat apart by entering the political arena. But most importantly it will be influenced by the reaction of the white community. They may become simply managers for its programs, or they may become the dangerous Native Power leaders some of the white community fear they now are. Or they may become Jenness' elite corps who will truly lead their people.[29]

Notes

1. Kaj Birket-Smith, *The Eskimos* (London: Methuen, 1959) p. 232. I am indebted to Graham Rowley for calling my attention to this concluding example in Smith's work and its unconscious significance, which I had previously overlooked.

2. Diamond Jenness, *Eskimo Administration, V: Analysis and Reflections,* Arctic Institute of North America Technical Paper no. 21 (Montreal, 1968), p. 38.

3. No attempt is made in this section to present a complete detailed survey of special programs for Alaska's natives or the experience in applying general programs to them. Only as much of the past as still appears operative in the present is summarized. The current situation is too fluid and changing to permit anything more than generalization of types and trends, anything now said concerning even a listing of operating agencies and programs being out-dated by the time this went to press. For more complete coverage refer to; Diamond Jenness, *Eskimo Administration, I: Alaska,* Arctic Institute of North America Technical Paper no. 10 (Montreal, 1962); Robert D. Arnold, "A Survey of the Administration Situation in Alaska as it Affects Eskimos, Indians and Aleuts," (Paper prepared for the International Conference on Cross-Cultural Education in the North, Montreal, August 18-21, 1969). For more critical and analytical treatment of the long-standing native programs, their underlying philosophies, implementation and results see: Jenness, *Eskimo Administration, V:* pp. 31-39, 48-50; Ernest Gruening, *The State of Alaska* (New York: Random House, 1968), "Native Claims: Equality versus Wardship," pp. 355-381, "The Natives — And the Still-Unsatisfied Hunger for Land," pp. 540-546; George W. Rogers, *Alaska in Transition: The Southeast Region* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1960), "The Federal Bureaucracy and the Indian," pp. 220-269.

4. Jenness, *Eskimo Administration, I:* pp. 5-12.

5. R.D. Arnold *et al., Alaska Natives and the Land,* Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska, October 1968 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 31.

6. This policy was embodied in provisions of the 1844 Charter as translated in Vladimir Gsovski, *Russian Administration of Alaska and the Status of Alaskan Native, U.S. Senate,* 81st Congress, 2nd Session, Document no. 152 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950), pp. 43, 46, 48-49. A somewhat different interpretation is given in S.B. Okun, *The Russian-American Company* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), pp. 193-216.

7. Arnold, *Administration Situation in Alaska,* p. 29.

8. Rogers, *Alaska in Transition,* pp. 230-234.

9. Arnold, *Administrative Situation in Alaska,* p. 10.

10. R.A. Smith, *The Frontier States — Alaska, Hawaii* (New York: Time-Life Books, 1968), p. 42.

11. For a fuller discussion see Rogers, *Alaska in Transition,* pp. 264-269.

12. J. Brady, "Native Land Claims," *Review of Business and Economic Conditions* 4:4 (November 1967).

13. Rogers, *Alaska in Transition,* pp. 223-224.

14. "White Man, Will You Listen To Me?" *Today in Alaska.*

15. Smith, *Frontier States,* p. 42.

16. Arnold *et al., Alaska Natives and the Land,* p. 453.

17. For reviews of the complex and conflicting legal background see Arnold *et al., Alaska Natives and the Land,* pp. 427-516; Brady, "Native Land Claims."

18. Lyndon B. Johnson, *President's Message to Congress on Goals and Programs for the American Indian,* March 6, 1968.

19. R.C. Haring and C. Correno, *Economic Base of the North Star Borough,* Alaska SEG Report no. 14 (University of Alaska, 1967), p. 49: F.Q. Sessions, *Fairbanks Community Survey: A Profile in Poverty,* SEG Report no. 16 (University of Alaska, 1967), p. 13; Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska, *Villages in Alaska and Other Places Having a Native Population of 25 or More, Estimated, 1967,* Anchorage, Alaska (undated).

20. Sessions, *Fairbanks Community Survey,* pp. 2, 18.

21. "Hensley Says Land Claims Solution Will Take Years," *Fairbanks Daily News Miner,* January 19, 1967.

22. Brady, "Native Land Claims," p. 12.

23. "White Man Will You Listen to Me?" *Today in Alaska.*

24. Brady, "Native Land Claims," p. 11.

25. *Anchorage Daily News,* April 13, 1969.

26. Associated Press, "An Eskimo Named Bill," *Southeast Alaska Empire,* August 28, 1968.

27. Smith, *Frontier States,* p. 41-42.

28. *Tundra Times,* June 28, 1968.

29. From internal evidence, some readers may have correctly deduced that this essay was written in late 1969 and/or early 1970. Since then a number of things have happened, but not much has changed. As of June 1971, Congress still had the native land claims under consideration with three bills in the House of Representatives and two in the Senate, each with differing land, cash and royalty provisions. The Alaska Federation of Natives demonstrated gains in political strength and maturity in the 1970 primary and general elections. Emil Notti, then president, ran a state-wide campaign on a cash budget of $5,000 and the volunteer labour of AFN members and supporters and finished a solid second in a three-way race for Democratic nomination for lieutenant governor. But the impressive showings were in the bush districts where long-entrenched white politicians were overthrown by young native politicians. On the basis of this showing, one reporter has suggested that the day of the gussuk (white) politician in Alaska's bush was over: "State Rep. Willie Hensley, D-Kotzebue, moved over to the Senate and handily defeated Sen. R.R. "Bob" Blodgett, D-Teller. Then he trounced Republican Werner Bohrer of Nome 2,532 — 733 in the general election. At the same time, Chuck Degnan of Nome defeated Rep. Lester Bronson, D-Nome, in the primary, then skinned Republican Leo Rasmussen 1,212 — 472 in the general. Hensley's old House seat was taken in the general election by another Native, Democrat Frank Ferguson, who defeated Republican Jerry Crow 1,096 — 356. In the Wade-Hampton House District, one of the State's most economically depressed areas, Martin Moore, an articulate young Democratic Native leader from Immonak, won election unopposed. In the Kodiak area, Democrat Ed Naughton defeated Republican Don Slater 1,187 — 610, while in the Aleutian chain Rep. Robert Moses won re-election unopposed after switching parties... [In the Ketchikan district] veteran Native legislator Rep. Frank Peratrovich, D-Klawock, easily led the field of four in the race for two House seats from that area." (Tom Brown, "Day of Gussuk Politician Over?" *Anchorage Daily News,* Nov. 13, 1970). Not all natives who ran were elected. Those running in the urban centres of Anchorage and Fairbanks, for example, were unable to muster sufficient support. But clearly AFN had virtually assured that henceforth representation from the dominantly native areas would no longer be by white traders and administrators.