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ABSTRACT

This study explores the relationships between the Alaska Native leadership, its interests in and impacts on higher education in Alaska, and the ways in which the University of Alaska responded to Alaska Native educational needs and initiatives, especially during the period from 1972 and 1985. The major question explored is why and how the University of Alaska system failed to adequately address the educational needs of Alaska Natives, especially given the level of political acumen of the Alaska Native leadership, their awareness of the importance of higher education as a means to control the land base "acquired" through the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, the mission statements of the University concerning the education of Alaska Natives, and the abundance of petroleum dollars available to the University during that period. While the Alaska Native leadership was requesting that "appropriate" educational programs be designed and delivered to rural Alaska Native students, the University of Alaska's response to these requests took the form of structural changes within the institution, rather than substantive change in the content of educational programs. The study demonstrates that the discrepancy between Alaska Native requests for substantive educational change and University of Alaska responses in the form of structural alterations is attributable, in large part, to the opposing world views of the two sets of actors, and thus to different perceptions of the nature and role of education in general.
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CHAPTER I
ALASKA NATIVES AND HIGHER EDUCATION

1.1 Introduction

I found my eight years as a member of the Board of Regents [of the University of Alaska] very frustrating because the University did little to respond to the needs of rural Alaskans when I was appointed and was only slightly more responsive when I left. I don’t believe it has become any more responsive today.¹

This statement by Sam Kito, an Alaska Native political and educational activist, accurately summarizes the attitude of most attending the 1991 Alaska Federation of Natives Convention. Few would attempt to defend the University of Alaska for its record of addressing, rather failing to address, the higher education needs of Alaska Natives.

This perception must appear ludicrous to the outside observer, given the amount of money, programs, human effort, and facilities that were devoted to “rural education,” especially during the oil boom years between 1972 and 1986. Why then, did this perception of the university exist in 1991?

This dissertation attempts to address this question by examining the development of Alaska Native higher education in the state from 1972-1985, and the role played by Indigenous people in that development. To accomplish this examination, two interrelated sets of activities are traced. On the one hand, the political rise of the Alaska Native leadership, their interest in development of higher education for Alaska Natives, and their influence on the appearance of

new initiatives in education are examined. On the other hand, the study examines 
the structural changes implemented by the University of Alaska in its attempt to 
respond to the needs articulated by the Native leadership, as well as to the theme 
developed in this thesis concerning the relationship between the world views 
held by these actors (the Alaska Natives on one side and the administration of the 
University of Alaska on the other) and the way in which those world views 
influenced each sides' understandings of how the higher educational needs of 
Alaska Natives could/should be met. The argument developed herein is that 
juxtaposed understanding of the purposes, meanings, and roles of education 
inherent in these opposing world views have been the major factor in the failure 
of the University of Alaska to provide higher educational opportunities that can 
be considered appropriate for contemporary Alaska Native needs.

Viewed in retrospect, it appears that the University of Alaska never 
planned for the inclusion of Alaska Natives in the higher educational system that 
developed in the state. In the seventy-five years since its creation, the University 
has responded to the higher educational needs of Alaska Natives only when 
external political pressures were brought to bear. Moreover, those responses 
were guided by a Western, Euro-American understanding of education, its 
structure, and underlying values and ideology.

The roles of Alaska Native leaders in the provision of post-secondary 
education for Alaska Native people are central to understanding any success or 
failure of a Western model of education in serving the needs of Native Americans. 
Alaska Natives have, through linkages to the larger society, shaped and reshaped 
their own structures.2 These structures have tended to frame their economic and 

---

especially his preface discussion.
political opportunities as well as be framed by them, thereby limiting their ability to act. In essence, the changing situation in which Alaska Natives have found themselves over the past three decades (from the mid 1960s to the present) has framed the issues—Land Claims—which necessitated higher education for the next generation of Alaska Native leaders. This, in turn, has impacted the range of responses available to both the Native leadership and the University. This recurring pattern is best understood as part of a dynamic relationship between these groups of actors rather than as a unified or restricted relationship defined by one actor alone; the Western world view. Individual and group actions are best understood within the distinctive histories of those groups and institutions. Native leadership and the University have made and re-made themselves through acting on not only those forces under their control but also on their perceived limits. In so doing, these groups have altered themselves, the world in which they live, and the conditions under which they act and interact.

A Western model of education and its inherent assimilation function places Native Americans in a state of conflict, wherein achievements in Western education are coupled with destruction to Native cultures. Examined here is the structure of American education (as exemplified by the University of Alaska) which incorporates an Eurocentric view of Native peoples and conflicts with Native people's understandings of nature, the environment, their relation to the land, and ultimately, the role of education. By tracing the history of the political and economic relationships of the Alaska Native leadership to the University of Alaska, this research highlights the attempts of a Western institution to redefine the Alaska Native understandings of land and spirituality to conform to those embodied in the Euro-American society. The University's failure to provide

---

Native-defined educational services to Alaska Native people was the result of a conflict between incompatible world views and the values they embody. To the extent that people in the Alaska Native leadership were able to work within a Western world view, they succeeded in encouraging the University to respond to rural and Native initiatives (1) by developing alternative sources of funding for programs, or (2) through legislative initiatives sponsored by Alaska Native legislators. The University’s unwillingness and/or inability to recognize the nature and validity of a Native world view, and complementary conceptions of the nature and role of education, has resulted in responses to Native initiatives always taking place within a Western understanding of education. Thus, post-secondary educational structures—even if intended to meet Native needs—have only accomplished goals defined within the Western world view. Ultimately, this research argues for the necessity of implementing institutional change based on the world view of Alaska Natives in order for the educational services desired and needed by Alaska Natives to be appropriately and successfully delivered to them.

1.2 Rationale

The need for research exploring the relationship of Native American education and land is a glaring one. Dean Chavers writes that an important "barrier which presently hampers American Indian education is a lack of research which has been conducted on the education of Native peoples."4 While Chavers is correct in his assertion that there is a shortage of research conducted by Native Americans about education, there is no shortage of research being conducted "on" Native Americans. In fact, an average of five hundred documents

4Dean Chavers, Funding Guide for Native Americans (Broken Arrow: Broken Arrow Press, 1982), 17.
per year are added to the ERIC data base. Given the large number of studies it is
difficult to believe that a shortage of research exists. Moreover, the linkage
between land and Native American education has gone largely unexplored.
Therefore, Chavers might more accurately argue that there is a shortage of
educational research useful to Native Americans and none that directly addresses
the inter-related issue of land.

Land has been and continues to rest at the core of these world views. At the
heart of Native American values is the belief that we come from the earth and
that we are bound to the cosmos by spiritual links to ALL things. The land is not
viewed in relation to scientific materialism, but rather as a source of spiritual,
intellectual, emotional and communal sustenance.

Beginning with the arrival of the first Europeans, the drive to de-limit
Native land holdings continues to this day. More than 320 ratified “Treaties”
affirm this assertion. Often overlooked, an additional feature of these “Treaties”
was the provision for education. Europeans established praying colleges early on
to civilize the Native Americans and to instill in them a Western ethic of hard
work. These two themes, civilization and work, should be read as make Christians
of them and settle them on individual small tracts of land where they can become
self-sufficient farmers, thereby freeing up large tracts of land for European
immigrants to America. In the 1870s President Grant felt that control of the
Native population could be accomplished less expensively through government-

5 Elaine Roanhorse Benally, Trends in American Indian Education: A
Synthesis/Bibliography of Selected ERIC Resources (Las Cruces: ERIC Clearing

6 Ward Churchill, Struggle for the Land: Indigenous Resistance to Genocide
Ecocide and Expropriation in Contemporary North America (Monroe: Common

7 Oren Lyons and John Mohawk (eds.), Exiled in the Land of the Free:
Democracy, Indian Nations and the U.S. Constitution (Santa Fe: Clear Light
Publishers, 1992), ix.
supported, missionary delivered education than it could by supporting a large standing army. His resultant change in policy reflects the prevailing opinion in the power of Western education as a means of acquiring Native lands without the need for payment in the form of treaties.8

In the case of Alaska, the record is also clear. The Alaska Native leadership's request for education to be provided in an appropriate manner and location came about concurrently with the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act in 1971. Emil Notti describes in his story the clear understanding on the part of the Alaska Native leadership that only through education could Alaska Natives hope to retain the land.9 Moreover, there is an equally clear understanding that without appropriate education the land will be lost, and with it the Native Peoples of Alaska.

This tension is framed in the language of “local control” of education. The manner and methods in which this drama is played out in post-secondary education is the focus of this investigation. John Schaffer argues that ‘control’ of the educational enterprise was never really the goal of the Alaska Native leadership.10 Rather, what was sought was an inclusion of Native values, knowledge and respect into the educational pedagogy of the State University system. The leadership's hope was that this inclusion would in turn lead to the academic advancement of Alaska Natives who could one day be a part of the University community contributing to the betterment of both cultures. In cases

9Emil Notti, interview, Anchorage, Alaska 1990,
10John Schaffer, interview, Anchorage, Alaska 1990,
where this inclusiveness has been accomplished, such as Tribal Colleges, there has been a significant improvement in retention and graduation rates.\textsuperscript{11}

1.3 Methodology

1.3.1 Overview and Research Approach

Even though there already exist many sciences, the most important one is missing: a science of humanity. That is the only science that can reconcile the interest of classes and thus serve as the foundation of a natural science because man is, after all, a part of Nature.\textsuperscript{12}

An inquiry of this type is best understood as extended and reciprocal, in as much as the structure (the University) and the actions (the Native peoples) are both engrossed in a struggle over agency. As Philip Abrams notes:

The problem of finding a way of accounting for the human experience which recognizes simultaneously and in equal measure that history and society are made by constant and more or less purposeful individual action and that individual, however purposeful, is made by history and society.\textsuperscript{13}

This research is designed to provide insight and understanding of the evolution of Alaska Native demands for appropriate, rural-based higher education and the University’s structural responses to those demands. David Apter defines structure as “the relationship in the social situation which limit the choices of action to a particular range of alternatives.”\textsuperscript{14} The method includes historical review of policy, the political and economic relationships which have linked the


\textsuperscript{13}Philip Abrams, \textit{Historical Sociology} (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982), xiii.

Alaska Native people to the University, and an examination of the effects of those relationships.

Works by Max Weber and Philip Abrams provide an historical and sociological framework for this study. Weber provides an understanding of the tendencies of bureaucracies to establish highly centralized institutions, maintained by rational legal forms of administration.\(^{15}\) The Weberian perspective provides a means for examining the University’s reactions to the external political demands of the Alaska Native leadership for higher education. In addition, the perspective of historical sociology provides a means for examining the dynamic interaction that has occurred between the Alaska Native peoples as represented by their leadership, and the University of Alaska. Building upon Abrams’ work, this thesis attempts to provide a better understanding of the intricate interplay between two conflicting social systems and the “shaping of action by structure and the transformation of structure by action.”\(^{16}\) Historical policy analysis blends educational policy analysis with a probing of the structural elements that tend to shape particular educational practices and arrangements over time. While this approach may lack a theoretical prescription, it tends to guard against premature exclusion of data which can lead to self-fulfilling prophecy and ultimately compromise the utility of the research.

This study also draws on the humanities and the social sciences by utilizing the narrative method to make visible the power variables embedded in the policy process, in much the same manner as a policy historian in that the focus of this investigation is on the origins and effects of power. Education is viewed here as


dependent on power variables. The extent to which modes of education represent
the accumulation of political, economic, cultural, and symbolic power is seen as
indicative of those that are persistent, stable, transitory, or dynamic. This work,
like that of educational policy historians, seeks not to discount or simplify the
conflict over education; rather than merely analyzing or describing the effects of
schooling, the intent here is to identify the influences which shape the
institutions and processes.17

Because this thesis is concerned with the behavior of a particular
population within a particular geographical area, the regional-historical
approach was also adopted.18 Regional histories are particularly useful as they
aid in placing social institutions within a context. An awareness of regional
variations is important for comprehending what is happening to a nation’s
people and institutions. Those institutions are not only representations of the
greater societal understandings of particular social relationships but also serve as
brokers of those understandings, particularly higher education in democratic
societies.19

17 Evelyn C. Adams, American Indian Education: Government Schools and
18 David B. Tyack, George Ticknor and the Boston Brahmins (Cambridge:
19 Louis Wirth, “The Limitations of Regionalism,” in Regionalism in
America, ed. Merrill Jensen (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1952), 381-
93. See also Frederick Jackson Turner, The Frontier in American History (New
York: H. Holt and Company, 1931); idem, The Significance of Sections in American
History (New York: P. Smith Co., 1932). Turner’s emphasis on regionalism was
shared by other early twentieth-century historians, as was his interpretation that
the origin of American uniqueness and greatness was attributable to western
and Its Methods for Revision of Historical Writing about the United States,”
Educational history as a field has tended to ignore the issue of Native American educational experience.\textsuperscript{20} For the past three decades American educational historians have focused much debate on ‘new’ methodologies and models with which to re-examine the educational enterprise in relation to urban experiences.\textsuperscript{21} Studies of Native American education have tended to focus on individual school experiences,\textsuperscript{22} analyses of policies,\textsuperscript{23} and personal histories of those subjected to the boarding school model of assimilation.\textsuperscript{24} In addition, Native American educational history has tended to focus on the role of primary and secondary education to the exclusion of higher education. These tendencies alongside the tradition of historians’ to not address issues unless they have


"ripened" historically, have left relatively unexamined the role of higher education in the assimilation process.  

Another useful methodological principle is contained in Max Weber's interpretation of class and class conflict in ancient societies. Weber argues that one must give due consideration in all historical analyses not only to economic and economically conditioned phenomena, but also to economically relevant phenomena. Public education (inclusive of higher education) is an example of an institution that may have considerable economic relevance in some historical circumstances; such is the case for Alaska Native education.

1.3.2 Data Collection and Analytic Procedures

The data gathering techniques employed for this inquiry are a function of the research agenda itself. That is to say, because this study focuses on Alaska Natives' perceptions of actions and events, a culturally appropriate approach was required. A formal, structured interview format was rejected as being culturally inappropriate. Instead, interviews conducted were undertaken with an understanding of the traditionally correct manner in which to elicit information. Native America has been "studied and interviewed" to the point that researchers using questionnaires, surveys, structured interviews and other so-called "objective" techniques tend not to obtain crucial information, and the  

---

information they do receive may be masked or distorted. In part, this is because of cultural differences between Native Americans and dominant culture researchers. For example, among most Native Americans it is considered inappropriate to ask someone direct questions. Instead, people are asked to tell about some event or events and the people then tell you a story. Standardized interview formats do not elicit such stories and do not provide a basis upon which these stories can be interpreted within their context.29

Mishler has called for the modification of interview techniques in ways which will capture the informants’ narratives. He argues that even when researchers engage in semi-structured and unstructured interviews, they tend to control the direction of the interview, viewing stories told as digressions from the topic at hand. He writes, “that one of the significant ways through which individuals make sense of and give meaning to their experiences is to organize them in a narrative form.”30

Therefore, inquiry more in tune with Native Americans and/or Alaskan Native ways of interacting was called for in this study, one attuned to the context of the events discussed and to the cultural nuances involved in the discussion (story) itself. Unstructured interviews were conducted in a way which would capture the narratives of each informant’s unique perspective. This format can be viewed as a continuum in relation to narrative forms used in Native and Western cultures. In the case where informants had adopted Westen modes of

29 The importance and success of efforts to employ modes of inquiry which fit the culture of the researcher’s informants is demonstrated by William W. Ellis in his study of urban Black youths. See his White Ethics and Black Power: The West Side Organization (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969).

communication, interviews shifted toward more Western narrative forms. I began each interview by posing the following open-ended question:31

Tell me about the university's relationship to Alaska Natives and its provisions for the delivery of higher education. Spradley and McCurdy call such questions *grand tours* which serve to facilitate a more culturally appropriate and sensitive negotiation between the researcher and informant.32

Because the focus of this study is on Alaska Native perspectives of the events, all research participants were Alaska Native. They represented the twelve regions established under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (1971). All had held elected and/or appointed positions not only within Native Corporations, but also at the State and, in some cases, the National level.33 Almost all had served on the University of Alaska Board of Regents at some time and all had a demonstrated interest in and commitment to Alaska Native education. Not only had they worked for the betterment of Alaska Native education, but their personal experiences as Native American students provided an understanding of a whole range of educational situations; public, private and federal.34 These participants worked together with the researcher in a manner that went beyond the traditional question and answer approach, collaboratively bringing clarity to the events, personalities, policies and actions reported herein. As Glaser and Strauss35 have argued, the best research participants are those who know the most about what

31 Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed.
33 See Appendix A for list of interviewees and sampling of interview transcripts.
the researcher is hoping to learn and are able to engage in a dialogue with the researcher to achieve this end. Open ended questions about the relationship of Alaska Native leadership to the provision of rural higher education were posed to a number of Alaska Native leaders selected on the basis of their central role in the evolving relationship concerning higher education between the University of Alaska and Alaska Natives.

Twenty-four years of personal and professional involvement at senior policy levels in Alaska Native leadership and at the University of Alaska provided me with considerable access to, and an understanding of, the important events, key people, and the written records essential to this inquiry. These unique experiences provided access and knowledge of where and what types of documentation were available. Moreover, the researcher's collection over this twenty-four year period of personal daily notes, copies of correspondence and relevant official documentation provided data that otherwise would be unavailable to other scholars. By reason of race, culture, profession and inclination the author has been a participant observer in Alaska Native education for more than two decades. The knowledge and experiences shared by the informants and myself were reflected in their initial responses to this question. For example, they typically remarked, "Why are you asking this? You were there."

Following Peshkin, Smith and others who have argued the need for engaging in self-analysis, it was necessary for me to continuously reflect on my own personal biases throughout the research process. My ethnicity, personal experiences, and relationships with informants created a danger in assuming that

I knew what the answers would be or what informants would say. To guard against this, I continually checked my observations against my assumptions.

Still, the specificity of personal experience and the *a priori* interest in learning from Alaska Native leaders informed this examination throughout. Historically, this dissertation addresses the phenomena of identity, action and incorporation, in as much as the institutional actions and individual actors are more a reflection of process than events. The author’s point is to tell a story not simply to present a narrative of events, which would run the risk of giving the reader an erroneous idea of what has happened and is yet to occur. A perceived need to focus on structural relationships over time, and only address the cases and individuals here as a means of highlighting or bringing into sharper focus those structural arrangements, prevents the dissertation from becoming mired in inter-group relations or the specific details of a particular set of individual and/or collective actions. In other words, the intent here is to offer some analysis, within the historical events themselves, of the construction and reconstruction of the relationships between the University of Alaska and the Alaska Native peoples, as represented by the leadership groups.

1.4 Setting

The word ‘Alaska’ is derived from the Aleut *Alyeska*, meaning the great land. This Native conceptualization of Alaska is very different from the Western notion of Alaska as “the last frontier.” Alyeska is indeed a great land. It is the northernmost state, one of only two non-contiguous states in the union. It contains the most western area and is by far the largest state in terms of land mass (586,000 square miles). If one were to place a map of Alaska on a map of the
contiguous states on the same scale, it would reach from California to Florida and from the Canadian to the Mexican borders.

As its size would suggest, Alaska is not a single entity climatically or geographically. The rain forests of the Southeast bespeak a temperate, moist climate, while the barren expanses of the Arctic North Slope suggest harsher weather patterns. Temperatures on the North Slope can fall to -50°F with wind chill factors in the range of -100°F. Summers on the North Slope, the land of the midnight sun, seldom rise above 60°F, and the summer sun never sets, just as it never rises above the horizon for three months during the winter. Such extremes are not present in most other areas of the state, with the exception of Interior Alaska. The Interior shares the extreme cold and lack of sunlight during the winter months that are common to the North Slope. Summer temperatures in the Interior can exceed 100°F, and the sun does not set appreciably for almost three months (mid-June to late August).

Alaska's geography is also diverse. Three major mountain ranges (Brooks, Alaska, and Wrangells) divide the state. The Brooks Range separates the Interior of Alaska from the North Slope; the Alaska Range lies between the Interior and Southwestern Alaska; while the Wrangells rest between Southwestern and Southeastern Alaska. Mt. McKinley, the tallest peak in North America, is in the Alaska Range. Many active volcanoes and glaciers are also present within these three ranges. One glacier alone is larger in area than the entire state of Rhode Island.

Alaska is further divided by great river systems, including the 1,979 mile-long Yukon, which begins in Canada and empties into the Bering Sea. Alaska also contains more than a million lakes, one of which is Lake Iliamna, the second largest freshwater lake in the United States (more than seven million acres).
Alaska is, in fact, many Alaskas, highly diverse in terms of climate, geography, and topography. Such a diverse environment necessitated a human population which was creative and highly adaptable in order to survive and prosper. Anthropologists and archaeologists suggest that Alaska’s first human populations arrived from the west, from Siberia to Alaska, by way of the Bering Land Bridge. Although the debate on the actual time frame continues, most experts agree that the first movement into the New World probably occurred sometime around 15,000 years ago. The resultant population of Alaska Natives is generally divided into three major groups: Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts. While this grouping provides a simplified system of classification for non-Natives, it does a great disservice to the rich and diverse cultural, linguistic, and ethnic backgrounds of the Alaskan people.

There are, in fact, some twenty Native languages spoken in Alaska, supporting the notion of great diversity rather than a more simplified assumption of only three groupings. By way of example, the term Eskimo is commonly understood as describing those aboriginal inhabitants of the North Slope of Alaska when, in fact, the Inupiat people are but one representation, linguistically and culturally distinct from other Eskimo peoples inhabiting other areas of Alaska. The geographical and climatic diversity of the state has, and continues to have an effect on Native and non-Native populations. The geographic separations tend to contribute to regionalism, parochialism, transportation, and construction issues within the state.

38 “Alaska Native” is a geo-political term coined during the land claims battle of the late 1960’s and early 1970’s in order to allow U.S. and Alaska policymakers a term which encompassed all of the various linguistic, ethnic, and cultural groups present in and party to the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement. There is no such “Alaska Natives” group, strictly speaking. The term has gained widespread acceptance among Native peoples (as well as non-Natives) in the years since the land claims (1971), and it has taken on a connotation of ethnic pride amongst Native peoples.
1.5 Summary

The purpose of this study is to explore the development of higher educational services offered to Alaska Natives, the political rise of Alaska Native leadership, and this leadership's interest in and impact on higher education developments in Alaska. This exploration makes visible ways in which the responses of the University of Alaska to Native educational needs and initiatives were manifestations of incompatible world views, those of the university culture and the Native people. These conflicts have resulted in the failure of higher education in relation to its Alaska Native constituency.

Acting as a participant/observer, various data were gathered. Data consisted of unstructured informal interviews, Native organization archival records, regional and historical records of the university, and state records relating to educational policy and land management.

This chapter details the purposes, theoretical and methodological background, and approaches taken in this study. Chapter II is a survey of the literature on minority education, higher education, organization theory, the University of Alaska and Native peoples related to this study. Chapter III is an analysis of the ways in which Western notions of education have shaped Alaska Native life, and in turn the way this has influenced the revitalization and focus on traditional views of education by Native leaders. Chapter IV is an overview of the relationship between the economy and education, with an analysis of the effects this relationship has had on Alaska Native higher education. Chapter V addresses the efforts made by the Alaska Native leadership to initiate, encourage, or implement educational change within the University of Alaska system. Chapter VI addresses the structural modification adopted by the University in
response to Native leadership efforts to bring about substantive educational change. Chapter VII is the conclusion, including a discussion of the implications for future research.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Minority Education

Many universities across the United States have realized that the doors to education in general, and to higher education in particular, had long been barred to persons of color and of lower socio-economic status. Over the past thirty years a few members of the academy began to seriously question and, subsequently, investigate the promise of education in America.

National disillusionment with educational provisions was reported in the 1960's and 1970's in such studies as James S. Coleman et al, Equality of Educational Opportunity (1966) and Christopher Jencks et al, Inequality (1973). These examinations brought to the foreground a proof that not all Americans enjoyed the basic opportunities of the United States' economic, social, and political system. In “the land of plenty,” resources were neither abundant nor evenly distributed. Access to political power, as most Native Americans have been well aware, was reserved for the non-Native population of America. The work of Coleman and Jencks and their associates identified education not as an avenue for the redistribution of resources but as one means by which other social and economic factors were legitimized in a process of social sorting and in the distribution of access to resources.

Universities' responses in the 1960's and 1970's were characterized by political radicalization and renewed interest in Marxist and class analysis, spurred
historiographically by revisionist educational history. Bernard Bailyn,\(^{39}\) Lawrence Cremin,\(^{40}\) and others were heralded as responding to the "house histories" and other noncritical descriptions often written by non-historians as inspirational textbooks for future teachers.\(^ {41}\) Revisionist history, however, remained focused primarily on urban school experiences. While there was some interest in the educational opportunities available to African American children, Native Americans were still caricatured in the writing of American history, and all but nonexistent in the history of American education.

Native American education was not addressed even with the appearance of the radical new histories, such as Michael Katz,\(^ {42}\) Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis,\(^ {43}\) and Joel Spring.\(^ {44}\) However, a new-found interest in the equality of educational opportunity, combined with national policy focus on education as a means of creating a new social order, brought an awareness to post-secondary decision-makers of the need to insure that racial and ethnic minority students not only finished elementary and secondary education, but also that universities and colleges provide an appropriate environment in terms of academic offerings, social settings and support. There is little evidence to suggest that substantive changes occurred within the university community at large beyond scholarly methodology and research foci.


2.2 Higher Education

While the Native American presence in higher education has been virtually non-existent, the desire to provide higher education to Native Americans by the academy has a long history in the United States. In 1619 the Virginia community of Jamestown established a college which opened its doors in 1621. Among the members of the first student body of the East India School were the male children of the local tribe.\(^{45}\) The purpose for the enrollment of the Native children, according to a commentator of the time was that “[i]t would be proper to draw the best disposed among the Indians to converse and labor with our people for a covenant reward that they might not only learn a civil way of life, but be brought to the knowledge of religion and become instruments in the conversion of their countrymen.”\(^{46}\)

In 1636 Harvard College listed among its goals, “the education of English and Indian youth of this country in knowledge and goodness.” In order to accomplish this education of Native youth, Harvard created a college-within-a-college for “twenty Indian pupils.”\(^{47}\) Dartmouth College and William and Mary also established Indian colleges in an effort “to teach the Indian boys to read and write and especially to teach them thoroughly the principals of the Christian religion.”\(^{48}\)

There have been many shifts in local and national policies concerning the education of Native Americans since these initiatives in the early 17th century. But the underlying purposes for providing higher education to Native Americans


\(^{47}\) Ibid., 33.

\(^{48}\) Ibid., 54.
have remained fairly consistent. Moreover, the locus of control of the policy process for prerogative educational provisions for Native Americans remained the purview of non-Native politicians, University administrators, and faculty with little, if any, regard for distinctive perspectives and priorities of Native Americans. This approach to higher education for Native Americans and the attempt to educate them in an European world view and values via European-style education—at all levels—has been, by and large, a failure.49

While we can account for shifts in federal policy as being reflective of changing national moods, coupled with the western expansion of the Union,50 a brief examination of the sociology of the academic profession provides some insights into the neglect of Native Americans, as well as other minority groups, not only in the historical record, but in the profession as well. E. Digby Baltzell argued that the composition of major university faculty, especially in history departments, was the preservation of old stock Protestants.51 Baltzell suggests that it was a matter of policy that certain history departments did not hire Catholics, Jews, African Americans, to say nothing of American Natives,52 in an

49See, for instance, the 1928 Merriam Report, “The Problem of Indian Administration” and the 1969 Kennedy Report, “Indian Education: A National Tragedy-A National Challenge.” Both reports argue that the educational provisions for Native Americans have failed to meet the needs of those it was to serve.

50Fredrick Jackson Turner, The Frontier In American History (New York: P. Smith Co., 1920). In his later study of sectionalism, Turner recognized the cultural influences carried to the frontier by immigrants. It is this ideology and accompanying quest by these immigrants for “free land” that is at issue here. While Turner’s hypothesis has been criticized over the years, I would argue that the American environment transformed the immigrant has gone largely unchallenged. See Edward Mims, Jr., American History and Immigration (Bronxville, 1950). Also, Ray Allen Billington, Western Expansion, 3d. ed. (New York: Holt and Company, 1967), 1-3, 308, 706, 746.

51Digby Batzell, The Protestant Establishment (New York: Vintage Books, 1966), 335-42. Also see the interview with John Schaffer; this ‘understanding’ is a constant theme expressed by all the Native leadership interviewed.

52Ibid., 335.
effort to assure White Anglo Saxon Protestant hegemony in the content and educative process of American academic life.

The boom in higher education after World War II (occasioned not only by the broad investment in post-secondary schooling afforded by the G.I. Bill, but also the vastly increased mobility of the American population) accounted for substantial increases in the racial diversity of American colleges and universities. The enrollment gains made were chiefly by second and third generation American Jews and Catholics. Higher education in America, it has been argued, has been one of the most effective agencies of acculturation or de-ethnicization. The university’s role has been to assimilate talented youth from all segments of American society into the dominant Anglo-American culture. Given this hegemonic impulse, and the largely Caucasian composition of university faculty, along with the history of American educational policy, it is no wonder that universities have been as ineffective in the education of Native Americans as their elementary and secondary counterparts.

It was not until the 1970’s that the political and social climate of the United States was conducive to acknowledging the growing desire of Native Americans for more control over the policies and institutions governing their daily lives. Nationally, the increasing demands of Native Americans, combined with an administration committed to a National policy of self-determination, finally led to the passage of a series of legislative reforms designed to increase the control of those institutions which affected the lives of Native Americans on a daily basis.

There was an increased awareness on the part of many universities and colleges of the need to provide a more hospitable, social, and educationally supportive environment for all racial and ethnic minority groups, including Native Americans. This redirection manifested itself, institutionally, in the establishment of racial and ethnic studies departments.56

Native Americans fully realize that they do not and cannot live in isolation from the larger society, but they are no longer content to live under the policy edicts of the government or institutions. Native Americans, like their non-Native counterparts, want the skills and the abilities to determine their own future. It is against this backdrop that Native American higher education should be viewed. Higher education offers a route for Native Americans to reach greater equality within the larger society, while at the same time retaining those distinct qualities which are Native American.

2.3 Organizational Theory

In order to frame the tensions which developed between the University of Alaska and the Alaska Native people over post secondary educational delivery in the 1970's and early 80's, it is necessary to look beyond the normal range of literature on education. Because the University's response to pressure from Alaska Natives is best described as structuralist, it is necessary to examine the field of organizational theory and behavior to determine how that response has been and is influenced by the institution of the University itself, as well as to understand the subsequent conflict between world views.

Local control of education is not a new concept. It is, however, relatively un-addressed in the literature examining post-secondary education and especially

in the area of cross-cultural education. Viewed through the lens of organizational theory, the construct is comparatively new. However, the precepts upon which it is founded may be traced to neoclassical organizational theory and its view of the human element, organizational behavior. From the time neoclassical theorists began to question mechanistic models of organization design until the present, theorists have argued the relative value of the importance of humans, within and outside the organizations, from both positive and negative positions. The bulk of today's educational administration research maintains that local control is an effective and efficient educational practice.

It must also be realized that organizational theorists, like other social theorists have defined their work within the particular tradition of their discipline. The questions considered by earlier scholars form the basis of acceptance, rejection, reformulation and/or criticism for contemporary researchers. As a result, theories are firmly grounded in the social and cultural circumstances—understandings or world view—of the theorist upon which the current research rests. That is to say, like other social theorists, organizational theorists must place their work within the larger cultural and intellectual works of their time in order to address the broader questions regarding the impact on the human condition(s).

Karl Marx, Max Weber and Sigmund Freud, arguably, have had the most profound impact on the development of Western society's orientation of social theory in this century. Taken together, these three Western theorists have presented the most articulate and influential statements of the modern industrial society. Their efforts have provided the basis for social theorists for several
generations and have set the agenda on which contemporary theorists have constructed their interpretation of social organization and behavior.57

Rather than review the basic intellectual heritage of Marx, Weber and Freud, the following review of organizational theory and behavior will focus on the principal developments within the fields after World War II, as the field of public administration, and particularly the field of organizational behavior, does not come into its own until this time. It should be noted, however, that the contemporary works in these fields are clearly the intellectual beneficiaries or inheritors of one or another (or a combination of all) of these great thinkers. In other words, the basic questions concerning the nature of human beings, social organization and the interaction(s) of the combination of the two are still a central focus of social theory.

The end of World War II brought about a proliferation of writing regarding organizational theory and organizational behavior. Two of the main theorists researching the impact of humans in organization (albeit from different perspectives) were Philip Selznick and Frederick J. Roethlisberber. Roethlisberber argues that humans are social beings and, as such, are motivated by self-esteem and recognition of their values and beliefs.58 The tone of Roethlisberger’s paper adds a new dimension to the study of organizational behavior—that of the dignity and respect for humankind. However, this approach is also firmly grounded in the Western understanding of humanity as well as the Western construct of organization. That is to say, on the one hand, human beings are still assumed to be separate and above all other forms of life and, therefore,

superior; on the other hand, this approach does not challenge the scientific management assumption that there is “one best” method of organization. Roethlisberger simply offers another variable for management’s consideration in its formulation of strategies to achieve its desired results.

In 1948, Selznick\textsuperscript{59} published *Foundations of the Theory of Organization*, a work which states that while the tasks of production may be divided into their incremental parts or stages, humans who perform such tasks are “wholes, not simply in terms of their formal roles within the system.”\textsuperscript{60} This introduction of the human element into the organizational model adds the element of human behavioral management in order to accomplish an organization’s task(s). Selznick proposes co-option, a process of adopting antagonistic sentiments into the leadership structure, as a form of manipulation.\textsuperscript{61} While Selznick acknowledges the human element, he does so in a manner which gives the illusion of respect for the employee but which, in fact, is simply a form of coercion. This centralized management approach also assumes that the consumer or client’s interests are best determined by the leadership of the organization and, like the employee, they too can be coerced into supporting the organization’s interests.

Douglas McGregor, working from earlier research, coined the concepts of ‘Theory X’ and ‘Theory Y’ as terms which represented dichotomous views of human beings in his paper “The Human Side of Enterprise.”\textsuperscript{62} According to

---


\textsuperscript{60}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{61}Ibid.

Theory X, humankind is slothful and must be prodded to work. Conversely, Theory Y conceived human beings as industrious and filled with latent creative energy which will burgeon in the right organizational environment. Theory Y has provided the theoretical basis upon which practicing educators have built and are attempting to advance the concept of site-based management—incarnation of local control in as much as "Theory Y relies heavily on self-control and self-direction." In other words, McGregor places the locus of control with the individual and not the organization. This approach clearly assumes a decentralization of authority, a delegation of responsibility, and a meaningful role in the decision-making process.

Cawelti's work clearly builds on McGergor's basic tenet of decentralization. Viewed from an educational perspective, Cawelti adds the elements of parental, community and student involvement in determining the educational agenda. Larson states that effective decentralization includes autonomy in budgeting, staffing and curriculum.

Galbraith's "Information Processing Model" provides an outline of organizational structure from the population ecology and contingency school of organizational theory, which argues that organizations do not operate in a vacuum, but are a part of a constantly changing environment which impacts on the organization. This work clearly builds on that of Katz and Kahn, who

---

63 Ibid., 66-67.
64 Ibid., 71.
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coined the phrase "open system" to describe organizations that function in an environment which has external forces (or uncertainty) affecting them.\textsuperscript{70} Galbraith's starting point is that of a highly structured hierarchical model which operates by standardization (i.e., it has a set of rules and procedures established to address various situations) and adds the variant of uncertainty. He does not propose the relinquishment of standardization brought about by rules and regulations, but instead proposes a type of contingency basis to deal with the new and unique problems and uncertainty. The foundation of this model holds that "it becomes more efficient to bring the points of decision down to the points of action where the information originates."\textsuperscript{71}

Burns and Stalker argue that stable conditions may suggest the use of a mechanistic form of organization, where a traditional pattern of hierarchy, reliance on formal rules and regulations, vertical communications and structured decision making are possible. More dynamic environmental situations requiring rapid changes would require the use of an organic form of organization, where there is less rigidity, more participation, and reliance on the workers to define and redefine their positions and relationships. Supervisors and managers find that the mechanistic form provides them with a greater sense of security in dealing with their environment than the organic form, which introduces much greater uncertainty. Burns and Stalker conclude that either form of organization may be appropriate in particular situations.\textsuperscript{72}


The purpose of this discussion is to make visible the movement in “public administration” toward more people focused, decentralized, democratic, and culturally defined administrative organizational approach. Rather than adopting an administrative perspective reflecting this movement in organizational theory, the drive by educators, as David Tyack and others\textsuperscript{73} have correctly argued, has been to create centralized control of the educational process, as well as the rise of an educational management class. This drive was in part due to the very nature of education. That is to say, in order to obtain and maintain the support of business, politicians, and the general population, public educators found it useful to adopt the scientific management theories exemplified by those of Frederick Winslow Taylor as a means to rationalize the use of public funds. The tensions between efficiency and effectiveness and the lack of a tangible product, such as a vehicle, have been an ongoing source of public distrust of education from the beginning. While these scholars are addressing elementary and secondary schooling, the situation is analogous to that of public higher education.

Max Weber described two strong and opposing forces that impact on all organizations: the need for division of labor and specialization and the need for centralizing of authority. The division of labor is an inevitable consequence of specialization. In the case of education, this is best understood as the separation of functions between the faculty and the administration. This complex specialization is, arguably, essential for organizational effectiveness and efficiency. It also means that diverse forces are, at any given point in time, attempting to move the organization in different directions. This in turn

increases the need—or the perception of need—for stronger organizational coordination and control and poses the policy dilemma in terms of choices between excellence and equality. In the process of mediating between these poles, many bargains have been struck. Educators often couch these trade-offs in terms such as freedom or individuality, which would otherwise be lost, it is argued, if we should unwisely follow equality to the door of mediocrity.

2.4 University of Alaska, Rural Education, and Native Peoples

The only research specifically addressing the relationship of the University of Alaska to Alaska Native peoples, and the provisions for higher education in rural Alaska, is Louis Jacquot's 1973 "Alaska Natives and Alaska Higher Education, 1960 to 1972: A Descriptive Study." Jacquot provides an excellent historical overview of the major educational developments in Alaska. His anthropological approach frames the developments in an optimistic light. That is to say that, while Jacquot acknowledges the historic inequalities of Western education as applied to Native peoples, he still paints a picture which is at best naive and at worst assimilative. While the title of Jacquot's work leads one to assume that the major focus of his dissertation would be on higher education, he in fact devotes less than one chapter to higher education. This is, in part, understandable as the time frame under consideration pre-dates University involvement in rural educational affairs. His study does provide a historical account of the policy practices of the State of Alaska, thus setting the stage for the

---

emergence of the REAA's (Rural Educational Attendance Areas) in the area of elementary/secondary education. This was seen by Native leadership as an attempt to provide for local control of elementary and secondary education in rural Alaska. This study also serves to document the growing pressures in the state for higher educational delivery in rural Alaska. Jacquot concludes his study with glowing comments concerning the University's growing acknowledgment of the need for higher education in rural Alaska, and the structural manifestations of reorganization, as well as the creation and construction of rural community colleges. One would expect in 1994, then, to be able to report the success of the University of Alaska in providing quality, meaningful and relevant education to Alaska Native people; unfortunately, this is not the case.

Frank Darnell investigated the degree of local control exercised by REAA's, which were structurally similar to urban school boards in other parts of the United States, and concluded that:

... they are extraordinary units of government, not only for the unique physical and cultural contradictions under which they operate, but also because they are neither cities nor boroughs and, consequently, there is no provision for their existence in either the Alaska Constitution or in the statutes defining local and intermediate government.77

Upon specifying the legal constraints to the authority under which the REAA's operate, Darnell concludes that the real control of Native education by Alaska Native people remains problematic because of the REAAs' "anomalous nature, questionable legal status" and "because REAA's have less authority than ordinary school districts" and thus "may be said to be agencies empowered more to manage than control."78 The structural response of the University of Alaska to the politically created Rural Educational Affairs Division and later the Rural

77 Frank Darnell, "Education Among the Native Peoples of Alaska," Polar Record 19, 122 (1979), 443.
78 Ibid., 444.
Community Colleges mirrors the understanding and response of the State of Alaska in their vision of the REAA’s. The University, when faced with the legislative mandate to provide education in rural Alaska, responded in a structural-functionalist manner rather than attending to the Native requests for culturally appropriate education. In other words, the University chose to build buildings and replicate the highly centralized, hierarchical form of administration, firmly grounded in the Euro-American tradition of organization and scientific management, rather than attempting to incorporate Native understandings of education, organization and world views.

The interest in decentralization of education in Alaska was the focus of David Getches’ (1978) and Kathryn Hecht and Ronald Inouye’s (1978) studies. These works focused on the perceived quality of rural education as expressed by Alaska Native corporate leaders, statewide Native leaders and educational researchers from the University of Alaska. The studies stressed the motive or intention to provide quality education and focused on achievement as measured in terms of scores on standardized tests. Implicit in these studies is the notion of nonsubstantive parental involvement in the educational enterprise at the policy formation, governing, control, operation and design levels of rural schools.

This observation is supported by the works of John U. Ogbu in his California studies of programs for Black students which were developed and implemented, without the input of the parents, by school officials more in response to external economic and political pressures than a sincere desire to improve education for minority children.79 These arguments are relevant in as much as they point to the lack of concern educationalists, in general, have for the inclusion of non-educational professionals in the conceptualization, planning

and implementing of educational programs, particularly in a cross-cultural arena. Moreover, in Ogbu’s studies, the responses by the educational community to the external political forces manifested themselves in structural ways. That is to say, when faced with low attendance, low grades and high drop-out rates among minority students, the educationalist’s response was to create ‘new’ programs rather than to examine the basic value assumptions of the educational enterprise. This approach ‘blamed the victim(s)’ while continuing to assume that the ‘system’—the school—is blameless. Ogbu’s work is in general supportive of the basic assumptions contained in this thesis; there is, however, a point of disagreement. Ogbu assumes that the solution to the problem rests in increased educational involvement of the urban Black parents, which will result in an increase in social/economic positions for African Americans. In other words, if the educational system will simply provide increased access into the policy formation processes and professional employment opportunities within the educational enterprise, educational attainment levels among Blacks will equalize, resulting in African Americans attaining their piece of the “pie.” Therein lies the major difference: most Native Americans do not and have chosen not to assimilate; they do not want a piece of the “pie”; they have a “pie.” They simply want to be able to enjoy their pie, their way.

Gerald McBeath’s study of the North Slope Borough government investigated the nature of formal organizations (read Western), focusing on the political institutionalization of policy formation and the degree of responsiveness and representativeness displayed by relatively important groups and individuals within the bureaucratic structures located in the decision-making process.80 McBeath also considered the concepts describing the leadership process, for

example, political recruitment, communication and socialization of Native leaders. While the study did not focus on educational policy formulation specifically, it is instructive in that it provides a view of the manner in which the North Slope Borough leaders perceive problems. McBeath's major thesis is that Native leadership is—and has been—developed by or through exposure to Western institutions and Western educational practices. According to McBeath, it is only through these experiences that Alaska Native leaders learn the appropriate behavioral patterns necessary to function successfully in the bureaucratic world. This line of argument is suggestive of an assimilationist attitude and provides only a superficial explanation of an extremely complex set of social, economic, political and cultural factors. McBeath fails to grasp that one may replicate a bureaucratic structural organizational form, and even operate it in a manner similar to the Western corporate model, without surrendering one's own cultural integrity or identity. This can be accomplished even when the outcomes of the organization are not profit motivated as in Western organizations.

A major tenet of this thesis is that the establishment of rural post-secondary education in Alaska was facilitated by key Alaska Native policy actors who, to varying degrees, had been exposed to Western institutions and education similar to those suggested by McBeath. However, this study will in no way advance or support the argument that Alaska Native leaders, merely because of exposure to Western institutions and/or education, sought to create yet another set of assimilationist institutions when they established the Rural Educational Affairs Division as well as the Rural Community Colleges within the University of Alaska system. Quite the contrary, the records presented here clearly show a pattern of requests on the part of Native peoples to have an educational experience, at all levels, which would allow for the retention of traditional values
and lifestyles, while participating in the educational process. This is not meant to suggest that there are not those within the Alaska Native population who chose to attempt to assimilate, or that such a choice is inappropriate; the point to be made here is that, if McBeath's line of argument were accurate, we would not be discussing such issues here and now. After five hundred years of exposure to Western institutions and education, there would be no appreciable differences between Native Americans and Euro-Americans. Obviously, this is not the case. The issue is much deeper, more profound than merely a matter of how Native corporate leadership structurally organizes mandated corporate and/or governmental organizations, or how it is 'socialized' through 'exposure to Western institutions and education,' as some researchers would lead us to believe.

Carl Shepro's 1985 study of rural Alaskan village self-government investigates the basic question of 'who' is making the decisions which affect the lives of the villagers. He focuses on the degree to which the state and federal government's proposals to decentralize service delivery have been accomplished. His findings suggest that the implementation of these decentralization policies have, in fact, resulted in an increase in the degree of centralization of decision making. Of particular interest to this study is Shepro's observation that the Western view of politics is one of conflict over issues, while the Alaska Native cultural view is that conflict is to be avoided. This dichotomized world view of the political process, as well as the educational, is at the heart of this thesis. It will be argued that throughout the period investigated here Alaska Native people, through their leadership, continually sought to achieve compromised/negotiated

solutions to problematic issues, rather than utilizing direct power confrontations as a means of achieving their desired goals. In other words, while Alaska Native leaders were clearly in positions within the Alaska State Legislature, and were clearly aware and competent to address the issue in appropriate Western cultural terms, the record shows that this was not the case. The Native leadership chose instead to attempt resolution in ways which were more clearly reflective of their cultural values and world views.

2.5 Summary

In this chapter a review of the literature was presented in the areas of minority education and higher education as developed in relation to Native Americans. In an attempt to clarify the University of Alaska's response to Native American's higher educational needs, a discussion of organizational theory was presented in order to demonstrate the continual tendency of the institution to specialize and centralize its organizational structure. This institutional posture clearly is not in keeping with current movements in "public administration."
CHAPTER III
ALTERNATE WORLD VIEWS

3.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter a review of the literature in the related areas of minority education and higher education was presented, as well as the theoretical framework from which I analyze the University of Alaska’s responses to Alaska Natives. In this chapter, a discussion of the conflict between the alternate world views of the dominate culture and of the Native American/Alaska Native cultures, and its effect on the provision of higher education is presented.

3.2 Native and Non-Native World Views

All societies have mechanisms for the training or teaching of their young about the patterns, norms, and roles of their culture, of training youth for their roles in society and for on-going adult learning and development. Western societies have, to a large measure, given this responsibility to professionals who create and define what is valid knowledge and how it is to be taught and learned. The power to create and validate knowledge and to control its dissemination is given to those who, by birth or training, have accepted a certain paradigm of knowledge—variously called Western, Cartesian, and scientific. The Native American populations do not need to rely upon formal educational institutions (structures) to teach the knowledge and skills of the culture. Families and communities build this knowledge, this learning, into their integrated, holistic
patterns of daily life. The academy's response to this form of knowledge—if it responds at all—tends to be one of studied intellectual curiosity. Little has been attempted by way of validating this knowledge as an equivalent way of knowing the world, the known or oneself.\(^\text{82}\)

At the base of people's beliefs and practices are ideas and concepts that are of ancient origin, which form the basis of "presuppositions" about what constitutes reality.\(^\text{83}\) These unstated presuppositions constitute the framework by which we give meaning to the world in which we live. These presuppositions differ from group to group, thereby producing different senses of what constitutes reality. A set of related presuppositions becomes the lens through which we examine the world. These related presuppositions provide the conceptual framework which we use to filter new phenomena, that which is alien and, in so doing, shape what we see.

The number of accounts concerning the "alien" human beings that Europeans encountered in the "new" world is vast. The Native American—the Indigenous people of the Americas—presented an anomaly to the European. The Native not only looked different, but had also developed a lifestyle and ideas about social organization and political theories which were unlike anything previously encountered by the European. The initial reaction of the European, after contact, was to view the Native American as merely "humanoid."\(^\text{84}\) As there was no mention in the Bible of such people or continents, Europeans sought an explanation grounded in their own presuppositions, based largely on Christian doctrine, in order to place these "new" peoples and places within their own

cosmology and, in so doing, they laid the foundation for five hundred years of “other.”

Real insight into the Native world(s) remains problematic. Contemporary researchers provide different descriptions of the possibilities which, for most Western trained social scientists, are historically grounded in the early works of missionaries who sought to compile Native descriptions of the world and of humanity’s relationship to that world by gathering information concerning myths, legends and rituals. The focus was on myths of creation and explanations or descriptions of ritual practices surrounding those myths. These early efforts provided an information base to which anthropologists and ethnographers added information concerning the people themselves. The information which has been compiled is undoubtedly colored by the intentions of the researcher. For instance, the intention of the missionary was to replace the belief systems of Native Americans, through education, with one based in Christianity. The intention of the non-missionary social scientist is to provide some insight into the Native ‘mind’ so as to facilitate assimilation of Native Americans into the dominant society.

Benjamin Whorf brought a new focus and greater insight to the study of Native Americans. Whorf’s analysis of Native languages found that ‘different’ people did, in fact, describe the world in different ways. Whorf’s presupposition was that there is an external reality, something that exists outside our own subjectivity. This external reality is multifaceted; it consists of many phenomena; human beings select particular phenomena as their main focus. Whorf refers to this act as a “dissection” of nature. “Each language,” he argues, “performs this
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artificial chopping up of the continuous spread and flow of existence in a
different way." Whorf points out that in the Western higher education
tradition "different sciences chop segments out of the world," such as botany,
biology, chemistry, and so on. Indigenous languages, especially Hopi, which
was the focus of Whorf's work, frame the world in terms of motion. Western
"things and objects" are seen as "events" in Hopi terminology. "Events" are in a
constant state of flux; the world is continually re-manifesting itself:

[Hopi metaphysics] imposes upon the Universe two grand cosmic
forms, which as a first approximation in terminology we may call
Manifested and Manifesting (or, Unmanifest) or, again, objective
and subjective. The objective or manifested comprise all that is or
has been accessible to the senses. The subjective or manifesting
comprises all that we call future.

That which is "manifesting" then becomes something which is "objective" in the
sense that it is something that can be experienced. The universe, however, is
dynamic, so that what is "objective" is not itself eternal—it is temporary—
therefore, it is not so much a "thing" as it is an "event" in flux.

In Models and Metaphors, Max Black criticizes aspects of Whorf's findings
while acknowledging that Hopi (as well as Navajo) thought is based on languages
constructed on the concept of motion as the major feature of the universe. Gary
Witherspoon, in Language and Art in the Navajo Universe, argues that "the
assumption" which underlies the Navajo world view is that "the world is in
motion, that things are constantly undergoing the process of transformation,
deformation and restoration, and that the essence of life and being is
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movement."92 It is from this concept of motion that Whorf derives his
description of the Hopi universe as one of dynamic "manifestation."

The works of Whorf and others who have probed the meanings inherent in
Native American languages leave no doubt that such languages, and thereby the
cultures in which those languages are spoken, depict a world view unlike that of a
researcher who is of European extraction.93 It is plausible, then, for us to argue
from an alternate world view or conceptual framework, which has at least the
same validity as those who choose to argue from the world view of the ancient
Greeks.

The implications of this conception of an alternate world view have only
recently begun to be explored by researchers such as Gary Witherspoon,94 James
Kale McNeley,95 and John R. Farella.96 Sadly, this research, like that of other
social sciences impacting Native America, has been left to non-Natives lacking
contextual understanding. In most cases, these social scientists also lack the
linguistic training to accurately depict these complex philosophical concepts or to
be able to comprehend their meaning(s). This is the case especially when focused
on the Native world view, and even when attempting to relate the concepts to the
dominant culture.

A conceptual framework, though it is implicit in language (both
structurally and contextually), and is based on some real aspect of the universe, is
difficult to expose to explanation unless one has lived within that framework. Also, in order to recognize that there is such a framework, one must acknowledge that there are ‘other’ competing explanations of reality which are equally valid. For example, the Western concept of guilt does not exist in Native American language(s), nor is there an equivalent emotional concept. One may read everything available about the concept of guilt, and one may even come to understand that guilt is something which arises out of specific philosophical traditions, and it may manifest itself in very specific and individual ways with those persons who share an understanding of that construct. However, if one has no such concept, it is almost impossible to consider what it would be like to live with such a concept as a real aspect of everyday life. On the other hand, someone who actually believes that guilt exists or knows what guilt is will not react in the same manner as does one who does not believe this concept to be a fact.

A world view can be likened to the concept of guilt. People do not merely believe that their view is the correct one; it is frequently believed to be the only one. It is reality and, as such, it is taken for granted. A world view is the filter through which one looks at and interprets the world; that grants meaning to one’s utterances, practices and goals. This is how it can be said that a conceptual framework is lived. As in the case of the Navajo and Hopi (as well as many other Native Americans), it becomes impossible to “chop up the universe” to see objects and events as separate or distant from the people.

Indigenous peoples have world views which are fundamentally incompatible with those generally held by industrialized societies. This incompatibility can be made visible through the comparison of nine principle differences (Table 1). While the elements detailed in the following table are based

\[97\text{This understanding comes from numerous discussions with many Native Americans from varied Nations, over the author’s life time.}\]
on my own experiences, those experiences have been greatly influenced by personal communications with Dennis Demmert, David Case, Vine Deloria, Ward Churchill, and other Native American activists expressing similar understandings in their own work. The table below is a blending of many Native American approaches and as such it is a representation of Native American conceptualizations of the world and should not be viewed as a definitive or all inclusive presentation of any or all Native American constructs.

Table 1. A Case Model for Comparing and Contrasting World Views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;Industrial Society&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Tribal Societies&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Land Use</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>Extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Governance</td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Participative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relationship to Environment</td>
<td>Controlling, manipulative</td>
<td>Adaptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social Life</td>
<td>Establish guilt</td>
<td>By shame, internalize social controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Beliefs</td>
<td>Deistic</td>
<td>Naturalistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Knowledge Transfer</td>
<td>Written, language-based</td>
<td>Oral, visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Social Life</td>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>Communal/tribal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Life Work</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>Generalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Abstract, classroom sessions</td>
<td>Demonstration of practical activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first difference relates to use of land. For industrialized society, land use is intensive. Land is farmed more and more efficiently. People crowd together in immense cities, while the resources are extracted from the land. In contrast, the use of land for Natives is extensive. Huge amounts of land are needed to provide subsistence for few people. Especially in the Circumpolar regions, resource usage does not tend to alter the land.

The second difference is governance. Governance in Western society is hierarchical and bureaucratic. There are federal, state, and local levels, each with specialists exerting control on our lives, and within each level there are hierarchies of power. Native societies tend to be more democratic as the people have more direct involvement in the decision making. Consensus building is viewed as an important leadership characteristic. Leaders are not elevated to exalted specialized roles; consequently, conflict or the use of overt methods of control are limited.

The third difference is in the approach to the environment. The non-Native approach tends to be one of control and manipulation. This is best viewed in conjunction with intensive land use and industrial age technological society, where the environment is reshaped to respond to human needs and whims. In contrast, tribal people adapted to their environments. Their technologies provided unique adaptations to the environments but the adjustment was made on the human side rather than one forced on the environment. These adaptive versus controlling mind sets tend to influence the ways in which humans interact with each other as well as with the physical environment.

The fourth difference relates to social control. For non-Natives social control is accomplished through guilt, determined externally and attributed to an individual. For Natives, social control is internalized through shame. In tribal
societies, an individual is viewed as responsible for his or her actions; therefore, societal control is predicated upon the individual's understanding of their social obligation and role within the community.

In traditional Native beliefs spiritualism encompasses all living beings. Supernatural forces do not necessarily take on human form. In this schema, human beings are but one of the intrinsic parts of a much larger interrelated universe. In contrast, non-Natives are deistic, conceiving of human beings as created in the image of their God. Such a conceptualization of human beings and their relationship to a deity allows for their belief that humans are superior to all other forms of life. This belief leaves non-Natives disconnected from the rest of creation, without a sense of community with other living things.

The sixth difference relates to knowledge. For non-Natives, the transfer of knowledge predominantly occurs through written communication from professionals who are given the power to decide what is worth knowing, to those whom such professionals deem to be in need of such expertise. In traditional Native societies, teaching tends to be done through oral and visual means, and the outcomes of learning are best exemplified by the life experiences of the elders, incorporating both thinking and feelings.

Social life within the dominant society tends to be based on individualism. The understanding of individual achievement, based on competition and attainment of social status and material goods to the exclusion of other members of the societal group, is a common feature of Westernized societies. In contrast, Native Americans tend to be communal and tribalist. Personality itself is derived by accepting the responsibility of being a contributing member of the social group. Understanding the interconnections of personality to other forms of life (and the rest of the universe) is what allows for a person's education to proceed.
While in the industrialized world we identify people with their job titles (professor, engineer, lawyer), in Native societies, your employment does not define who you are:

You are an Indian first, last and always. You may have a degree in anthropology, law, or nuclear engineering, but that is your profession, and how you make your living; it is not you! . . . Your first responsibility is to be a human being, an Indian. Once you can accept that fact and use it as a positive factor, you can do whatever professional tasks are required of you but you will know when to draw the line between professional responsibilities and the much greater responsibilities of being a person. You can earn money but you cannot be happy or satisfied unless you become yourself first.98

The role of the individual as it relates to work is the eighth difference addressed. In industrialized society, greater value tends to be placed on specialized knowledge. In tribal societies, survival is dependent upon a broad repertoire of knowledge held by individuals.

The final distinction between the two world views relates specifically to education. For the dominant society, education is an abstraction carried out through formalized instruction. In tribal societies, education is based on personal experiences, observation, demonstration, and practice toward competency.

Only in the Industrial society is education conceived as a separate function from the categories described above. Education is conceived as a product which is predicated on the assumption that achievement in education will facilitate a member's economic and social mobility in the society. The ability to compartmentalize and conceptualize issues such as land and governance as separate and distinct entities from education makes visible the sharp differences between Native and non-Native world views. Education in a Native context is both

process and content. Native students who undergo education through Western forms of schooling acquire knowledge during that process, but it is knowledge without relevance or meaning because it is decontextualized from a Native world view. Thus, by its very nature, Western education places Native Americans and Alaska Natives in a conflict between two worlds. Traditional values, spirituality, and tribal ways of being and knowing are neither respected nor incorporated into the schooling curriculum. Those absences have been the case in American education in general and, as this study will document, more particularly in the instance of the University of Alaska.

As discussed previously, these differences in world views are also closely related to differences in organizational approaches. The Western approach to organizational management is hierarchical. This structure presupposes a differentiation of an individual's worth within the hierarchy. The value of the individual is defined in terms of his/her office, gender, title, or educational status held within the organization. Conversely, from a Native perspective an individual's worth is predicated on the assumption that all things have equal value. Metaphorically, social organization can be viewed as a flat circle from a Native world view and as a pyramid from a Western corporate world view.

In the face of theoretical shifts within the field of "public administration" toward more humanistic, culturally sensitive approaches, Western educational administration continues to be wed to a structural-functionalist approach to management. A structural-functionalist perspective is a product of its cultural and intellectual heritage and presupposes differentiation at all levels. It assumes that people are created in the image of God, therefore, all other things are inferior. This assumption is in direct opposition to the Native world view which 

99 John Schaffer, interview, Anchorage Alaska, 1991. This is a theme which runs throughout the interviews conducted.
assumes that all things are interrelated and equal in importance. Therefore, in order to provide more people focused, decentralized, democratic, and culturally sensitive approaches to education, an examination of these differences in world views makes visible the need to go beyond issues of organizational structure to looking at more substantive issues of what constitutes appropriate education.

### 3.3 Summary

This chapter has outlined a number of variables for differentiating between the world views of the dominant world culture and that of Native Americans. In the next chapter, a discussion of the relationship between economy and education is presented.
CHAPTER IV
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ECONOMY AND EDUCATION

4.1 Introduction

The argument presented in this chapter is that the Western approach to Native American education, and more specifically Alaska Native education, has been driven by economic and political desires of the dominant culture to assimilate or acculturate the indigenous peoples so as to delimit their control over lands, resources and their identity. In the United States, higher educational programs provided by the majority of colleges and universities are not designed for people who do not wish to share or buy into the American Dream. The culture of the University is deeply grounded in the Western philosophical tradition of the scientific/intellectual model and the Judeo-Christian belief that humankind is superior to and removed from the natural world.\footnote{William Mayo, "Opening Remarks" at the \textit{Alaska Federation of Natives Annual Convention}. Anchorage, 1993.} Thus the curriculum content, regardless of the particular philosophical orientation of the author or the teacher, is approached from the Western civilization/colonial/pioneer point of view. Native Americans are subjected to an educational system that is opposed to their existence as tribes, not only as political entities but as cultures with spiritual and economic relationships with the land. The melting pot identity of most Americans is the dominant theme throughout the literature in all academic
disciplines, as well as in the popular culture. This belief leaves no room for other world views and or definitions of education.  

Until recently in the United States, the phenomena of class and class struggle were neither studied by members of the academy nor acknowledged as a political force, especially as it relates to higher education. The belief that the United States was (and is) a classless society was embedded in the Constitution and related philosophical documents, and this belief was perpetuated by the state. All citizens were encouraged to believe that such a society inevitably led to opportunity as well as upward social and economic mobility. The chief agency for the perpetuation of this belief was education, ostensibly available to all equally. This was and is not the case for Native education in Alaska at any level of the educational enterprise, in any geographical area, or at any point in Alaska’s historical evolution. A look at the history of primary and secondary education of Native children in Alaska begins to demonstrate this inequality. The discussion then turns to the role of the Alaska Native leadership, especially as they were, and continue to be, influenced by the issue of land and the land claims movement in Alaska.

4.2 Early Primary and Secondary Education

4.2.1 Russia: The Beginnings of Western Contact

The Western educational experience of Alaska Natives began in 1741 when the Russian explorers Vitus Bering and Chirikof made the first recorded contacts.  

Indeed, the loss of sixteen men by Chirikof in a skirmish with

Tlingits near present-day Sitka must have been educational for both parties, and it set the tone for Russian/Native relations for the next 126 years.103

The Czar’s eastward expansion of the Russian empire to Alaska seems to have been the result of two major factors. First, by the 1700s, the colonial expansion of European nations in the Pacific Basin had determined the geographical importance of Alaska as a link between America and Asia.104 The second factor was greed. The Russian promyshlenniki, Siberian fur hunters, received the reports of large numbers of fur-bearing mammals in the region with jubilation. In a fashion similar to the coureurs de bois of New France, and somewhat later, the American mountain man, these fur hunters swept eastward from Kamchatka to the Aleutian Islands. By 1784, the promyshlenniki, inflamed by cupidity, had violently and viciously established a base on Kodiak Island.105 Fearing the loss and misuse of tax rubles, the Czar moved to consolidate control of his extension of empire through the creation of a profit-motivated corporation patterned along the lines of Great Britain’s Hudson’s Bay Company. The Russian-American Company, chartered in 1799 and headed by Alexander Baranov, contained a provision directing that schools for children of both sexes be established and attended.106

The inclusion of an educational provision in the Russian-American Charter appears to be more directly related to the company’s economic interest than to charitable inclination. For the Aleuts and Tlingit/Haidas, the period between 1742 and 1780 had been a period of holocaust. The promyshlenniki made no attempt to

103Ibid., 48.
civilize or convert the aboriginal inhabitants, instead a policy of extermination of the entire Indigenous population was begun. The state of war which existed between the Russian fur hunters and the Native peoples ultimately detracted from the harvest of furs.\textsuperscript{107}

Eventually, the Russians recognized that the improvement of relations between the Russians and the Alaskan Natives would increase economic returns, so the task of bringing order between the two cultures was assigned to the missionaries of the Russian Orthodox Church. Through education and conversion in schools provided by the Company and staffed by the Church, it was believed that greater profits would result because of a decreased level of hostility between the Russians and the Alaskan Natives.\textsuperscript{108} During the Russian-American period in Alaska (1741-1867), the Russian-American Company established and maintained over twenty mission schools from Kodiak Island to Russian Mission on the Yukon River, including a colonial academy at Sitka (to train surveyors, navigators, engravers, and accountants) as well as Lady Etulin School for young women, which taught needlework, languages, geography, history, and household arts.\textsuperscript{109}

The decline of the fur trade, the questionable profits from the Russian-American Company, the political and economic costs of the Crimean War (1854-1856), and the growing interest of the United States in becoming a Pacific power convinced St. Petersburg that the gigantic, isolated, and costly holdings in North

\textsuperscript{109}Ibid., 24.
America had become a liability. These factors, as well as harmonious diplomatic relations with the United States, set the stage for the sale of Alaska.\textsuperscript{110}

The sale of this territory to the U.S. in 1867 initiated a marked and rapid decline in Russian missionary activity. The Russian Orthodox Church, however, continued to provide economic assistance to Alaskan schools until the 1917 Bolshevik revolution, after which the mission school support came from the U.S. branch of the Church.\textsuperscript{111}

\section*{4.2.2 The United States}

The United States' purchase of Alaska from Russia for $7,200,000 may be viewed as an astute business move from both sides, particularly on the part of the Russian Chancellor, Baron Edouard de Stoeckl, whose countryman Prince Gorbachev declared in a letter home:

\begin{quote}
[Americans] look upon that continent as their patrimony. Their destiny ("our manifest destiny" as they call it) is forever to expand ... they are the ones who gradually invaded Texas, which later became a state of the Union. New Mexico and some other parts were acquired in the same manner. It had been hoped that our colonies' lack of resources would keep them safe from the greed of freebooters, but it was not so. Although the fish, the furs, and some other comparatively insignificant products of our possessions certainly did not measure up to the rich valleys of the Mississippi and Rio Grande, nor to the gold-bearing plains of California, they did not escape the covetousness of the Americans.\textsuperscript{112}
\end{quote}

Prince Gorbachev had indeed felt the pulse of the land hungry Americans and their sense of destiny and greed. Viewed in this light, the sale of Alaska was a means for the Russians to receive at least some payment for their possession

\textsuperscript{111}Charles K. Ray, 17.
rather than run the risk of losing it to American expansionism, which had been the Mexican experience with the loss of Texas and California to the U.S.

From the American viewpoint, the purchase may be viewed as a wise move on the part of William Henry Seward, Secretary of State under President Andrew Johnson. While traditional historians of these events have focused on the congressional and public debates surrounding the purchase, arguing that a general lack of support existed both in Congress and in the national press, there seems to have been sufficient material support for the purchase. *The Boston Herald* told its readers:

> those who know the most about it, estimate it most likely, the climate on the Pacific side [at that latitude] is not to be compared to that on the Atlantic side of the continent...the country is reported to abound in furs, forests and minerals, while the rivers and bays on its coast swarm with fish as fine as ever were caught.\(^{113}\)

*The Philadelphia Inquirer* was prophetic:

> a time may come, when the possession of this territory will give us command over the Pacific, which our extensive possessions there require.\(^{114}\)

Political and public debates aside, the fact is that an economic relationship between Sitka and San Francisco predated the California gold rush, and by 1868 Louis Sloss, Hayward M. Hutchinson, and William Kohl had formed the Alaska Commercial Company, a furrier business which in 1870 was granted a federal monopoly for the Fur Seal Islands (now the Pribilofs). The venture proved a profitable and enduring one. Like its predecessor, the Russian-American Company,\(^{115}\) the Alaska Commercial Company also saw an economic benefit to


\(^{114}\)Ibid., 283.

\(^{115}\)Richard A. Pierce, “Prince D.P. Maksutov: Last Governor of Russian America,” *Journal of the West* 6 (July 1967), 403-411.
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educating Natives (that is, civilizing them) and founded schools on St. Paul and St. George Islands in 1870.\textsuperscript{116}

The fact remains that Alaska’s economic benefits were almost irrelevant in the Gilded Age of America, an America that was preoccupied with urbanization and a contiguous West rich in minerals, farm products, and cattle, all of which were being linked together by an ever-expanding network of railroads. Understandably, perhaps, provisions for educating Alaskans (both Native and non-Native) were left to the commercial ventures (such as the Alaska Commercial Company and the Nevada Mining Company) and to various missionary societies. Between 1867 and 1884, the Federal Government neither established nor made provision for the establishment of any schools in the district (territory) of Alaska.\textsuperscript{117}

Protestant church societies first established mission schools in American Alaska at Wrangell in 1878, followed by mission schools at Tanana, Sitka, Anvik, Hoonah, Hydaburg, and Juneau between 1878-1884.\textsuperscript{118} These schools were the result of efforts by the Methodists and Presbyterians in Alaska.

The year 1884 marked two major developments for Alaska Native education. First, Sheldon Jackson, a Presbyterian minister, educator, and founder of the mission school at Sitka which still bears his name, was appointed General Agent for Education in Alaska. Second, the United States Congress passed the first


\textsuperscript{117}Carol Barnhardt, \textit{Historical Status of Elementary Schools in Rural Alaskan Communities, 1867-1980}, (Fairbanks: Center for Cross-Cultural Studies, University of Alaska Fairbanks, 1985), 2.

Organic Act\textsuperscript{119} for Alaska, which appropriated $25,000 and required the Secretary of the Interior to use the funds as was necessary to "make needful and proper provision for the education of the children of school age in the territory of Alaska, without reference to race, until such time as permanent provisions shall be made for the same."\textsuperscript{120} The act also provided for the continuance of mission schools by permitting missionary stations previously established among the Indian tribes to occupy up to 640 acres of land for the support of the mission/school. This action was simply an extension of U.S. policy in effect during this period, as the provision of funds and land to missionary societies for the support of mission/schools in Indian country had been standard U.S. policy for many years.

Reverend Jackson, as the newly appointed Educational Agent for Alaska, proceeded to divide the territory. Jackson decreed that certain religious denominations would be given lands and a portion of the educational budget in differing regions of the Territory, thus insuring that established missions would not have to compete with newly arriving missionaries.\textsuperscript{121}

Reverend Jackson's works were productive indeed. His drive to bring Christian education to Alaska was instrumental in the Moravian mission begun in Bethel in 1885, the Quaker mission/school in Kotzebue in 1887 and over 20 Catholic schools by 1920 (Holy Cross being the first in 1888).\textsuperscript{122} In fact, 28 of the 43 schools operating in Alaska in 1888 were denominational, while the balance


consisted of private schools such as those previously mentioned established by commercial enterprises to provide education for the children of company employees.123

By 1896, increased public pressure for sectarian education in the U.S. led to the progressive federal dissolution of the missionary school subsidies. Federally run day schools replaced the mission-run boarding schools, although several boarding schools were maintained.124 Not until 1905, with the passage of the Nelson Act, did Alaska see the establishment of compulsory-attendance public schools.125 The Act provided that incorporated towns could organize and manage their own schools. Further, it established that any community outside of an incorporated town having a school population of at least 20 “white children and children of mixed blood who lead a civilized life” could petition the clerk of the court for the establishment of a school district. The Nelson Act also stated:

[T]he education of Eskimos and Indians in Alaska shall remain under the control and direction of the Secretary of the Interior, and school for and among the Eskimos and Indians of Alaska shall be provided by an annual appropriation and they shall be permitted to any Indian boarding school.126

With the passage of the second Organic Act, creating the territorial legislature, Alaska now had two school systems, as was the case in the United States. One system existed for Whites and children of mixed blood while a separate one operated for Eskimos and Indians. In 1917, the territorial legislature was granted control over the school systems for Whites and children of mixed blood,

while the Federal Bureau of Education operated the schools for Natives. From 1912 to 1931, approximately 5000 Alaska Native students passed through Federal schools in Alaska.127

It should be noted that with the passage of the second Organic Act (1912), the Federal government not only established the means for local control of education (excluding Natives), but also assumed that the territory would fund the schools from the Alaska Fund.128 The Alaska Fund was made up of those tax dollars received from trade and the sale of liquor within the Territory. Because the importation and sale of liquor to Natives was illegal, and the major source of trade was between residents of those towns and villages founded for the purposes of resource extraction (e.g., timber, fur, fish, and minerals), and most of these ventures were owned by outside concerns, it seems reasonable to assume that the Federal government could simply have funded a single school system. They wanted out of the education business, but they were ultimately the funding agent for the dual system from separate but similar tax bases.

This situation was more economic than legal. As very few treaties existed between the Native inhabitants and the Federal government, Federal responsibility for Native education notwithstanding, a legal question existed as to the degree of Federal responsibility. Was the level of responsibility the same as for those Indians with whom the government had negotiated treaties? Ultimately it was held by Federal courts that the government retained educational responsibility.129

What is of particular interest is that the Territory was not industrialized and all taxes were based on import/export of raw products, so the Federal government was taking money out of different pockets to pay for two school systems. This dual school system was to remain in place until 1962, when the State of Alaska signed an agreement with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, transferring the responsibility for Native education to the State.\textsuperscript{130} It was not until 1975, however, that a truly single system of education emerged.\textsuperscript{131}

The policy vehicle which made possible the transfer of Native schooling to the State came about in 1934 with the passage of the Johnson-O’Malley Act.\textsuperscript{132} The national mood concerning the education of Native Americans shifted slightly from an assimilationist mode to one providing a more culturally sensitive educational environment.\textsuperscript{133} This minor shift in philosophy on the national level was never completely achieved in Alaska, however. As Jacquot has noted, the basic curriculum focus remained “rudimentary English, training in vocational crafts and personal and community hygiene.”\textsuperscript{134} Citing the Ray report, Jacquot argues that:

[The] policy [was one] of creaming off the brightest boys and girls, sending them to boarding schools for basically vocational education, and then returning them to their villages where they were expected, by teaching and example, to render service to their neighbors.\textsuperscript{135}

\textsuperscript{130}Charles K. Ray, 37.
\textsuperscript{132}Margaret Szasz, \textit{Education and the Road to Self-Determination, 1928-1973} (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1974).
\textsuperscript{135}Ibid, 37.
This practice of providing secondary education via boarding schools located in various areas of Alaska was a holdover policy from Native education in the contiguous states, and at the time it was implemented in Alaska, it was viewed as too costly and lacking in results in the lower 48 states. The first such school in Alaska was located in Wrangell, and boarding schools were also established at Eklutna in 1924, Kanakanck in 1926, White Mountain in 1924, and Mt. Edgecumb at Sitka in 1947. It is interesting to note that the locations of these boarding schools were in rural areas, not urban non-Native communities, and that the educational histories of these locations were tied to missionary and economic activities from the earlier eras. The other alternative for secondary education for Native students was to send them to BIA boarding schools in the contiguous states.

The pre-World War II era saw little change in the educational delivery systems for Alaska Natives. The State did assume control of the schools previously operated by the Federal Government, however, and by the 1940s Alaska Natives were beginning to push for the abolishment of the dual system of education. They also began to raise the issue of shipping their children off to boarding schools located great distances from their home villages or even to locations in the contiguous states.

Of particular importance for our purposes is the boarding school established in Sitka in 1947, Mt. Edgecumb. Edgecumb would prove to be the training ground (not in an academic sense, but rather in more of a social/psychological sense) for the cadre of Native leaders who would help to

---


shape not only educational policy in Alaska, but also State and Federal policy concerning almost all aspects of Native life for generations to come.138

By 1959, the State of Alaska had assumed the operational responsibility for those rural schools previously under Federal control as well as those schools located on military bases. It is worthy of note, however, that complete transfer was not accomplished until 1962.139 Instead, the State, at this juncture, chose to create another educational structure (the S.O.S., or State Operated Schools) to oversee these institutions, rather than simply incorporate them under the State’s Department of Education. This move essentially continued the operation of two separate and unequal educational systems.140 This pattern would be replicated by the state university system, in its establishment of rural co-operative extension centers, in as much as these centers were created to serve the non-native populations of the various state and federal agencies based in rural Alaska.141

In 1917, the University of Alaska was formed by a special act of the Alaska Territorial Legislature, with the main campus located in Fairbanks. The campus was originally known as the Alaska Agricultural College and School of Mines. This name reflects the understanding of Western society as to the nature of higher education and its relationship to economic and social development in frontier America. Therefore, the purpose of the institution was to train students in agriculture and mining. In relation to Indigenous people, Lester Henderson, a former Commissioner of Education in Alaska, stated:

140Ibid., 111-112.
141While it might be noteworthy to provide statistical data about Alaska Native student retention rates, according to the university reporting system, such data has not been maintained in a distinguishable fashion, Statistical Abstract, University of Alaska System, Office of Institutional Research, 1991.
In any consideration of the general population and school population, in relation to higher education, account need be taken of representatives of the white race only . . . The aboriginal population, while equal to the white in many sections and larger in other sections, is not a consideration when the establishment of higher education institutions of learning is contemplated, in view of the fact that a very small percent of the aboriginal children complete the eighth grade and an almost negligible number attend high school. These people will not be a factor from a higher educational standpoint for at least two generations, if one is to judge from their past rate of progress.142

While there was little change in educational provision for Alaska Natives in the 1950's and 1960's at either the elementary or secondary level, and none at the post-secondary level, there was major change for Urban Alaskans. In 1953, the territorial legislature created a system of Community Colleges in urbanized areas of Alaska.143 The original Community College Act stated that a qualified school district could establish, operate, and maintain a community college in conjunction with the University of Alaska, which had been established in 1917. The language of the act caused more than a little confusion as to who would have ultimate authority over the colleges—the University or the school districts.144 The 1962 State legislature, in an effort to clarify the governance question of the Community Colleges, acted on the recommendation of a special legislative committee and revised the Community College Act to read: "the University will establish, maintain, and operate community colleges in cooperation with local school districts or other political subdivisions."145

The situation in rural areas would not be altered substantially until 1976, when the Tobeluk vs. Lind case (more commonly known as the Molly Hootch case) created Rural Education Attendance Areas (REAAAs) in 1976. These regionally

---

144Ibid., chap. 58.
based, locally administered districts initially cost the state $59 million for rural schools, and by 1986 an additional $150 million for the construction of elementary and secondary schools in rural Alaska.

This overview of the history of education in Alaska sets the scene for the role that Native leadership would play in Alaska education. Clearly, the focus within the state was on the education of majority children, and what little attention Native education received was apparently given grudgingly by both federal and state level governments. Changes in these attitudes awaited a strong active voice from within the Alaska Native communities.

4.3 The Rise of Native Leadership

Education arrived on the North Slope of Alaska in 1924, six years after the second Organic Act (1912). Western education was established with the arrival of Bureau of Education schools at Cape Prince of Wales, on the Bering Straits, at Point Hope on the Northwest Coast, and at Point Barrow, the Northern most tip of the North American continent. These schools were operated by the Presbyterian, Episcopal, and Congregational mission boards, respectively, with annual subsidy contracts from the U.S. government.146

Western education was linked directly with Western economic development in Alaska. The same steam ship, usually from San Francisco, that delivered the annual supplies for the school and store also brought the new teacher.147 As the Bureau of Education established schools, it also built cooperative trading posts. These stores were united under the Alaska Native Cooperative Association (ANICA)

146 Eva Alvey Richards, Arctic Mood (Caldwell: Caxton Printers, 1949). This is one teacher's account of experiences in Arctic Alaska during the year 1924-25 and should be viewed as a romantic account as it was written retrospectively from outside Alaska and is based on a single year's experience.

when the Indian Reorganization Act was extended to Alaska in 1936. The net effect was the gradual modification of what had been a purely subsistence-based economy to one more cash-oriented.\(^{148}\)

The social and economic shift brought about by schooling and cash based economics posed limited threats to the traditional lifestyle of the Inupiat peoples. Threats to the land, or the loss thereof, have historically been the source of conflict between Native Americans and the non-Native cultures of the Americas.\(^{149}\) In the case of Alaska, loss of land holdings was not initially a cause for concern among most Native peoples because early white arrivals tended to establish few permanent communities, and those were tied to mainly seasonal economic enterprises such as whaling, fur seal harvesting, mineral extraction, and logging. However, as rural Alaska moved closer to a cash-based economy, the demand for Native land and resources accelerated. As a result, the need increased for an educated Native leadership\(^{150}\) to mitigate the tensions inherent between the resource extraction/development philosophy of the White, urban population and the rural Alaska Native desire for cultural survival. Given that large numbers of non-Natives tended to be concentrated within the coastal areas of Southeastern Alaska, the Aleutian Chain, it is not surprising that the earliest organized Native leadership developed in the southeast region. With the post-

\(^{148}\)Ibid., p. 356.


\(^{150}\)The use of the term leadership is not meant to infer that the Native leadership of the 20th Century is a traditional leadership, but instead is a leadership derived from contact and conflict with western ideologies, institutions, and legal practices. It has evolved in large part as a consequence of Native awareness that traditional authority structures would not be recognized as legitimate by the larger society, and thus represents an attempt to use the authoritative structures of that larger society as a means to promote and protect traditional Native values and interests.
World War II push by various political elements in Alaska to achieve statehood for the territory, local concern mounted because Natives in Alaska held clear title to two small reservations (Metlakatla on Annette Island in Southeast, and the Chilkat Indian village near Klukwan) and, after entry into the Union, the state would be entitled to withdraw 102,550,000 acres of land.\textsuperscript{151} Thus, the rationale for the founding of that organization, the ANB, was in response to threats to the land.

An even more pressing regional concern to Inupiat peoples would be the Atomic Energy Commission’s 1958 proposal to use 1,600 square miles of land near Cape Thompson south of Point Hope as an experimental test site, code named Project Chariot.\textsuperscript{152} The proposed nuclear test provided the catalyst for the creation of the Inupiat Patriot organization in Barrow in November 1961, the second Native organization to be formed with regional concerns. Additionally, support for the project—clearly from non-Native interests—was the first case where the University of Alaska took an active and visible stand in opposition to Native interests. The newly hired University of Alaska President, Dr. William R. Wood, would clearly set the tone for his long tenure as the chief executive of the state’s higher education institution by attempting to use his position in support of pro-development interests in the proposed use of thermo-nuclear devices at Point Hope. These actions established the policy orientation of the University as it related to Native issues for years to come.

The following section will briefly delineate the rise of three Alaska Native regional organizations: the Tlingit Haida Central Council, the Inupiat Patriot, and the Tanana Chiefs Conference. The events surrounding the rise of each of these


organizations are similar in that, in each case, non-Native interests posed a direct and clear danger to the continued use and occupancy of the land and, thus, a threat to the continuation of Natives’ existence as separate and distinct peoples. So, while these organizations might appear to mirror organizations from the larger or dominant society, in terms of structural arrangements as well as public behaviors, they are fundamentally different in their primary function: to help preserve Native values, culture, language, and above all, land—goals which are at odds with those characteristic of the dominant society. While the events of the 1970's have shaped and will continue to reshape the Native world, it is difficult to appreciate their impact without an understanding of the historical progression of Native organizations and leadership development upon which these events are based. This understanding is appropriate because it in turn provides an appreciation and understanding of the factors influencing the conflict over higher education.

4.3.1 The Tlingit Haida Central Council

In 1912, nine Tlingits and a Tsimshian met in Sitka and founded the Alaska Native Brotherhood (ANB). Initially, ANB had one main objective, winning citizenship status for Alaska Natives.154 By 1922, Chapters (called camps) were established in most towns and villages of Southeastern Alaska.155 The Dawes Act (1887) had made provisions for citizenship for Native Americans provided that those Native Americans “severed tribal relationships and adopted the habits of

153 Such as the 1971 Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA); the Molly Hootch rural schools settlement, 1976; the construction of the trans-Alaskan oil pipeline from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez, 1974-77; the State’s subsistence law, 1978; and the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, 1980.
154 The Alaska Native Sisterhood (ANS) was formed three years later to make this a universal goal, as opposed to one focused only on males.
civilization." This national policy necessitated the inclusion of two related items onto the ANB agenda: education for themselves and abandonment of aboriginal customs which were seen by whites as uncivilized.

From its inception, ANB addressed political issues and concerns. William L. Paul, a Tlingit attorney and active member of ANB, successfully defended Charlie Jones, who had been denied the right to vote in Wrangell two years before the national legislation passed.\textsuperscript{156} While the case did not really affect the legal status of Alaska Natives, according to Drucher "it was accepted as doing so in the popular mind, both White and Indian."\textsuperscript{157} As a result, there was increasing acceptance that Alaska Natives had the right to vote.

In 1924, William L. Paul was elected to the Territorial Legislature, making him the first Alaska Native to serve in that body. Even though one legislative seat had been won in the name of Alaska Natives, it represented very little real political power in a forty-person legislature, especially since most Natives living in remote settlements away from Southeastern Alaska were not generally aware of it. Their children were enrolled in schools as they were established, but most adult villagers had little formal education and, by and large, were not concerned about elections and the operations of territorial government. Their concerns instead were to continue to live on the land as they had for generations.\textsuperscript{158}

The significance of ANB, and of William Paul's focus on the right to vote for Alaska Natives, has at least two major implications relevant to this discussion. First, is the early realization on the part of Alaska Natives, at least those in

\textsuperscript{158}Robert Arnold, 85.
Southeast Alaska, that the legal/legislative process was the only viable vehicle for resolution of Native/White conflicts. The second is, that education—in the Western sense, not the Native one—was the key to accomplishing the first goal.

In 1920, the Alaska Native Brotherhood, under the direction of William L. Paul and his brother Louis F. Paul, focused its attention on the issues of equal rights for Natives. The Pauls sought to place Natives in control of their own lives with the abolition of the separate school system in Alaska being viewed as a major means to bring such a goal to fruition. This, then, became the primary issue of the 1920s.159

By the 1930’s, the issue of recognition by the federal government of Native land claims was of primary importance as more non-Natives moved into Southeastern Alaska and, as such, presented a growing threat to the Native way of life. Specifically, the issues were land and resources (timber and fishing rights). ANB’s response to these threats was to pursue legislative and legal means of resolution. In 1935, with ANB backing, Alaska’s Congressional delegate Anthony Diamond secured passage of the Tlingit-Haida Jurisdictional Act authorizing a Native suit before the U.S. Court of Claims to determine what lands the Tlingits and Haidas were entitled to due to their ownership at the time of purchase. The next year (1936), in part because of ANB backing, the New Deal Indian Reorganization Act was extended to Alaska.160 These events and activities set the legal and legislative stage for ANB to sponsor the establishment of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska Organization, the group filing suit against the federal

government in the U.S. Court of Claims over timber sales within the Tongass National Forest—a suit which was not settled until 1959.161

ANB's leadership changed by 1940. Frank Petrovich of Klawock and Andrew Hope of Sitka were significant not only within ANB's leadership but also in the Alaska Territorial Legislature. They were elected first to seats in the House and later the Senate from which they worked to improve the status of Alaska Natives for more than a decade.162

World War II brought into focus the first real threat to land holdings of Alaska Natives as the U.S. government built military bases in various parts of what had been rural and largely un-threatened areas of the state. Alaska's strategic location was of enough importance for the U.S. to build the first overland road, the Alaska/Canadian Highway. This road linked the territory to the contiguous states and allowed for the transportation of material and personnel to the interior regions of Alaska.

The war focused the nation's attentions on external issues, which meant that the Indian policy of the New Deal largely fell by the wayside. The termination policies of the post World War II era manifested issues in Alaska, such as the opening of the Tongass National Forest in Southeastern Alaska for logging in 1949. ANB fought the opening in court as well as in the U.S. Congress without success. Congress considered a number of anti-, or at least non-supportive, bills directed at and posing threats to Native rights. In addition to the logging of the


Tongass National Forest, Congress considered a bill which would have limited the number of fish traps permitted in Alaskan waters. On its face, this would be a positive measure; however, it would actually legitimize a practice which was detrimental to Native fishing. Congress also attempted to prevent the Secretary of the Interior from establishing Indian reservations in Alaska which would have provided some measure of protection to Native lands and resource rights.\(^{163}\)

Finally, during the same period, Alaska's Congressional Delegate, E.L. 'Bob' Bartlett, introduced statehood legislation which posed a clear threat to Native land rights. ANB fought these issues in court as well as in political circles and legislative halls with mixed results. The significance of these events, as Haycox has noted, is in the increased political, legal, and organizational experiences gained through relations with the federal government. The interactions allowed the development of a level of sophistication on the part of the ANB leadership, a sophistication not as yet present in other regions of Alaska.\(^{164}\) The ANB leadership experience would prove to be a significant factor when, in 1966, the Alaska Federation of Natives was founded in response to the growing threat from the State of Alaska to Native land and resources. Tlingit and Haida leaders contributed significantly to the successful organizational development of AFN and the settlement of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971.\(^{165}\)

4.3.2 The Inupiat Patriot

The decade of the 1960's brought a new threat to Native land rights and cultural survival. Whereas Southeastern Alaska had a steadily increasing White population and accompanying economic development from purchase onward, the

\(^{164}\)Ibid.
more remote regions of Alaska, that is, the Interior and the North Slope, had had limited white populations until after World War II; thus, the Alaska Natives of these regions had no real perception of that threat to their land. The militarization of Alaska during the 1940's and 1950's brought, for the first time, a substantial and permanent White population to regions of the state which had had only limited White populations prior to World War II and the subsequent Cold War. By 1960, Alaska Natives made up about one-fifth of the total population of the state.\footnote{166} The White population was concentrated in half a dozen cities (predominantly Juneau, Ketchikan, Anchorage, and Fairbanks) and the majority of the Native population lived in one or another of the 250 plus villages scattered throughout the state.\footnote{167}

With the Cold War came the period of fear and fascination with nuclear power. In 1957, the Atomic Energy Commission conceived and attempted to promote an "excavation application" through the use of atomic and hydrogen explosives.\footnote{168} The goal of the project, "Project Chariot," was to create a deep water port at the mouth of Ogotoruk Creek, 110 miles north of the Arctic Circle, by exploding two, one-megaton and two, two hundred kiloton bombs. Each of the smaller bombs were ten times more powerful than the bomb dropped on Hiroshima.

Without consulting the Eskimos living in the area (approximately 700 people living in the three villages of Point Hope, Kivalina, and Noatak\footnote{169}), in 1958 the Bureau of Land Management licensed the Atomic Energy Commission to

\footnote{166}{In contrast, Alaska Natives made up fifty percent of the territorial population in 1930. See Angie Debo, \textit{A History of the Indians of the United States}, 387.}
\footnote{167}{Arnold, 94.}
\footnote{168}{Peter Coates, "Project Chariot: Alaskan Roots of Environmentalism," in \textit{Alaska History} 4, 2 (Fall 1989), 1-32.}
\footnote{169}{Debo, 388.}
use 1,600 square miles of land around Cape Thompson, south of Point Hope, as the experimental test site. Dr. Edward Teller, the "father of the hydrogen bomb," traveled to Alaska, making speeches in Juneau, Anchorage, and Fairbanks in an attempt to build support for the project by assuring his audiences that the fledgling state would receive multi-millions of dollars in federal funds, and further that the creation of a deep water port would provide a means of developing and transporting to market mineral deposits thought to be available along the Arctic coast of Alaska.\textsuperscript{170} Dr. Teller and his associates from the AEC and the University of California's Lawrence Radiation Laboratory were successful in gaining the support of C.W. Snedden, publisher of the Fairbanks \textit{Daily News-Miner}, the state's Chamber of Commerce, and notably the University of Alaska's president, Dr. William R. Wood, newly arrived from the state of Nevada—a state with some history of its own concerning nuclear testing.\textsuperscript{171}

When officials of the AEC held a meeting in March of 1960 with the Village Council in Point Hope,\textsuperscript{172} the commission officials assured the villagers that "[there would not be] any danger to anyone" as a result of the explosions.\textsuperscript{173} At the heart of the issue from the Native perspective was the possible destruction of and/or contamination of fish, migratory fowl, and caribou, which were and remain a part of traditional subsistence lifestyle for these people. Also of concern was the loss of the land, in the Native world view inseparable from the effects on fish and animal life. In an attempt to avoid possible litigation, the AEC promised to compensate for any possible damages, personal or property. Not surprisingly, the

\textsuperscript{170}Norman Chance, \textit{The Inupiat and Arctic Alaska: An Ethnography of Development} (Fort Worth: Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1990), 143.
\textsuperscript{171}Peter Coates, 5-12.
\textsuperscript{172}Angie Debo, 388.
AEC's assurances that Project Chariot would not be hazardous to the Inupiat people or their subsistence lifestyle were unanimously rejected by the Village Council.174

As the controversy surrounding Project Chariot continued, further north another threat to Native culture was unfolding in Point Barrow. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the Department of the Interior was ordered by the Secretary of the Interior to enforce the 1916 Migratory Bird Treaty. The Migratory Bird Treaty forbade the hunting of ducks and other migratory birds from March to September, the time when most are nesting, which corresponds exactly to the period in which these migratory birds are present on the North Slope of Alaska, and thus contradicts traditional subsistence hunting cycles.175 It is of interest to note that the Treaty, although ostensibly in place for almost fifty years, was not enforced in Alaska until Native peoples began to question the authority, right, and intent of the policies concerning Native land rights of the Department of the Interior. This is the same federal agency which had approved the land transferred for Project Chariot and would oversee the selection and

174 Howard Rock, Editorial, *Tundra Times*, 1 (November 1962). Howard Rock, an Inupiat artist born in Point Hope, became the spokesperson for the Village of Point Hope. With the financial backing of Dr. Henry S. Forbes of the Association of American Indian Affairs (AAIA) Board of Directors, Rock founded the *Tundra Times*, a Native newspaper offering a Native perspective on issues concerning Native people. The first edition came off the presses on 1 October 1962, and the paper remains in operation to this day. The masthead of the first edition carried the names of two Native organizations—the Tanana Chiefs Conference representing Athabascan Indians and the Inupiat Patriot representing the Inupiat Eskimo. Later that same year the other three Native groupings represented in the state were added to the masthead: Tlingits, Haidas, and Aleuts. (See Debo, 396)

175 As a result of the Secretary’s order, on 31 May 1961, John Nusinginya, an Inupiat member of the Alaska State Legislature, was arrested by a federal warden for hunting eider ducks out of season. After a village meeting called to discuss the issue, 300 Inupiat residents of Barrow showed up to present the warden with 138 eider ducks and signed statements from each hunter that the ducks had been taken by them out of season.

For details of this infamous event, see Chance, 1990; Debo, 1988; Arnold, 1978; and Coates, 1989.
transfer of 103 million acres of land from the federal government to the State of Alaska as a consequence of the Statehood Act of 1959. The agency also was charged with managing Native American trust lands and, therefore, had competing interests and demands to try to balance. When the history of the Department's management of Native American lands is examined closely, it is all too obvious that the scales used in such instances have been weighted heavily against Native rights and interests.176 It is not unreasonable to suspect that these same scales were used in the Alaska case, and the reactions by Native peoples to Departmental initiatives indicate that they shared this perception.

As a result of the increasing threats to land and culture, and with funds obtained from the national Association on American Indian Affairs (AAIA), a meeting was held in Barrow in 1961. Yup'ik Eskimos from Southwest Alaska and Inupiat Eskimos from the Northwest Coast and the North Slope came together and agreed to undertake a focused political action program designed to address the growing threats. The Inupiat Patriot (Peoples' Heritage) thus was formed and became the first political organization in Arctic Alaska, with regional membership and regional concerns. Their common focus was the protection of aboriginal land rights.177

In March of 1961 the villagers of Point Hope sent a letter to President John F. Kennedy asking that Project Chariot be canceled and that the 1,600 square miles be restored to their previous status, that is, the public domain. Newly appointed Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, who had a good Indian legislative record


as a representative from Arizona, and Assistant Secretary John A. Carver, who had an interest in Native American issues, also were interested in having the status of the land withdrawal reviewed. On May 29, 1963, under growing pressure, the AEC withdrew its land use permit and the land was restored to the public domain on September 2, 1963.

In a similar move, the people of Point Barrow petitioned President Kennedy for an exception to the Migratory Bird Treaty, so as to allow them to legally harvest a traditional food source. It was then that Alaska U. S. Senator E.L. ‘Bob’ Bartlett began to show concerns over Alaska Native problems. With his assistance, as well as that of Secretary Udall, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife was put in check. The charges against Nusinginya and the other 138 hunters were dropped and the traditional harvests continued.

4.3.3 The Tanana Chiefs Conference

The North Slope and Coastal regions of Alaska were not the only regions in which threats to land and livelihood were presenting themselves. In the interior of the state, the construction of a massive dam was being proposed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Rampart Canyon Dam and Reservoir Project was initiated in 1962 to create a lake "greater than Lake Erie or the State of New Jersey at a cost of several billion dollars."

Construction of the dam across the Yukon River would have flooded 1,648 square miles of hunting, fishing, and trapping lands, displaced an approximate

178Debo, 383. See also Coates, 17; Chance, 147.
179Coates, 17. For a brief review of the events leading to the withdrawal of the proposal see Peter Coates, "Project Chariot: Alaskan Roots of Environmentalism," Alaska History 4, 2 (Fall 1989), 1-32.
180Arnold, 95; Debo, 393; Chance, 147.
1,200 Athabascan Indians, and destroyed 24 Interior villages. Like Project Chariot, the Rampart Dam proposal enjoyed widespread support from Alaska's federal and state senators and representatives, large private contractors, urban mayors, owners of urban newspapers, and the administration of the University of Alaska.182

In conjunction with and preceding the Rampart Dam Project, the state land selections mandated in the Statehood Act of 1959 were becoming increasingly ominous. While the statehood legislation acknowledged the rights of Natives to lands they used and occupied, each selection withdrawn by the state meant that more Native lands were jeopardized across the state. One needs only to recall that Natives held clear title to just two small reservations in Alaska at the time. Therefore, the potential for massive displacement and/or land loss loomed larger in Native villages across the state. By 1963 Alaska Natives had filed a thousand petitions with Interior Secretary Udall, calling upon him to implement a land freeze on all land transfers from the federal government to the state until such time as the Native claims and rights had been clarified.183

An historic meeting took place in the Yukon River Village of Tanana on June 24-26, 1962. Having heard of the proposed dam project, village elders and leaders from the Interior villages met to discuss the threat and outline possible courses of action.184 Alfred Ketzler, chief of Nenana, served as chairman. The incipient threat of ongoing state land selections and the immediate threat of the Rampart Dam served as catalysts for the creation of the Tanana Chiefs Conference (TCC) (Dená Nená Henash).185

182Arnold, 100-103.
183Chance, 148.
184Debo, 394; Arnold, 102-103.
185Personal communication with Alfred Ketzler, Fairbanks, 1991.
TCC was the historic successor to the traditional consultative and governing assembly of the Athabascan peoples of Interior Alaska that dated from 1912. While the modern TCC (which is a non-profit regional social service organization incorporated after the 1971 passage of the Alaska Native Settlement Act) had its origins in the 1959 threat posed by statehood, the first meeting of the Chiefs was also a result of threats to the land. The continuing migration of Whites into the Interior of Alaska, and the subsequent plan to construct a railroad from Anchorage to Fairbanks,186 had led to the first Tanana Chiefs Conference devoted solely to Native land rights. It was held in Fairbanks in July of 1915. Judge James Wickersham, Alaska's delegate to Congress, called the meeting. Of the fourteen people in attendance, six were traditional chiefs. Their concern was best expressed by Chief Alexander of Tolavana, who asked Wickersham to “not let the White people come near us. Let us live our own lives in the customs we know.”187

The 1915 conference proved to be ineffective, as the railroad was constructed and opened the Interior to further white migration and resource extraction—primarily in the area of gold mining.188 However, the 1962 Tanana meeting proved to be valuable. Ketzler was among the first of the Alaska Native leaders to propose Congressional actions to save the land for Native peoples, as opposed to the earlier attempts to use the courts. Additionally, the meeting made it clear to all those in attendance that the threats were of concern to all Alaska Natives, not just to individual groups or villages. This meeting is credited with

188Arnold, 81.
providing the basis for the Native request to Secretary Udall to freeze the land, as well as being the genesis of the Alaska Federation of Natives.\textsuperscript{189}

The organization of Tanana Chiefs, in combination with the publishing of village protests to the Rampart Dam Project by the \textit{Tundra Times}, apparently stimulated the Department of the Interior to do a study of the issues. The result was the cancellation of the project, as there was found to be no market for the electricity that the dam would generate. It was also found that the project would destroy the habitat of moose and migratory fowl. As Debo points out, however, no mention was made of the "habitat and nesting grounds of the Indians"\textsuperscript{190} which would be lost should the project have been built.

Alaska’s Congressional Delegation was not of one mind when it came to the issue of Native lands. Senator Ernest Gruening was of the opinion that the matter be referred to the U.S. Court of Claims for adjudication. Senator Bartlett, however, felt that the state land selection and transfer should proceed without awaiting clarification of the Native claims, and his position was the more representative of the state leadership.\textsuperscript{191}

By 1962 the number of regional Native organizations in Alaska had grown to five, with the addition of the Fairbanks Native Association (1960) and the Association of Village Council Presidents (1962). This still left many regions and Native people of the state unorganized (in the Western sense). The great distances, the lack of communication, and the extremely high cost of travel severely hampered contact among the various regions. Also, age-old ethnic rivalries bred distrust, as State Senator Eben Hopson of Barrow stated in a letter that Howard Rock printed, in part, in the \textit{Tundra Times}:

\begin{itemize}
\item [\textsuperscript{189}]Arnold, 102.
\item [\textsuperscript{190}]Debo, 397.
\item [\textsuperscript{191}]This is my liberal interpretation of Chance’s observations concerning this issue. See Chance, 149.
\end{itemize}
... I can just picture you and a handful of other Eskimos sitting at a conference table with a full battery of the members of the Alaska Native Brotherhood, and being voted down on every proposal you might have.192

4.3.4 The Alaska Federation of Natives: A Statewide Organization

While mistrust and fear clearly existed between the various Native regions, the growing pressures to obtain title to the land were of common concern. As these pressures mounted, Steven V. Hotch of the ANB made a proposal that the various Native associations unite.193

The central element to the organizing of a statewide Native group was that of a common threat of loss of the land base which was overcome, in part, because of events ongoing in the larger society. The decade of the 1960’s saw the beginnings of the recognition that the termination policies of the federal government had only served to further erode the land base of Native Americans and had not brought them into the dominant society in any sense of the term—sociologically, economically, or politically. The noted Native American policy historian, Francis Paul Prucha, suggests that a middle ground was perceived by U.S. government officials, something between the thrust for total assimilation (which was the primary purpose of the termination policies of the 1950’s) and paternalism (or, as Prucha terms it, ward-ship) which had been the hallmark of Indian policy in the early part of the 20th century.194

The Kennedy Administration began an Indian policy reminiscent of the John Collier policies of the 1930’s, inasmuch as it was the position of the Kennedy

192 Howard Rock, Editorial, Tundra Times (March 1963), also reprinted in Arnold, 109.
193 For a full account of this event, see Arnold, 108-112; and Debo, 398.
Administration that only through Indian participation in the administration of programs for them would there be any real hope of raising the living conditions among Native Americans. The 1961 Commission on the Rights, Liberties, and Responsibilities of the American Indian recommended that it was the duty of the U.S. government to assist the Indian peoples in progressing “from their present poverty to a decent standard of living.” It also made recommendations concerning tribal government, Indian health services, and educational programs.195 The Commission’s report, like its 1928 predecessor, the Merrimam Report, believed that only through economic development and Indian participation in the administration of Indian programs could Indian peoples hope to make meaningful achievements.

The focus on poverty and citizen participation began in earnest with the ascension of Lyndon Johnson to the presidency. President Johnson declared War on Poverty in hopes of producing a Great Society. The significance of these national trends for Alaska Natives lies in the manner in which President Johnson chose to implement the various social and economic strategies. Because the Johnson Administration sought to put the money for program operations in the hands of local non-profit organizations (e.g., the community action programs), Native organizations had to be created to enable federal funds to be distributed in Alaska. These funds then provided one major impetus for the creation of organizations ranging from land claims focused organizations to the ultimate formation of the Alaska Federation of Natives. Over the next few years, with funding available from the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity, it was possible for Native leaders to travel and hold meetings to create these organizational

structures leading to the regional and, ultimately, the statewide Native organizations.

Two new regional groups were formed almost immediately, that is, Gwitcha Gwitchin Ginkhye (Yukon Flats People Speak) and the Cook Inlet Native Association. A meeting of the seven existing regional organizations was held later that year, in 1964, in Anchorage. The focus of the meeting was the need for more political activity among Native people and the need to work cooperatively toward the achievement of common goals.

National attention was focused on village housing, poverty, and education in rural Alaska in 1965, which overshadowed the lands issue. Native land rights returned to the forefront as a result of an announcement made by the newly formed Arctic Slope Native Association (ASNA). ASNA filed a claim to 58 million acres of land, representing virtually all the land north of the Brooks Range, based on Aboriginal use and occupancy. The following year, Emil Notti, then president of Cook Inlet Native Association, called a statewide meeting of all seven of the Native organizations, to be held in Anchorage on the ninety-ninth anniversary of the transfer of Alaska from Russia (October 18, 1966). Thus was created the Alaska Federation of Natives.196

The year 1966 saw advances on other fronts for Alaska Natives. In addition to having overcome regional and ethnic distrust, Alaska Natives had begun to exert a political presence. Local and statewide political candidates addressed the three hundred Native delegates at the Anchorage Convention, and AFN’s endorsements are credited with swinging the election of some state and local races. Legislation was also drafted for presentation to the U.S. Congress outlining

196For a detailed and complete reading of these events leading up to and including the creation of AFN, see Arnold, 1978. For a more legal interpretation of these events, see David Case, Alaska Natives and American Laws, 1984
Native demands and requesting that land withdrawals, sales, and leases be halted until a resolution of the Native claims had been reached. In response, Secretary Udall issued the order to freeze the land pending settlement.

The 1966 elections also added seven Alaska Natives to the state legislature. John Sackett of Ruby, Jules Wright of Fairbanks, Willy Hensley of Kotzebue, Carl Moses of Unalaska, Frank See of Hoonah, and John Westdahl of St. Mary's were elected to the state House of Representatives, and Ray Christiansen of Bethel was elected to the state Senate. In a sixty-seat legislative body (comprised of twenty Senate and forty House seats) seven seats represent the possibility of exerting significant influence, especially if those holding those seven seats vote as a bloc. On the house side, six seats were enough to insure the passage or blockage of legislation, particularly when the other fourteen house members represent their own regions (primarily white, urban centers) and party affiliations (Democrats and Republicans). This is not meant to infer that those Native legislators did not also represent regional and geographical differences nor that they were not members of one or the other of the major political parties. However, one needs to bear in mind the overriding reason for this turning to politics: resolution of the land claims. The same universally agreed upon reason for coming together under the AFN banner was the main reason behind the formation of what became the *Bush Caucus*.

The Bush Caucus is a term which is used to refer to those legislators from rural areas (who also happen to be primarily Native) whose beginnings can be traced back to a small group of legislators from Northwest Alaska, who banded together in terms of voting in 1966 to try to assure that the people of the Northwest Coast received equitable funding from the territorial and later the state
government. They called themselves the *Ice Block*\(^{197}\) and while their concerns were regional, the idea of a bloc vote in the legislature (one based on geographical rather than party lines) seemed a workable way to begin to insure that state services and projects would go to rural areas.\(^{198}\) Events elsewhere in the state were forcing Native peoples to develop organizations and strategies to protect their land and lifestyles.

### 4.3.5 The Policy Environment

The national policy environment was significant in relation to what unfolded in Alaska. The mid to late 1960s were turbulent times in the United States. Ethnic groups and social scientists (such as Colman and Jencks) were beginning to question the role of schooling. The promise of social and economic mobility advanced by school promoters had not materialized for many of the nation's people, especially those of color. Still, there were those who believed that education could set right social injustices, specifically President Johnson, who declared war on poverty. Johnson's Community Action Programs targeted low income Americans as the recipients for federal dollars in the hopes that, via such programs as Headstart, these people would pull themselves out of their poverty. As a former educator, Johnson seemed to share in the belief that through education one would or could advance oneself. However, Johnson did not seem to have a great deal of confidence in the American educational establishment if one bears in mind the vehicle(s) he chose for implementing his war on poverty. Johnson program dollars were, for the most part, not designated

---

\(\text{197}\)Major General John Schafer, interview, Anchorage, Alaska, June, 1990.

\(\text{198}\)John Sackett, interview, Fairbanks, August 1990, and Frank Ferguson, interview, Anchorage, October 1990.
for use by the state or local governments. Additionally, educational bureaucracies were also limited in their access to this new source of funding. 199

While public attention in the U.S. was divided between the activities of the militant minorities, the increasing national involvement in the war in Southeast Asia, the growing unrest amongst the nation’s youth and the radicalization of the academy—all of which tended to accentuate differences—the Alaska Native peoples were uniting. Federal funding for Community Action Programs (CAP) had enabled the various regional Alaska Native leaders to travel to other regions and meet other leaders who, they soon learned, had the same or similar concerns. These programs also served as the training ground for a new generation of Native leaders. Through participation in these meetings, which provided access and exposure to policy makers at the state and National level, the Alaska Native leadership gained invaluable experience in the rules of the game, 200 which placed them in a position to further the Native cause in terms that were most intelligible to the non-Native community. 201

The 1966 AFN convention and the success of Native political candidates in the 1966 elections were clear signs that Native peoples were ready and able to come together to meet a common threat, loss of land—a threat that had increased with each and every land withdrawal by the state and with every lease sale. The

199 This is a line of argument advanced by Dr. Harold Silver, in a summer seminar at UBC, SEDS, 1989, from my own notes.

1966 elections also brought a new governor, Walter Hickel, a man committed to development and opposed to the land freeze effected by Secretary Udall. For example, in a letter to Udall (written shortly after taking office), Hickel complained about the freeze, arguing that it denied the state its right to select land under the Statehood Act. Udall responded by reminding the Governor that both the Statehood Act and the Organic Act of 1884 recognized the existence of Native land rights until Congress enacted a settlement.202

The Bureau of Land Management of the U.S. Department of the Interior opened large tracts of land to oil and gas leasing in September of 1966. Native organizations filed protests and Udall announced that all such leases would be held in abeyance pending investigation of the protests.203 Faced with mounting tensions from the White population of the state over the land freeze and the impatience of the oil companies to begin exploration activities on the North Slope, Governor Hickel convened a Land Claims Task Force composed of Native representatives, state officials, and personnel from the Secretary of the Interior’s office. The task force presented its findings and recommendations to the Governor in the spring of 1968. While this version of a just and equitable settlement of Native claims was not acted upon in the Congress, it is nonetheless significant as it marks the recognition by the state government that Alaska Natives were a political force to be contended with if land issues were to be resolved.204

As mentioned previously the decision on the part of Alaska Natives to pursue political resolution as opposed to legal remedies was a major turning point

in the settlement. From 1968 until the final passage of the Claims Act in 1971, a number of bills were introduced in Congress representing the interests of the various parties: the State of Alaska, the U.S. Department of the Interior, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of both houses of Congress, and the Alaska Federation of Natives. Congressional hearings were held every year from 1968 until passage in 1971, into every aspect of the matter in hopes that a solution could be found. But not until 1969, when a major oil field was discovered on the North Slope of Alaska, did there exist sufficient political and economic muscle to push through a settlement.

The 1968 election of President Richard M. Nixon posed a new threat to the Native position on the settlement of claims. Once in office, Nixon would seek to replace Interior Secretary Udall with Alaskan Governor Walter Hickel who had spent the last two years trying to have the freeze lifted. Upon his nomination, Hickel would state, "[w]hat Udall can do by executive order I can undo." This statement proved to be premature. Cabinet nominees require confirmation by the U.S. Senate and, because AFN chose to withhold its endorsement of Hickel given his position on the freeze, Hickel found himself in a situation from which he could only extract himself by agreeing to support the Native position regarding the settlement of claims prior to lifting the freeze. Hickel agreed to continue the freeze until December 1970 and, based on that promise, he obtained the AFN endorsement and was confirmed to the post of Secretary of the Interior. This demonstration of the political acumen of the AFN leadership was an important one. It sent clear messages to the leadership of the state, as well as to those multinational resource companies interested in developing Alaskan resources, that the

205 Ibid., 48.
Native leadership was independent, increasingly strong, and growing in their ability to influence the actions of government in order to advance the interests of the Native community.\textsuperscript{207}

At the heart of the struggle was the matter of control, in a very real sense control of the future survival of many cultures and peoples of the land. The issues centered in four general areas: the amount of land that Alaska Natives would receive; the amount of money that would be received by Alaska Natives for the extinguishment of pending and present claims; whether the state of Alaska would be party to the settlement; and the amount and duration of any royalty payments deriving from the sale of minerals extracted from state and or federal lands. While the state consistently argued against its inclusion in any and all of these issues, the federal government's position, via the Department of the Interior, flip-flopped numerous times. The only consistency to the federal position was to be found in its position that the monetary settlement and land settlement numbers were low. In the end, a compromise was reached which awarded Natives less land than they had sought, 40,000,000 acres as opposed to 60,000,000. There was an increase in the monetary settlement, from the $500,000,000 sought by AFN to $962,500,000, and the State of Alaska was made party to the settlement. A two percent overriding royalty on mineral extraction, in perpetuity, would go to the Native corporations.\textsuperscript{208} In addition, Public Law 92-203 (the ANCSA of 18, December 1971) passed the costs of more than fifty percent of the monetary settlement on to the state, $462,500,000 would come from the Federal Treasury and 500,000,000 dollars from the State of Alaska.

\textsuperscript{207}Ibid., 126-9.

\textsuperscript{208}Alaska Native Land Claims Hearings (HR 3100, HR 7039, HR 7432). 92nd Congress, First Session (Washington D.C.: GOP, 1971.)
At least one student of ANCSA is highly critical of the AFN leadership for its actions immediately following President Nixon's call to the AFN convention in Anchorage (1971) to inform the delegates that he had signed the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

At a time that called for statesmanship [sic] of the highest order, such was almost totally lacking amongst the Native leadership of the day. While the long legislative skirmishes may have required political leadership that was tough, stubborn and somewhat cynical, and indeed, the art of political confrontation was extremely popular all across the nation in the latter 1960s, when the moment of victory arrived, such men did not have the intellectual training and discipline to build the machinery of long-range planning and close association that was then required. The traditional philosophers and intellectuals of the village and regional peoples were set aside during the long, drawn-out political fight for the settlement. The leadership that evolved and was in power by 1971 was, by and large, made up of young, vigorous and aggressive men who had gained a taste for power through their association with attorneys of stature and high government officials both within the state and in Washington D.C. The older men of the villages, who traditionally contributed a steadying influence in the people's affairs, were not consulted and were almost totally ignored in the end.209

While Jacquot's point concerning the lack of inclusion of the elders in the actual negotiations of the settlement is valid, he fails to grasp the significance of the transformation in Native/non-Native relations. This settlement was fought out in a Western political arena, not a traditional one. Therefore, for the most part, Elders were not well equipped to participate in such settings. Rather, the education and experience that these younger leaders had acquired by serving on boards of directors, in the state legislature, and through the creation and operation of various not-for-profit corporations, made the settlement possible. Understanding the split which occurred requires consideration that AFN was an entity created, in large part, to enable the federal government to negotiate with a single body rather than with each and every village. Given the diversity of

cultures and needs across villages, it is understandable that tensions existed within the Federation, and that upon settlement that these tensions should erupt into regional confrontations over specific clauses within the Act. Provision of higher education focused on Alaska Native needs became the major issue during the decades of the 1970s and 1980s. It is to this issue that we turn in the next chapter.

4.4 Summary

This chapter discussed the relationship between economy and education and subsequent consequences for Alaska Native higher education. The relationship between Western interests in land and resource extraction created the tensions out of which grew the first generation of Alaska Native leaders. These continuing threats to the land base and cultural traditions translated into legislative and legal actions on the part of the Alaska Native leadership. Educational delivery and the provision of culturally appropriate education to Alaska Natives became a major point of conflict between Western and Native leaders. These conflicts set the stage for the rise of the next generation of Alaska Native leadership. The following chapter details continuing conflicts between the University of Alaska and Alaska Native leadership.
CHAPTER V

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA AND THE ALASKA NATIVE LEADERSHIP

5.1 Introduction

In Alaska the development of Native (also called 'Rural') higher education came about within the social and political context of national policy. However, the particular events and circumstances which led to the establishment of rural education by the University of Alaska are distinctly Alaskan. In what follows I shall demonstrate that the University of Alaska made educational provisions for rural residents only after the intervention of the Alaska Native leadership. Specifically, I will focus on the creation of the office of the vice president for rural affairs (REA) within the office of the statewide president, the subsequent dismantling of the REA, and the creation of a division of community colleges, Rural Education and Extension services (CCREE).

5.2 AFN: Internal Organizational Conflict

The Native leadership managed to restructure the Alaska Federation of Natives and have it back on track by October of 1972. The major difference between the pre-and post-1972 AFN is that, after the 1972 restructuring, the power to make decisions and negotiate was moved from the statewide organization

---

210 Generally, 'Rural,' 'Rural Alaska' and 'Bush' or 'Alaska Bush' are accepted as synonymous terms. These terms are used to refer to areas of the state that are not on or contacted by the road system. The majority populations in these areas are Alaska Natives, thus the common understanding is that Rural and/or Bush are terms relating to Native interests or issues.
to the regional, and often to the sub-regional, levels.211 This reorganization was designed to redefine both the structure and functions of the organization. The board of AFN recognized that the needs of Alaska Natives were many and varied, and that services provided to regional corporations, both profit and not-for-profit, would require specialized personnel with expertise in both areas. The solution was to create two boards: one concerned with the for-profit corporate needs and one focused on the human resource needs of the various regions and not-for-profit corporations. It was these human resource needs that motivated AFN to examine the University of Alaska's ability and willingness to provide training to Alaska Natives, and to analyze more closely the role the University played in their education to that point. They found a lack of appropriate programs and seemingly disinterested administration at the University, and as a result, AFN created its own Committee on Higher Education early in 1972. The Committee released a position paper prepared by Louis Jacquot on 16, May 1972, which stated in part that "the development of educational programs that prepared people to live in the bush and the city must be one of the highest institutional priorities of the University."212

The structural realignment and the position papers generated at this time were in response to what occurred at the Alaska Methodist University AFN meeting in December 1971. Following notification at the meeting of President Nixon's signing of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, many protests were made thereby splitting members' positions on matters of organizational structure and policy decisions. This created a context for the reexamination of structural

211 This statement is supported by an analysis of Alaska Native organization that the author undertook in conjunction with his Ford Foundation Leadership Development Grant. Report on file with Ford Foundation New York, 1973.
alignment of the Alaska Federation of Natives statewide organization. A key issue addressed related to the delivery of higher education in relation to Alaska Natives. The terms of the Settlement Act made visible the need for higher education. Leadership recognized that to insure the continued control of the land and resources transferred under the terms of the Settlement Act required the establishment of an appropriate delivery system of higher education for the upcoming generation of Native youths.

From the onset, elders were consulted informally prior to formal meetings by Native Regional corporate leaders. Elders' views and decisions were then represented at formal meetings by the elected Native Regional leadership. An important view held by elders was to allow the younger generation of Native leaders to serve as culture brokers representing their peoples' interests to the Western world. To outside observers, the role of elders may be interpreted as being very Western since elders input was less visible. The role of elders, however, is clearly represented in the following quote by John Sackett.213

. . . because you will be working with your own people's money, their birth right and their settlement and because in many cases, many of the Native people do not know what decisions to make because of a lack of education, this will be the greatest responsibility of leadership.

Jacquot's report to AFNs subcommittee on Higher Education was written in response to the events which occurred at this meeting. In this report he criticized the AFN leadership for being too "Westernized." Specifically he was referring to his perceived exclusion of elders from the decision making process.

Jacquot's interpretations of these events are suspect given his reliance on Gordon's214 description of marginalized leaders as an explanation for the lack of

leadership present in the AFN during this period. The problem is that Gordon studied European immigrants, not Native Americans. Native Americans are not immigrants, nor do they intend to assimilate, a dilemma at the very heart of the problem throughout the history of U.S./Native relations. Furthermore, Gordon suggested that these "marginally ethnic intellectuals" constituted a distinct trans-ethnic subsociety, referring to scholars and intellectuals in the Western sense of that term, that is, University trained persons. Contrary to Jacquot's position, this does not describe the AFN leadership. As Erichman points out, only twenty-four college degrees were granted to Natives from 1895 to 1950, and between 1950 and 1967 only 101 college degrees were attained by Alaska Natives. This point is confirmed by Emil Notti, the president of AFN at the time of the split, and the man who structured the reconfiguration of AFN in 1972. This restructure resulted in the division of responsibilities into two boards, The Human Resources Board was responsible for dealing with non-profit social services concerns. The Land Claims Board was charged with attending to regional profit corporations.

The leadership of AFN at this juncture is more readily understood when viewed from the perspective of a Weberian tripartite construct of leadership as an "imperfect and transitional affair." Weber's conceptualization of leadership and organizational behavior allows the external and internal dynamics of development at play during the land claims struggle to be taken into account. As such, the Weberian model better explains the organizational split and the more

215 Ibid., 224-230.
217 Emil Notti interview, Anchorage, Alaska. Oct. 1990. Notti, the first president of AFN, stated that there were only "about fifty college trained Natives in the State in 1966" and that most of the leadership of the regional corporations and AFN had, at best high school and perhaps some vocational training.
dominant roles of the new leadership as opposed to that of the more traditional village elders. Of equal importance, Jacquot's focus does not consider the influence that individual actors may have on shaping the nature and direction of policy, assuming that the environmental constraints are recognized and included in the process of policy formation. These Weberian concepts, of subjective actors and social interaction respectively, provide a more useful model from which to evaluate the nature and direction of the leadership. The Weberian types of authority must be viewed not only in light of the environmental variables which influence the behaviors of key actors, but also in terms of the role of the charismatic leader operating within the policy environment to influence the direction of formulation and implementation. It should also be noted that elders were not excluded from the claims process; indeed, they were utilized very effectively in the course of the public hearings as well as in giving testimony before the U.S. Senate and House. 219

The leadership of AFN was acutely aware of the need for highly trained specialists to run the corporations created under the terms of the settlement and to manage the assets of the corporations (the Act granted to the Native corporations the title to both surface and sub-surface mineral rights). Due to the efforts of William Paul and other Native legislators, the territorial legislature had recognized the need to provide support for Alaska Native students with their passage of an Act in 1955 authorizing the University of Alaska to make available up to ten scholarships (in the form of free room and board) per year to Alaska Native students. 220 The Act had been repealed in 1968 and replaced with a more general type of scholarship program, more general in the sense that Alaska


220 The legislation was 140 SLA 1955.
Native students were no longer targeted as being in special need of financial assistance.221 The Act now provided for the University administration to determine to whom this aid would be given. One year later the Alaska Native members of the state legislature again acted to bring to the attention of the University of Alaska administration the need for support of Alaska Native students. The passage of House Concurrent Resolution Number 56 (1969) instructed the University of Alaska to develop and institute a plan that would assist Alaska Native students in their pursuit of higher education and which would provide support to Native students, not only in terms of economics, but also in terms of academic and social areas.

5.3 Alaska Native Human Resource Development Program

The University of Alaska’s involvement in rural education at the beginning of the 1970s was confined primarily to the fifteen sites of the Cooperative Extension Service. These sites were in areas of the state which were either sites of non-Native economic activity (such as commercial fishing) or locations which had national defense-related significance (such as early warning radar sites or actual military installations). The educational offerings at these sites tended to be concentrated on continuing education courses, self-improvement, and agricultural areas.222

The average rural education student of this period was thirty years old, worked full time, and pursued an undergraduate degree on a part-time basis, 93% taking seven credit hours or less per semester. There were, of course, regional differences in the student bodies. On Adak, for instance, 60% of the students were

221112 SLA.
Navy personnel, while the other 40% were dependents or residents involved in services related to the operation of the Naval base. At the Delta/Greely center, 44% of the students were military with 56% coming from the communities. However, at Ft. Yukon the enrollment was 85% Native, with 65% of the students engaged in non-degree, job-related skill development.\(^{223}\)

The response of the University was the creation of SOS (Student Orientation Services).\(^{224}\) It needs to be acknowledged that there was a program for Native students at UAF which operated from 1963 until 1967. The College Orientation Program for Alaska Natives (COPAN) was a summer enrichment program funded by the federal government which sought to increase the level of proficiency of Alaska Native students in their use of the English language, both written and verbal. This pilot program was the creation of Lee Salisbury, a professor of English at UAF, who was looking into ways of reducing the Native student dropout rate. He came to believe that one means to do so was to operate programs that were sensitive to Native needs. COPAN only operated as long as the federal government provided funding, and in 1967, without support from the University, the program closed. Its impact was such that it would become the basis upon which a new state sponsored program would be built. SOS had rather humble beginnings for a program which targeted the problem of Native dropouts as its primary purpose and which was created as the result of legislative action. The legislature acknowledged the problem of high Native attrition at the University

---

\(^{223}\)Ibid., 27.

\(^{224}\) The University archives, the Board of Regents minutes and the University Presidential records were reviewed in order to ascertain whether or not there was any institutional support for this program and/or for the creation of its successor (SOS). Except in the case of an unfavorable reaction to the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 56, no mention of either was found, thus, offering persuasive evidence that while supporters amongst the faculty for Native programs undoubtedly existed, there was no support at the highest levels of the University system at this point in time.
when it mandated in 1921 the University to take steps to correct the situation, citing Salisbury's program report:

The period of highest Native student dropout occurs, typically, during the freshman year. If social and academic supports, such as COPAN has provided, were available to students who need them during this critical period, the attrition rate would decrease.225

Unfortunately, the legislature failed to provide the University additional funding to implement the program. The solution came by way of private funding. Three oil companies donated the funds sufficient to support a single counselor and a half-time secretary.226 SOS also formed a Native student advisory council which served as the liaison between the Native students and the University.227 By 1971, SOS had increased (because of funding made available by the Bush Caucus) in size (staffing) to the point that it had three full-time and five part-time student counselors:

The counseling services affected through SOS are in most cases centered around here-and-now problems the student might have. Some students do seek rather continued advice and assistance on continuing problems but for the most part the students are seeking

226Ibid., 2. It is important to note that the oil companies had just paid 900 million dollars for leases to the state of Alaska for the right to develop oil reserves on the North Slope of Alaska's Brooks Range and that they (the oil companies) were engaged in a lawsuit in which they sought to prevent the Arctic Slope Native Corporation from forming a Borough. The issue was one of taxation. Should the Arctic Slope become a Borough with the powers of taxation, the oil companies would have to negotiate directly with the inhabitants of the area they sought to develop. Eventually the courts ruled in favor of the residents of the North Slope. Therefore, one could infer from the actions of the oil companies in court that they were not supportive of Native rights; on the other hand, one could assume that these same oil companies were indeed supportive of Native peoples as they came in aid of the University in terms of providing funds for SOS. My view is that the oil companies sought to improve their political image in the Native regions, the University, and possibly the legislative arena by their actions. For a description of the events surrounding the law suit, see Gerald A. McBeath, North Slope Borough Government and Policy making (Anchorage: Institute of Social and Economic Research, 1981).
solutions to immediate difficulties. Many of the problems are of a bureaucratic or "red tape" nature.228

SOS's 1971 Progress Report notes that one of their chief problems in the program centered around the counseling staff. Not only were these counselors non-Native, they were frequently unaware of the academic standing of the Native students in their charge. The tutorial service, paid out of the program budget increase (FY 1972) resulting from legislative appropriations, proved to be less than satisfactory:

A student can fall hopelessly behind while at the same time, during formal contacts with his/her counselors, appear to be having no problems. Many times it was found that the tutor's sole motivation was strictly monetary and he [or she] viewed SOS as a soft touch.229

SOS seems to have had mixed results in the area of academic achievement according to the perceptions of the faculty most directly involved. Members of the English department cited as the major criticism the difficulty of most Native students in word usage, study habits, and motivation. At the same time, these instructors argued that the greatest successes were encountered when members of the English department taught the freshmen level courses in conjunction with those in biology and history. The report states that student grades stabilized, and in some cases improved, in all three areas.230

In the twenty-two years since SOS's creation, its mission has not changed. The program is still in operation, housed on the fifth floor of the Gruening Building on the UAF campus. The program still provides basic tutorial and academic support for Native students on campus. The results are still viewed as mixed, but the program has now been institutionalized and all incoming Native

---

228 Ibid., 7.
229 Ibid., 9.
230 Ibid., 15.
students are routinely routed to SOS upon acceptance to the University. During the University restructuring in 1985, the name was changed to Rural Student Services (RSS). Among some Native leaders there existed resentment concerning the acronym SOS as it conveyed the sense that Native students were in trouble and, as such, in need of special help.

In July of 1971 the Alaska Federation of Natives initiated a program similar to that of SOS. The Alaska Student Higher Education Services (ASHES), funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was designed to coordinate all special services for Native students and was initially implemented at the two non-public universities in Alaska (Sheldon Jackson College and Alaska Methodist University) as well as at the University of Alaska. Operated under the auspices of the Alaska Federation of Natives, the program’s dual focus was to unify the operation of Upward Bound (a post-high school summer enrichment program for rural students of at least junior class standing) and Educational Talent Search (a statewide college recruiting operation). As is the case with most first-year operations, in 1971 ASHES was a fairly loosely controlled operation, but by 1972 AFN had appointed a board and was more closely monitoring the use of ASHES’s personnel and budget in order to insure compliance with the grant as written. Furthermore, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) had been signed

---

232 As a member of the first ASHES employees, this statement comes from my personal records and recollections.

AFN used the services of the educational field staff for a variety of organizational purposes outside the scope of the Federal grant; i.e., we frequently provided advice to village councils on matters pertaining to Land Claims, such as the pros and cons of becoming an IRA and the benefits and liabilities of incorporating as a municipality—a strong push was on in 1970-1971 by the state of Alaska to have villages incorporate, and the AFN position was not to do so, pending settlement of the Act.
into law and the leadership of AFN was acutely aware of the need to locate and train potential Native talent so as to implement the Settlement.

A statewide director for ASHES was hired and the following goals were set forth:

1. orientation, by field recruiting and on-campus seminars
2. counseling on academic and personal matters of concern to students
3. tutorial support services
4. curriculum development by providing multi-cultural and community relevant materials
5. institutional change by suggesting reforms “to make higher education relevant to the needs of Alaska Natives.”233

The need for AFN to pursue a program such as ASHES was based on the common belief amongst Native leaders in 1970-71 that the University of Alaska had failed to actively recruit rural students.234 Additionally, there was a great benefit in having six counselors (this was the initial number of field counselors employed under the ASHES grant) traveling around the state spreading the word on behalf of the AFN leadership. These field counselors became the conduit through which information flowed to and from the villages, thus enabling AFN to plan and build for the future, and deal with the day-to-day problems existing in a state that spanned five time zones.

ASHES, while it worked with and tried to coordinate the various Native student services on the campuses, was ultimately an AFN program staffed and operated by Native peoples for Native peoples. It was not an extension of the University and, in fact, was frequently at odds with the non-Native staff who comprised the majority of University personnel and with whom the ASHES staff had to deal on behalf of the Native students.


234 I was a member of the AFN/ASHES field staff at this point in time (during the directorship of Kelly Simmeonoff, of Kodiak). This issue was discussed at staff meetings in Anchorage.
The need for trained Native leaders to manage the affairs of the profit and not-for-profit corporations mandated in the terms of the ANCSA was of extreme importance to the Native peoples. Regarding establishment of programs and courses to meet those needs, the University was seen to be so unresponsive by the AFN leadership that a council was formed to address the issue of rural education, and private funding was sought for the development of such programs.

On November 20, 1972, Larry Merculieff, representing Alaska Native Foundation (ANF) interests, Dr. Frank Darnell, director of the Center for Northern Educational Research (UAF), and Dr. James Matthews, director of the Cooperative Extension Service (UAF) met with a representative of the Kellogg Foundation, Dr. Gary King, to write a grant that would "develop Native leadership and human resources, based on the expressed needs of the Native community and to attempt to initiate institutional change to allow for academic certification of informal educational experiences."^235 Kellogg awarded a major contract to the University of Alaska and the Alaska Native Foundation at the conclusion of this meeting.

The grant established the Policy Council of the Alaska Native Human Resource Development Program (ANHRDP)^236 which was, until 1994, a marriage of convenience between the University and the ANF. Its first year of operation was not viewed by University President Dr. Robert Hiatt as a particularly productive one. As the first ANHRD director points out in his cover letter to Kellogg, "most rural Native people have a very negative view of the University of

---


^236 The Council consisted of three Native members, Emil Notti, President of ANF, Roger Lang, president of AFN, and Mitch Dimentieff, vice-president of Tanana Chiefs Conference. Fred Bigjim was later added as a member at-large. The University membership was made up of Dr. Frank Darnell, director of the Center for Northern Educational Research, Dr. Vlc Fisher, director of the Institute of Social and Economic Research, and Dr. Don Dafoe, Vice President of the University of Alaska.
This first year of development, in fact, was a very significant one. Interest in higher education, on the part of AFN/ANF, would ultimately lead to the creation of the Rural Educational Affairs (REA) division within the University, a division which focused on the needs of rural, primarily Native, residents.

It is clear from the above discussion that the Native leadership in Alaska in 1971–72 was concerned with what they perceived as a lack of educational opportunities for Native students, both the Native students attending the University of Alaska and those who chose to remain in rural areas. The Native leaders’ use of legislative and private funding as a vehicle to achieve their goals was clearly a major shift in Native/non-Native policy interaction conducted at the highest levels of the respective organizations. Meetings of the presidents of ANF and AFN with the Vice President of the University, and correspondence between the University President and the ANHRD council suggest that the use of the legislature to enact policy provisions for Native students (SOS, House Concurrent Resolution No. 56) had its desired affect. The University was forced, via the legislature, to make provisions for Native students and began to appreciate the growing political acumen of the Native leadership and its ability to influence state educational policy.

5.4 Seeking Mediation

The need for a cadre of educated leaders in rural Alaska came into sharp focus with the settlement of the Alaska Native Land Claims (ANCSA) in 1971. Not only did ANCSA mandate the creation of regional profit and not-for-profit corporations, it also mandated the establishment of village corporations which

---

were granted title to lands in and around the villages, as well as title to surface mineral rights. Recognizing the need to train personnel who could successfully manage these local, regional, and statewide assets, the leadership of the Alaska Federation of Natives and the Alaska Native Foundation sought funding to establish a leadership training program. In 1971, the Kellogg Foundation provided the funding and forum for the University of Alaska and the Native community to begin to address the long neglected educational needs of rural residents. The Kellogg Foundation awarded a long term grant to the Alaska Native Foundation, this grant was to financially support the training of Native leaders. The program which grew out of this grant was the Alaska Native Human Resource Development Program (ANHRDP). The activities of the Alaska Native Human Resource Development Program have not only been significant, its role in the creation of rural higher education (as well as the growth of the rural community colleges during this period) was, in fact, a driving force.

In an attempt to identify the educational needs of rural Alaska, ANHRDP undertook a landmark investigation to determine what fields of study were important to the Alaska Native peoples and how programs might be structured to maximize the involvement of Native peoples—commonly referred to as the Lisa Rudd study. "The Higher and Adult Education Needs in Rural Alaska" was a structured interview study of fifty-one Native corporate leaders to determine their perceptions of the needs, both in terms of type and location of delivery, for education. The study was funded by Kellogg and jointly administered by the University of Alaska and the Alaska Native Foundation.238

The study itself was important as it clearly established an understanding on the part of the Native leadership that education was an essential aspect in determining the success or failure of managing the assets of the various regions. Another benefit of the study was the increasing awareness of higher and adult education needs among the rest of the Native leadership. The level of awareness and concern varied widely among the leadership, especially on the regional and village levels. While some of the leadership had given considerable thought to the issue (such as Doyon and the Arctic Slope regional corporations which were in the planning stages of establishing their own colleges), others (such as Calista and Koniag) were developing working relationships with the University's community colleges. Still others were more focused on gaining control of the elementary and secondary schools. Finally, there were corporations that, while aware of the need for higher education and training for their employees, were focused on other more pressing and immediate concerns. 239

The study's findings, while of no surprise to the Native community, seemed to leave the university at a loss. The overwhelming interest documented in the study in vocational skills development, as opposed to the degree-oriented programs, reflected not only a response to the demands of the Settlement Act, but also a basic understanding of what training was needed for cultural survival. Rural Alaska was rapidly changing from a subsistence economy to a cash economy and as such the need to enter wage-based employment was increasing. 240 Therefore, there was a strong interest in training which would lead to a paying job. In fact, "the possibility of a job on completion of the course"

239 Ibid., xi.
and "the possibility of better pay or promotion upon completion of the course" were ranked second and third out of ten suggested factors which might motivate people to take courses.241 Not surprisingly, the two most frequently mentioned needed areas of study were natural resource management and financial management, both of which were obvious responses to the demands of the Settlement Act. The other major theme centered around the issue of local control of the type(s) of education to be offered. This manifested itself in a dichotomous manner. On the one hand, rural residents were asking for skill training that would lead to known job openings and at the same time, they were asking for skills which could be exercised in their home areas. In 1972 these requests created a real dilemma as rural Alaska had little in the way of major construction projects. However, this situation changed rapidly during this decade. Housing, construction, electrification, and communications projects were also on the agenda of the Bush Caucus.242

In general, all members of the Alaska legislature were concerned with the issue of educational opportunity for their constituents. Thus, competition for the limited resources available was further intensified, adding new urban and regional dimensions to the heretofore primarily rural focus. The legislative interest in the University of Alaska was framed in the context of whether or not the University was providing an adequate level of support to the community colleges—prior to 1972 all of these community colleges were located in urban, primarily white communities. In events which followed, the major factor under consideration was separation of the community colleges from the University of Alaska system. This theme of separation has been a recurring one in the

University of Alaska’s history and one which the Native leadership made use of during the latter part of the 1970’s, as discussed in the following section.

5.5 Legislation

During the 1970 legislature, House Bill 701 and Senate Bill 487 were introduced. This House Bill would have created an individual board of regents for each of the community colleges. The colleges would have remained a part of the larger University system, and each college board would have remained under the jurisdiction of the University Board of Regents. The belief was that an alternate form of administration was necessary for the community colleges to survive. Senate Bill 407 would have created a more autonomous community college system headed by a provost. Neither bill reached the floor of either body, yet this was just the beginning of a series of bills which were introduced between 1970 and 1983.

During the interim months between the 1971 and 1972 legislative sessions, the legislature established a committee to examine the function of, and needs for, higher education in the state. The committee hired the consulting firm of McLean and Associates which prepared reports over the course of the next five years and advised the legislature on improving the delivery of post-secondary education. In their first report, submitted in January of 1972, McLean recommended that the administrative structure of the University be retained; however, the report also noted that many Alaskans felt that the University administration was more committed to central campuses than to rural or community colleges.243 McLean recommended that the University statewide

administration allow the community college presidents to set and administer their own policies and procedures.\textsuperscript{244} As a result, the 1972 legislature addressed two pieces of legislation introduced at the request of the Interim Committee on Higher Education. The House Bill 23 simply urged the University administration and Regents to recognize the community colleges as equally important components of the University system, while the second (House Bill 606) contained several provisions designed to upgrade the community colleges within the University hierarchy; for example, originally, the University organizational structure provided for a chancellor of community colleges who, along with three other chancellors (Anchorage, Juneau, and Fairbanks campuses) reported directly to the University system president. This was a provision of the 1962 legislative revision of the 1953 Community College Act; however, it did not begin to operate until the 1982 Board of Regents’ restructuring of the University system. At the same time, the Anchorage Community College president was upgraded to a chancellor and the college to a major administrative unit (MAU), a technical term used to denote organizational status within the University system reserved for four year campuses.

Representative George Holman of Bethel (rural Alaska), a former school teacher turned politician, introduced House Bill (636) during the 1972 session which proposed to separate the community colleges from the University and put them under the State Department of Education. This Bill passed the House but failed to reach the floor of the Senate prior to the close of the session. However, Representative Holman, in an attempt to force the University to address the needs of his rural constituents, held the State’s budget hostage by refusing to report the budget out of the State House Finance Committee for nearly a month until he

\textsuperscript{244}Ibid., 18.
received authorization and funding for the establishment of a community college for Bethel.245

At the beginning of the 1974 legislative session, McLean and Associates submitted a report which again recommended that the organizational structure of the University system be retained as a single governing body under the direction of the Board of Regents.246 In response to the growing pressures from other rural legislators for a community college in their districts, the McLean report also recommended that a minimum criteria be established to insure that no future colleges would be established via legislative mandate and that a commission on post secondary education be created to evaluate the applications of Alaskan communities for community colleges. Also, the report suggested that community college directors be more involved in policy program and budget making.247 The Interim Committee on Higher Education introduced a bill (House Bill 541) which provided for the establishment of community colleges by the Board of Regents through contractual agreement with school districts or municipalities. The bill passed the House but was still in committee in the Senate at the end of the session.

Also in 1974, Senate Bill 239 was introduced. This bill would have established a vice president for rural education and Native affairs. The bill had not made it out of Senate Finance Committee at the end of the 1974 legislative session, but the concept or idea of a policy-level position within the statewide University system was a matter of some importance to the Native leadership and would resurface in the future. In fact, the matter was of such a pressing nature that McLean and Associates produced an additional report in 1974 entitled “Higher Education in Alaska: With Special Reference to the community colleges” which

247Ibid., 206-213.
argued for more local control on the part of the community college presidents and advisory councils.\textsuperscript{248}

In 1975 two bills were introduced (House bill 144 and Senate bill 162). While similar to the 1974 House Bill, the new bills would have created a vice president reporting directly to the University of Alaska statewide president, whose responsibility would have been the administration of the Community colleges. When the bills were introduced, the Interim Committee stated that unless this type of administrative structure was established, a great deal of pressure may be brought to bear on the legislature to separate the community colleges from the University system. The final McLean Report, submitted during the 1976 legislative session, supported this reasoning. The report called for an autonomous community college system within three years, stressing that the community colleges had matured to a point where they could operate on their own. In part, McLean was acknowledging that the legislative representatives, especially those from rural areas, were more than willing and able to insure the creation and growth of Community colleges in their districts (e.g., between 1972 and 1976 three rural community colleges were established by legislative actions—Bethel, Nome and Kotzebue).\textsuperscript{249}

The 1977 session saw the introduction of yet another community college autonomy bill, Senate bill 294 and House bill 410, both of which had several co-sponsors and were functionally the same legislation. The chief sponsor, Senator


Between 1972 and 1976 McLean and Associates conducted and submitted five reports to the Alaska legislature, in Juneau. It is important to note that these reports were commissioned by a political body and should be interpreted accordingly.
Croft of Anchorage, sought to create a separate board of governors that would have authority over a chancellor of the community colleges. These bills relevant to education were not reported out of committees and so died there.

Meanwhile, legislators from primarily urban centers continued to focus their attention and legislative activities on the disparities between the University and community colleges by introducing bills which attempted to separate the community colleges from the statewide University system. Simultaneously, there was growing political pressure from rural legislators for community colleges to be constructed in bush or rural Alaska. Their willingness and ability to use the legislative process to insure that rural Alaska received its fair share is evidenced in the successful actions of Senator Holman in the creation of Bethel Community College in 1972.

Later, similar bills were introduced in 1979, 1981, and 1983 legislative sessions. Like their predecessors, they failed to clear committee. While urban legislators and the University administration were bent on finding a different method of structuring the University system, the Native leadership was focused on the creation of a system of higher education appropriate for, and attuned to, the needs of rural Alaska. In the next section I document the activities of the Native leadership which parallels the legislative period described above.

5.6 Native Leadership: The New Generation

The Alaska Native Human Resource Development Project’s (ANHRDP) policy council had sought to work with the University to create not only an appropriate system for higher educational delivery in rural Alaska, but also one which would

\[250\] The above legislative history is a synopsis of a report prepared by the Community College Interim Committee on Community Colleges: A Report to the Twelfth Alaska State Legislature (Juneau: Alaska State Legislature, February, 1981).
be of utility within the regions to be served. The ANHRDP policy council was established and served as the institutional link to the University. It was viewed, at least from the position of Native leadership, as the linkage at the highest level (the presidents of both the statewide Native organizations were active members of this council). As the reports were generated, such as the Rudd Report described above, they were sent directly to the university statewide administration. Further evidence of this linkage is to be found in the archives of both institutions, as well as written correspondence and communications between the policy council and the statewide university administration. These were addressed to and generally answered by the presidents of the three organizations—AFN, ANF, and the University.

The theme of need for Native leadership training had been raised by every organization doing business in rural Alaska. It was a theme that was successfully used by the Alaska State House of Representatives Finance Committee chairperson, George Holman of Bethel, to secure funding in the Fiscal Year 1972 (FY 72) budget for the Bethel Community College. Prior to that, the University administration had never included a line item for rural Alaska in its budget requests to the state legislature.

By 1974, the Native leadership was convinced that Mitch Demientief’s assessment of the University’s racist posture was correct. Demientief, who was a member of the ANHRDP policy council and president of the Fairbanks based not-

---

251 Needs Assessment Survey (Anchorage: Alaska Native Foundation 13 September 1974), 6. The basis for this statement is the following quote from the report: “People requested courses that related to their needs in their environment instead of the traditional textbook type of approach.”

252 Emil Notti, interview, Anchorage, Alaska 1990. Mr. Notti was the first president of the Alaska Federation of Natives and a driving force behind the policy council.

for-profit Tanana Chiefs Conference, stated between Conference in a letter to the policy council:

It appears that the University of Alaska is beginning to take notice of the need, and that its budget requests will begin to reflect it. But the University is bound by a bad case of institutional racism, and cannot be counted upon to gear up to meet the rural Alaska’s needs for another three years at least... As with all things in the bush, the people of rural Alaska will have to develop their own post secondary educational systems. This has been the experience of the North Slope Borough, and this experience will doubtlessly be repeated many times before the University of Alaska will be willing and able to respond adequately to the needs of rural Alaska for post secondary education.²⁵⁴

The Alaska Native Leadership felt it would be necessary for the Native community to seek alternate means of increasing the University’s awareness of the importance of rural post secondary educational delivery to Native peoples, and to place increased emphasis on the policy agenda of the University statewide administration.²⁵⁵

In addition to the Kuskokwim Community College (established in Bethel in 1972 by legislative action) the Bush Caucus responded to the need for increased rural educational delivery in the villages of Nome (1973) and Kotzebue (1974) by using the legislative authority to issue bonds to financially support the increased

²⁵⁵ Taken from the Minutes of the ANHRD Policy Council, Dated 18 December, 1974. The Policy council passed resolution number 46-74, which in part states, “Whereas the University of Alaska has a responsibility to serve all of the citizens of the state, and whereas all the Alaska Native people have a legitimate claim to resources and efforts of the U. of A; and whereas the ANHRDP is one of several, as yet, unrelated efforts addressing educational and development needs of Alaska Native peoples; and whereas efforts to serve the Alaska Native people should be an integrated effort; therefore be it resolved by the Board of Directors of the ANHRDP that the board support the development of a substantive, coordinated effort to address the needs of Native Alaskan, and the board urges the Academic Development Plan Committee to incorporate explicit recommendations into their plans, which would constitute a clear commitment on the part of the University to address the needs of Alaskan Native citizens; and that this Policy Council provide the Academic Development Plan Committee with further specific recommendations in the future.”
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level of University involvement in rural Alaska. In part, the issuance of the bonds was a means of moving the University administration into a position where it was forced to acknowledge not only the need but also the power of the Native legislators to obtain state services for their constituents in rural Alaska.256 By issuing bonds for the construction of buildings to house post secondary education and by legislatively appropriating the funds to support the personnel and other necessary items, the university was placed in a position of either staffing and operating these new institutions or of offending the Bush legislators and possibly placing the balance of the University’s funding requests at risk during the next legislative session.257

The University, under increasing pressure from the Native Leadership and the press,258 shifted to the belief that the Native requests for rural education could not be satisfied via the Cooperative Extension Service’s sites by simply increasing staffing. The December 18, 1974 minutes of the ANHRDP policy council reflect the growing sense of frustration on the part of the Native leaders when they said “[t]he University has not responded to the needs of the rural Native Alaskans in a satisfactory way.”259

256See interview with former State Senator Frank Furgeson of Kotzebue, 1990. One of the main points of Senator Furgeson is that of attempting to bring parity between urban and rural Alaskans.

257This line of argument is supported by a report from Louis Jacquot, the director of the ANHRD policy council, which in part states, “Most regional leaders, time and time again, very strongly indicate that the higher educational institutions in this state were not listening to them and they had strong doubts if they ever would.” (Anchorage: Alaska Native Foundation Archives, 6 August, 1974).


Two themes were clearly emerging from the Native community: (1) the desire to locally control not only the location of post secondary education delivery, but the content of the educational process as well; and (2) the belief on the part of the Native leadership that, if the AFN/ANF rural education plan was to succeed, a senior policy level position had to be created in the statewide administration, that is, a position at the vice presidential level. With this in mind, the members of the ANHRDP policy council attended University of Alaska President Hiatt’s January 1975 Presidents Council to discuss the plan and seek University support. The University administration formally endorsed the proposal and President Hiatt directed his staff to begin work on its implementation. For their part, AFN/ANF was charged with generating the political support necessary to obtain the funding for this new rural educational component and the legislative strategy. The ANHRDP staff would negotiate between the legislature and the University concerning control of the rural educational programs with the understanding that a strong emphasis would be placed on the needs for regional policy boards rather than boards which were merely advisory.

At first glance, the prognosis for a new educational division focused on rural needs and attention to Native concerns seemed very favorable given the official University position, as outlined above. However, by January 15, 1975, the University vice president, Don Dafoe, began to speak of the difficulties the University was encountering in post secondary rural education and of some of the means it was using to remedy the problems. Some of the problems identified were:

---

260 ANF Memo from Eric Ekvall, Director of ANHRDP to Roger Lang, President of AFN and Emil Notti, President of ANF (Anchorage: Alaska Native Foundation Archives, 20 February 1975).
261 President’s Files (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, 1975). Also see the Tundra Times Fairbanks (10 December 1975).
finding a way to integrate the University into the bush rather than the bush into the University; trying to take conventional courses out into bush Alaska with conventional teachers who soon realized that they were not relating to the villagers nor the villagers to them; offering programs designed to meet the immediate needs of the people rather than the 'off the shelf' courses traditionally found on campus.262 Thus, it would seem that the University administration had, within one month’s time, gone from being totally committed to the AFN/ANF rural education plan to being confused about the most basic elements of that plan. From the beginning, the Native leadership stressed the need for programs that would be of use to the people and had offered a possible design for the delivery of those programs. Moreover, Emil Notti had outlined this to James Matthews in his July 11, 1972 letter, where he stated “[w]e know that the manpower [sic] needs include such disciplines as business management, planning, land management, legal services, etc. I feel the systematic development of college degree programs similar to the one developed in the Headstart program would be of long-term interest to Native people”.263

The sense that the University was not supportive of the rural education proposal was voiced by one of the very few Native faculty members of the University, Dennis Demmert. Demmert, director of the Native Studies Department of the University of Alaska in Fairbanks, spoke of the need to clarify and deal with the University’s failure in meeting Native educational needs. He also spoke of the conflict in philosophy of education between the University and the Alaska Native peoples, which was a means of raising the issue of traditional courses.

263Letter to James Matthews, Director of the Cooperative Extension Service of the University of Alaska, from Emil Notti, President of the Alaska Federation of Natives (Anchorage: Alaska Federation of Native Archives, 11 July 1972).
versus those identified in the Rudd study. While this could be viewed as vocational education versus higher education, that was not the intent of the Native leadership nor of Demmert. He spoke of the ineffectual manner of educational delivery and of the priority given to budgetary considerations over the needs of Native students, an allusion to the view held by many of the University administration that dollars given to rural education would be dollars taken away from other departments on the main campuses and therefore a reduction in programs.264 Finally, he spoke of the decision-making problems, meant as a condemnation of the highly centralized decision-making process of the University administration.265

It seems evident that at least some members of the University statewide administration would have preferred that this issue of rural education would be overshadowed by more pressing Native concerns. However, the efforts of the Native leadership, both regionally and statewide, and especially those of Sam Kito Jr. (a Native member of the Board of Regents), had achieved too much momentum to be stopped. Realizing this, President Hiatt, prior to receiving either legislative or Board of Regents approval for the creation of such office, appointed Dr. Frank Darnell, then the director of the Center for Northern Educational Research, to be acting vice president for Rural Educational Affairs.266

The combination of Native legislative power, the pressure of the Native organizations, the use of the press, and the Native regent managed to secure funding for the construction of a second building in Kotzebue for the community.

264 This line of argument was still being advanced in the University statewide administration, and was still being argued in 1980 when I was assistant to the statewide President Jay Barton (1980-1985).

265 The above interpretations of Dennis Demmert’s remarks are based on conversations with Dr. Demmert as well as the 1990 interview in Fairbanks. He is no longer a member of the University faculty, Fairbanks; currently he is the Executive Director of the SeAlaska Heritage Foundation.

266 President’s Papers (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, 1975).
college and the purchase of additional land and equipment for Nome. The Extension Center in Nome became Northwest Community College, and its first president was appointed in September of 1975. Changes were also occurring in the ANHRDP Policy Council. Eric Ekvall was appointed as acting director of the ANHRDP, replacing Louis Jacquot.267 More importantly, perhaps, was the change in orientation of the Policy Council. The Council recommended that ANHRDP begin to provide more educational experiences for Alaska Natives rather than merely building institutional grant support for the University. Further, it was recommended that the ANHRDP staff continue working with AFN/ANF on the development of a Rural Education plan that was appropriate to the needs of rural Alaska.268

By March of 1975, President Hiatt had come to the realization that he had little choice but to except the Alaska Federation of Natives/Alaska Native Foundation proposal. By then, the proposal had become a set of legislative initiatives that enjoyed widespread support.269 These initiatives mandated the establishment of satellite centers of higher education in rural Alaska and created the office of the vice president of Rural Educational Affairs (REA).270 The distrust of the University on the part of the legislature (especially those

267 Alaska Native Foundation Archives, Minutes of Policy Council, November 1975, Anchorage.
268 Ibid.
269 House Bill 144 and Senate Bill 162. HB 144 established the office of the vice-president for Rural Educational Affairs and SB 162 was the accompanying bill introduced in the Senate. The major difference in the two pieces of legislation is that HB 144 would have made the position the vice-president for community colleges while SB 162 limited the role of the vice-president to that of the Rural Education Division. With the support of the Native leadership, the Senate version of the Bill prevailed during conference committee hearings.
270 As reported in Anchorage Daily Times, 27 (March 1975), “Hiatt told the HESS committee the proposal . . . was ‘one of the most innovative and practical schemes’ he has seen. He indicated the University is willing to cooperate fully if the program wins approval.”
legislators from rural Alaska), was driven home by Senator Holman of Bethel who made his skepticism of the University's support for rural education known during the Senate finance hearing on the University budget when he said: "[t]raditionally the University of Alaska has not been very responsive to rural education needs." 271

The University Board of Regents took formal action in May of 1975 in the form of a resolution of support for the AFN/ANF rural education proposal and the pending legislation which would support this new division and the office of the vice president. The resolution also reaffirmed the University's support of the need for policy making councils as opposed to the traditional advisory councils, to aid the vice president in the formation and administration of the new division. 272

5.8 University Response: Rural Educational Affairs

The Division of Rural Educational Affairs (REA) came into being at the end of 1975. Elaine Ramos, a Tlingit Indian from Southeast Alaska, was appointed as the vice president of REA and began her duties in January of 1976. Ms. Ramos' appointment was not altogether well received by the University community as evidenced in a memorandum from a political science professor questioning Ms. Ramos' qualifications:

My concern, because this is an historic appointment, is that a highly qualified woman be selected. Appointment of a candidate solely because she is a woman or an activist Alaskan Native, not on the basis of her being the best possible candidate for the position, will injure the prospects of all women and minorities in the future, if Ms. Ramos cannot perform her responsibilities. 273

272 University of Alaska Board of Regents Minutes (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, 9 May 1975).
273 A confidential memorandum, from Dr. Andrea Helms (Associate Professor of Political Science, UAF) to Dr. Robert Hiatt, President of the University of Alaska (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, 27 November 1975).
The University administration did not support her hiring.\textsuperscript{274} Indeed, once the position was authorized and a search process well underway, it became clear that the University administration had its own short list of preferred candidates—all of which were male, and only one who was Native—William Demmert, Pat O’Rourke, and Frank Darnell.\textsuperscript{275} Demmert had a posting in Washington D.C. which he chose not to leave. O’Rourke, who at the time was the Director of the Bethel Community College and on administrative leave to obtain his Ph.D., also declined the offer. This left Darnell, who was actually in the position as Acting Vice President for Rural Educational Affairs, and who was the choice of the faculty. However, the mandate from the Bush Caucus and the Native Leadership required that a Native person be hired. The inability of the University administration to fill the position from their own short-list of candidates meant that they had little choice but to offer the job to Ms. Ramos. The level of concern about Ms. Ramos was such that President Hiatt proposed to the Board of Regents that the position not be filled until either Demmert or O’Rourke was available to take it. Hiatt was well aware that he could not move Darnell from the acting position directly into the full-time position as the specter of sexual and racial bias had already been raised as an issue in the hiring for this position.\textsuperscript{276}

The position announcement, which stated that an earned doctorate was a requirement for the position, was at the heart of the matter. The University community was locked into a singular vision of what constituted a senior

\textsuperscript{274}Confidential Memorandum from Dr. Robert Hiatt, President of the University of Alaska, to the University of Alaska Board of Regents referencing the selection of a Vice President for Rural Educational Affairs (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, 17 November 1975).

\textsuperscript{275}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{276}Letter from the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Region X, Seattle, Washington, to Dr. Robert W. Hiatt, President of the University of Alaska (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, 5 September 1975).
administrator, and that vision was one in which the candidate had to have completed and been accepted into the fraternity of higher education—in other words, possessing a Ph.D. While Ms. Ramos had a substantive background in administration—she had been the assistant dean of students at Sheldon Jackson College (1972) prior to her appointment with the University of Alaska—she lacked the required credentials. Her educational training had been in nursing and she had an M.Ed.. More importantly, Ms. Ramos had been very active in the revitalization of Tlingit language, dance, and religion. One of her major personal interests was the Raven Dancers. This was (and remains) a group quite unlike those that non-Native peoples are accustomed to seeing and hearing. From the dress to the spirituality and education embodied in the presentations, the focus is on authenticity. Ms. Ramos was (and remains) deeply committed to the Native world view and this, too, could have contributed to the University's discomfort.277

Dr. Hiatt, given the pressures from the various Native leadership and organizations, was ultimately left no room to maneuver when the Federal Government also became party to the hiring. Responding to a complaint from the AFN, the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare investigated and found that there had been improprieties in the recruitment process ranging from the way the advertisement was written to the circulation, or lack thereof, of the notice of recruitment. At stake for the University was the potential loss of federal research dollars if the University was found to be out of compliance with Title VI


Ms. Ramos is currently the Director of Native Studies at the University of Alaska Anchorage, and is still an activist for Native affairs and students.
Native political pressure was beginning to have an impact on the University's structural alignment for the delivery of rural educational programs. This impact was acknowledged by Mitch Dementiff in his statements that "We have created by our mere presence two new things at the University. . . . There is now an attitude. There is now a department. . . ." Indeed, AFN/ANF could boast the creation of an entirely new division. In fact, prior to Ms. Ramos being installed as vice president, the University administration placed four community colleges (Bethel, Nome, Kotzebue, and Kodiak), the Cooperative Extension Service, and the new legislatively mandated Alaska Native Language Center under the direction of the vice president of Rural Educational Affairs. This structural alignment would prove to be not only a beginning, but also the ultimate undoing, of REA and the vice president. In fact, by December of 1976, problems between the new division and the University administration had escalated to the point that Ms. Ramos was reassigned and the fate of Rural Educational Affairs was again uncertain.

In February of 1976 the ANHRDP Policy Council voted to expand the number of seats on the Council to include the new vice president of Rural Educational Affairs and appointed Elaine Ramos to fill that seat. At that same meeting, concern was expressed that the Council was being viewed (by the University

---

278 Title VI of the United States Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in services to students.

Title IX of the United States Civil Rights Act, Educational Amendments of 1972, prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in educational programs.


280 University of Alaska, President's files (Fairbanks: University of Alaska archives, December 1975).
community and possibly the urban leadership) as an aggressive advocate for Rural Education and perhaps the Council was becoming a bit too political. The general feeling of the members of the Council seemed to have been that they needed to walk a very fine line between advocating and agitating. The Kellogg grant funds had been used to set up and run REA and the grant had been for the development of materials, programs, and processes to better the delivery of rural education. Therefore, there was some basis for concern as far as the possibility of losing the Kellogg funding due to non-compliance should someone raise the question.281

Problems for REA began prior to Ms. Ramos’ arrival, as stated above. The University administration seemed to have not made adequate arrangements for the new vice president. There were problems with office space; indeed, there was none.282 Even though the University had had an acting vice president for REA since 1975 (Darnell, see above), there was no support staff, budget for the division, or any of the customary amenities associated with such a position. Although the least important of these was the University assigned car, the fact was that no car was provided to Ms. Ramos for almost two months,283 and that the University maintained that it could not find the car—the same vehicle that Darnell had been driving for almost a year—is, I believe, indicative of the level of


282 University of Alaska, Internal Memorandum, addressed to Howard Cutler, Chancellor, UAF, from the Fairbanks Campus Space Committee, Subject: Office Space for Central Staff of REA (V.P. Ramos) (Fairbanks: University of Alaska, Archives, 20 April, 1976).

283 Discussions with Elaine Ramos (Anchorage: University of Alaska Archives, March 1990). There are some hand written “notes” from the Executive Vice President (Don Defoe) to President Hiatt, undated, which would support Ms. Ramos’ claim, although the language of the correspondence is vague.
institutional resistance present within the University of Alaska to the entire concept of rural education and, perhaps, to Ms. Ramos, specifically.

While the record seems clear that there was a lack of institutional support for REA, there was continued legislative support. The FY77 budget for REA allocation clearly shows that the Alaska State Legislature was willing to provide the necessary funding to ensure the division had adequate financial support. Table 2 outlines a breakdown of the FY77 REA operating budget exclusive of the community college(s) budgets.

Table 2. Fiscal Year 1977 Operating Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under Regents and Administration:</th>
<th>$75,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for REA, Secretary, and support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under Administration and Institutional Support 284</th>
<th>$325,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under Rural Affairs Extension Centers 285</th>
<th>$873,800</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under Rural Area Centers 286</th>
<th>$750,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The total REA budget, therefore, increased the University's operating base budget by $1,718,800. This number represents all the new money that the legislature had appropriated for the new division in its first full year of

284 New money added to University's operating budget.

285 This was the old public service budget and was reallocated by the legislature, taking $230,000 from the University statewide administration, the University of Alaska Fairbanks administration, and from the University of Alaska Anchorage administration's operating budgets. The intent was to shift not only the management of these rural sites to REA, but to shift the control of the operating budgets as well.

286 New money added to University's operating budget.
There was support from elected officials (State Legislature) for the new division as evidenced by additional appropriations to the University to support the operation of the division.

While issues of budget, staffing and space are usual and customary problem areas in large, complex organizations, Ms. Ramos certainly had more than her fair share. It would seem that a senior administrator should have been able to deal with these problems and, given time, Ms. Ramos might well have been able to do so, but time was running out and other more pressing issues were mounting.

When the division was organized (prior to Ms. Ramos’ arrival), the President had placed the Alaska Native Language Center under the direction of the new vice president as well as ten of the Cooperative Extension Service sites in the state and the four rural community colleges. This meant that the new vice president would need to travel to each of the locations to meet with the advisory boards, the staff, and the community leadership in order to establish a working relationship with each of the communities to be served, as well as to become familiar with the operations of each location. Given the geographical distribution of this new division, the time necessary to accomplish these visits was, or so it seemed to the University president (Dr. Hiatt), occupying too much of the vice president’s time and placing her out of the office far too often. The real issue was not one of whether Ms. Ramos was in the office, on campus, or whether she was at one of the rural sites. The issue here was one of philosophy.

288 President’s Files (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, 1976). There are a series of memos from both Dr. Hiatt and the executive vice president, Dr. Don Defoe, to Ms. Ramos citing her frequent absences from the office. It is quite clear from the tone of these memos that their expectations of the behavior and role of a vice president and Ms. Ramos’ were at odds. The memos start in March of 1976 and continue until Ms. Ramos’ transfer from the vice presidency in November of 1977.
Ms. Ramos was well aware of the rural (i.e., Native) desire for the local boards to be policy boards, as opposed to the University's preference for these boards to remain advisory to the centralized administration housed at UAF, and this situation was further aggravated by the fact that Ms. Ramos was prepared to work with these councils to implement the findings of the Rudd Report.  

A contributing matter was the Alaska Native Language Center's (ANLC) placement within REA. The ANLC was the creation of Dr. Michael Krauss and Dr. Irene Reed, two noted linguists interested in documenting Native languages in Alaska before these languages were lost. In order to insure that the unit had funding to conduct its research, Dr. Krauss spent countless hours in Juneau lobbying the state legislature for funding and in 1974 was successful in his endeavors. It must be noted, however, that the Native leadership was not consulted nor made party to ANLC creation. It is also noteworthy that the Native leadership was not opposed to the creation of the ANLC and, in fact, financially supported Drs. Krauss and Reed through legislative appropriations. Ms. Ramos felt strongly that Alaska Native peoples should receive credit and acknowledgment for their contribution to the documentation, translation and interpretations of the various Native languages. This placed her at odds with Drs. Reed and Krauss, who saw Ms. Ramos (who spoke Tlingit fluently, as her first

---

289 See above for a detailed description of the 'Rudd' report. Basically, the report had identified the educational needs and wishes of the Native leadership for 'practical' training so as to enable the better implementation of the terms of the ANCSA of 1971; these training programs tended to be viewed by the University as vocational rather than academic and, as such, somewhat inappropriate for University offerings.

290 In 1974 the State of Alaska passed the Bi-Lingual/Bi-Cultural Act: This legislation was not substantially different from that passed by other states, in order to receive the federal funds made available for these services.

291 John U. Ogbu, The Next Generation: An Ethnography of Education in an Urban Neighborhood (New York: Academic Press, 1974). Ogbu makes the same observations by arguing that professionals made without the involvement of parents and in many cases the motive for the actions were or could be seen as economic rather than a academic. This would seem to be the case here also.
language) as an unqualified meddler and not an appropriate administrator for their program. The addition of the ANLC staff as critics of Ms. Ramos provided the administration with academic support for the position they had held even prior to her hiring. While Dr. Helms had raised the question of Ms. Ramos' qualification early on in REA's history, the impact of the ANLC comments was far more profound as they came from a unit within REA, and from "professional" staff engaged in scholarly research for the betterment of the academy, if not the Native peoples.

In November (1976), the decision to relieve or reassign Ms. Ramos of the vice presidency of REA had been made. Reasons for her demise fell into four basic categories: (1) that the University administration never believed in the need or legitimacy of REA; (2) that REA competed for legislative funding (with an unfair advantage because of the power of the Bush caucus) for dollars which should have gone to Fairbanks, Anchorage or Juneau; (3) the fact that Ms. Ramos was not a typical University administrator in that she lacked the doctoral degree, was a strong supporter of local control of the educational process, and was a woman; and finally (4) the possibility that Ms. Ramos' vision of what REA should be and should do so frightened the University administration that they saw no other means to deal with this woman but to remove her from the position. Dennis Johnson's August 3, 1977, Tundra Times article "Pressure Politics Do Not Belong In Rural Education," summed up the disappointment felt by the Alaska Native leadership when he wrote that "[t]he University of Alaska's answer to higher

292 Discussions with Elaine Ramos, Anchorage, 1990-1991. This line of argument is also supported by a confidential letter sent the University President by Dr. Reed (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, 21 September, 1977).

293 President's Files, confidential, hand written memo from Clark Gruening (University General Council) to President Hiatt (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, 6 November 1976). Mr. Gruening, assured President Hiatt that, should he desire not to, he need not worry about Ms. Ramos, nor did he have to offer Ms. Ramos another assignment within the institution.
education in Bush Alaska has been the Rural Educational Affairs program, but since it began nearly two years ago, it has been the system's outcast child struggling to survive against the administration's political maneuvers . . . " Ms. Ramos spent her time working with the various boards on matters of policy and allowed the boards to operate as policy making, with herself serving as an advocate for their positions at the institutional level. This was not well received by the administration.

The Rural Educational Affairs division of the University of Alaska was born of political pressures and implanted on the surface of the University structure. It never became a functional part of the University, but rather provided the justification for the University to not provide services to rural Alaska—REA would do it. From the beginning, the University gave little or no support in the areas of budget, fiscal management, staffing or office space, nor did they ever commend the institution for the success of the endeavor. REA was never included in the University's accreditation umbrella and, in most other institutional senses, was left to survive, or not, on its own resources. This might have been appropriate had the University left the division to survive, or not, to the REA'S own resources.

The year 1977 was one of administrative change at the highest levels within the University: President Hiatt resigned in February; Dr. Charles Furgeson was brought from Juneau (UAJ) to serve as acting president until November when Dr. Neil Humphrey became president, and, to the dismay of all, Dr. Humphrey resigned in December. There was such turmoil within the University administration that a sort of paralysis set in. To further add to the University's difficulties, the relationship between the University and the legislature

---

294Discussion with Ms. Ramos, Anchorage, 1990. A number of discussions were held with Ms. Ramos over the 1990-1991 year; I continue to speak with her via telephone and computer mail on a regular basis.
deteriorated to the point where the legislative budget and audit division took
direct control of the University after finding an enormous budgetary shortfall.
The changing administrative mandates left REA and its staff in a state of flux with
very little support for a decisive rural education program since the removal of
Ms. Ramos.

Early in 1977, Ms. Ramos filed a grievance over her removal. This action
kept REA in the press, however in a very negative light. Ms. Ramos lost the
grievance, then later filed a successful lawsuit against the University and
remains an employee of the University as the coordinator of Alaska Native Studies
at the University of Alaska Anchorage. As for the position of vice president of
Rural Educational Affairs, it was downgraded to a vice chancellor level and later
to the level of dean. The division of Rural Affairs was disbanded and became a part
of the Division of Community Colleges and Rural Education and Extension Services,
CREE.

5.9 Summary

This chapter has shown that the locus of control of higher education has
been, and may still be, largely the bastion of Western European culture and
ideology and, as such, has resisted the inclusion of minorities and women. Higher
education has also demonstrated a decidedly non supportive posture as it relates to
the provision of appropriate academic subject matter for these marginalized
groups. In the case of the University of Alaska, there has been a pronounced
pattern of exclusion of services to Rural Alaska Natives even when the funding
for these services is provided to the institution.

Social scientists concerned with policy making in Alaska have argued that
the problem was one of demands of Native leaders being made in an inappropriate
fashion. In his study of the North Slope Borough government, McBeath investigates the nature of formal Western organizations, focusing on the political institutionalization of policy formation, and the degree of responsiveness, adaptiveness, and representativeness displayed by relatively important groups and individuals in the bureaucratic structures located in the decision-making process.\textsuperscript{295} McBeath’s theme of pluralistic bargaining as an appropriate means for Native leaders to articulate their demands for services is a flawed concept as it relates to the demands of the Native leadership to the University. Primarily, this line of reasoning assumes that the University has a differential responsibility to (in this case) Native peoples, and also that Native leaders sought a service that was over and above those services already available to them. In this case, the services were not readily available, nor were the services which were available perceived as appropriate to the needs of the rural residents. Finally, this line of reasoning blames the victim, rather than the institution.

The theme of control of rural services in Alaska is also examined by Shepro.\textsuperscript{296} His focus is on the degree to which the state and federal government’s proposals to decentralize service delivery in rural Alaska have, in fact, resulted in a more centralized form of control of the decision-making process. Shepro argues that the Western view of politics as conflict over issues is opposed to the Native cultural view that conflict is to be avoided. As demonstrated in the chapter, the creation and use of ANHRDP as a broker between the University and the Native leadership bears witness to the willingness of the Native leadership to use negotiations and compromise to achieve desired goals. Further evidence is the


case of the hiring of Ms. Ramos; it is not until she is removed from office that legal actions are taken to remedy the unjust termination. As argued in this chapter, Native leaders sought to influence the policy process by negotiation and compromise within the political processes of the legislature rather than by direct power confrontations with urban non-Native elites and/or institutions such as the University.

While McBeath's line of argument is the one that most closely represents the views held by the institution of the University of Alaska, Shepro's theme of compromise and accommodation more closely corresponds to the author's understanding of the events. Additionally, this thesis suggests that a conceptualization of what a University is and should be is a part of the academy's historical grounding. Threats, real or perceived, to this notion of University have been met with resistance and hostility. While change is frequently a frightening prospect, the most appropriate conceptualization of higher education is one in which change is constant and expected, to be sought rather than avoided. It is only through the inclusion of new and different ideas and world views that we can expand our understanding of the universe in which we live. The inclusion of those peoples once excluded from the educational process is the true mission of those involved in the educational enterprise, for they will help us to better understand the role and relationship of humankind to, and within, the universe.

The following chapter discusses the continuing conflicts in structural modification versus substantive changes in providing appropriate higher education for Alaska Natives.
CHAPTER VI
THE CONFLICT CONTINUES:
STRUCTURAL MODIFICATIONS VERSUS SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE

6.1 Introduction

This chapter will examine the reorganization of the University of Alaska through the creation of the Community College, Rural Education and Extension Service (CCREE) division of the University of Alaska (1977), and its later demise (1985). CCREE was created from the ashes of the Rural Educational Affairs division of the University of Alaska’s statewide administration. Like the mythical Phoenix which rose from the ashes of its own funeral pyre only to be consumed in the flames of its own nest, CCREE too would perish in yet another structural realignment of the University's delivery system. Particular attention will be focused on the concern of the Native leadership about the creation of the CCREE division and their subsequent lack of resistance to its reorganization in 1985.

6.2 The Community College, Rural Education and Extension

Responding to growing political pressures from Anchorage urban legislators for increased University presence as well as to Alaska Native leadership demands for the development and delivery of rural education, the Board of Regents of the University of Alaska compromised. In June of 1977, the Board of Regents formally established a new Major Administrative Unit (MAU) charged with the administration of all community colleges, extension centers and
rural education. Born of political pressure and compromise and not entirely well received within or by the Native community, CCREE was in fact yet another centralization of rural educational administration. It was not entirely dissimilar, structurally or philosophically, from the pre-REA division, in that it was a total administrative division in which rural education was but a part of a larger mission. Additionally, it was housed in an urban area—Anchorage—and unlike REA, CCREE had authority over all the community colleges and all the extension services. Rural education had been reduced to a unit within the division administered by a dean rather than a system vice president, and was required to compete for limited resources at the division level rather than from a statewide policy position.

CCREE can best be understood when viewed as an extension of the belief in the equalizing powers of higher education, dating from pre-colonial times. Its structural manifestation may be viewed as an expression of political and cultural (Western) understanding of higher education as a means of cultural maintenance. Education, as a function of the state, is inevitably political, but whether or not the University expresses a particular political dogma is not the focus of this study.

The western migration of European settlers expanded educational opportunities to the farthest reaches of the American frontier. Public schools, colleges and universities, compulsory schooling, Chautauqua, university extension, vocational schools, correspondence study, community colleges, free libraries, museums, technical institutes, business schools, employer sponsored training programs, Sunday schools, and literacy programs, private schools, preparatory schools, all these offered educational opportunity to anyone who

297 Minutes of the University of Alaska Board of Regents (Anchorage: University of Alaska Archives, 28 June 1977).
lived in or was willing to move to an urban area. The American belief in education as the most important factor in upward mobility was one of the key factors in the urbanization of America.²⁹⁸

In comparison with cities, the educational opportunities in rural America were at best minimal. Rural versus urban, on the basis of opportunity for self development through education, became a social and political conflict in the United States in the 1970's. While not generally viewed as a class conflict in the European sense, that is, embedded in political dogmas, this was a historic expression of American individualism, reflecting the belief that if equality of opportunity was not available in the rural area, opportunity could be equalized by moving to the city. This perspective helps to understand the University of Alaska's continual placement of rural educational administrative units in urban areas, on major campuses. What it does not explain is the University's structural and philosophical response—or non-response—to Native demands for higher educational opportunities. Scott's belief that American institutions of higher education can equalize opportunity, if they have the will, is an interesting observation.²⁹⁹ While it is true that universities, and other educational institutions, in recent years have attempted to expand their delivery systems outward into rural areas, in the case of the University of Alaska the issue was more than will, it was and is a matter of world view or philosophy. Scott, like other scholars,³⁰⁰ is addressing the rural areas of the continental United States,

²⁹⁹Peter Scott, Strategies for Postsecondary Education, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975), 142.
and more specifically the western population of those states. Thus his study, while interesting and informative, does not apply directly to the Alaska situation. These studies perhaps are relevant to conditions and circumstances present in the contiguous states, and then only if one is concerned with non-minority education. However, they all demonstrate a failure to attend to any of the issues raised by the Alaska Native leadership. Their relevance to this study rests in the fact that these studies were incorporated into and used as, at least in part, the rationale and justification for the structural creation of the CCREE unit within the statewide University of Alaska system.301

The Regents (with the exception of Native Regents Kito, Fate, and Schafer) did not question the institution's willingness to meet the higher educational needs of Rural Alaska nor the capacity of the institution to comprehend and respond to those needs in the manner in which the Native Leadership had been requesting since at least 1972. However, there continued to be a lack of attention to Native demands for practical courses, delivered in culturally appropriate terms and at rural sites.302 The urban/rural aspect of the University's delivery system was a source of increasing controversy among the urban legislators, as pointed out in the previous chapter. In addition, the issue could be, and frequently was, framed in regional controversy. While Fairbanks had the main campus, Anchorage had a larger enrollment and was the major population and economic center of the state, yet the two Anchorage campuses (the four-year UAA and the community college ACC) were not receiving the level of funding that Anchorage legislators thought appropriate. Anchorage legislators sought to rectify the situation by raising cost effectiveness issues, specifically the cost of delivering higher education in rural

301 University of Alaska Board of Regents Minutes, Sub-committee on Community Colleges, (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, 28, June 1977).
302 University of Alaska, Board of Regents Minutes (Anchorage: University of Alaska Archives, 16 May 1978).
Alaska versus the number of students being served. Representative Terry Martin of Anchorage, a member of the Alaska House of Representatives' Subcommittee on the University of Alaska Budget, was a frequent critic of the University's expenditures in rural Alaska.\textsuperscript{303} Martin's line of reasoning, supported by his urban-based conservative constituency and motivated by political and regional interest, was greatly misinformed. While the costs of salaries and buildings in rural Alaska were higher than those in the urban areas of the state, the numbers of credit hours generated by the rural community colleges and other rural based programs were high. In fact, enrollments in Rural Education increased by 69.2% between 1978 and 1982. This translates into 6,973 student credit hours in 1978 and 11,802 in 1982.\textsuperscript{304} Additionally, the unit cost for delivering these credits was $110.26, while the cost for urban based courses was $112.55 over the same four year period.\textsuperscript{305} Clearly the focus on cost effectiveness served to obscure other, more real issues for Martin and his supporters.

What had begun as a question of access to higher educational services in the late 1960s and early 1970s had become a question of ideology, commitment, culture, and willingness on the part of the institution to address the needs of rural Alaska in meaningful and appropriate terms. The short-lived experience with the Rural Educational Affairs division demonstrated to the University administration that the delivery of services across vast geographical areas within a fluid and frequently politically volatile climate was an extremely difficult process. The structural response, CCREE, was culturally and organizationally appropriate from

\textsuperscript{303}This author had frequent contact with Representative Martin during the period under investigation and the above is characteristic of Representative Martin's understanding and approach.

\textsuperscript{304}Rural Education Status Report (Fairbanks: University of Alaska, January, 1983), 5.

\textsuperscript{305}Ibid., 41.
a modern\textsuperscript{306} structural organizational theory point of view. That is to say, the University administration’s concerns focused on organizational design. This naturally leads to a set of structural questions including, but not limited to: what should the structure look like? how should it work? how will the unit deal with structural specialization, departmentalization, control, and the coordination and control of specialized units?

The urbanization, centralization, and reliance on professionals in educational administration is well documented in American educational historiography.\textsuperscript{307} One of the guiding tenets of the modern structural school is that rational organizational behavior is best achieved through systems of defined rules and formal authority. Authority is central to modern structural organizational theory because control and coordination are essential for maintaining organizational rationality. It is this adherence to the control and centralized coordination that best explain the University’s establishment of CCREE. The environment—politically and economically—was indeed dynamic, as documented in previous chapters. Even so, the belief on the part of the University administration in centralized control of those units concerned with rural education was a natural response to the tensions inherent in the controversy surrounding the structural manifestations, that is, Rural Education.

The University of Alaska’s response to Native requests for higher education was then, from the Western perspective, the appropriate one. A major point of

\textsuperscript{306}The term or label “modern” structural organizational theory differentiates this school of organizational theory from the classical school. While both are concerned with structure or design of organizations and their production processes, the term “modern,” always in quotation marks, differentiates the structural theorist of the 1960’s and 1970’s from the classical; i.e., Max Weber, Adam Smith, Fredrick Winslow Taylor.

this thesis is that there has been, and continues to be, a vast difference between the Native conceptualization of education as a tool, and the University community’s understanding of education as a process which leads to social and economic mobility.\textsuperscript{308} In other words, CCREE was a Western response to the dynamic political and economic conditions, creating an urban, centralized administrative unit charged with the management of the various other types of educational delivery systems present at that time. The University created CCREE to deal with rural education because the University administration and Board of Regents were unable to conceptualize a structure different in design and function from those with which they were familiar (i.e., the bureaucratic model), as described by Weber.

The compromises necessary for the establishment of CCREE came from the most active and vocal Native member of the Board of Regents, Sam Kito. Building on the well-publicized failure of REA, which was fresh in the minds of the urban legislators, and with the continuing need for educational delivery to rural Alaska, combined with the mounting regional pressure from the Juneau and Anchorage campuses for a larger share of the operating budget, Kito persuaded the Board to establish a committee for community colleges.\textsuperscript{309}

The compromises to the University’s restructuring plan which created CCREE stemmed in part from the pressures of the urban legislators and in part from the internal University community. Anchorage and Juneau legislators, responding to constituent demands, were pushing the University to combine the community colleges with the four-year campuses located in their communities. This would affect Juneau-Douglas Community College and the University of Alaska


\textsuperscript{309} Minutes of the University of Alaska Board of Regents (Juneau, University of Alaska Archives, 2-3 March 1977).
Juneau, and the University of Alaska Anchorage and Anchorage Community College, in addition to the newly created administration for the Community College, Rural Education and Extension Service.\textsuperscript{310} The final concession on the part of the Native leadership was their withdrawal of the demand for a senior level policy position. Regent Kito had made a motion at the June 28, 1977, Board meeting mandating the University to establish the office of vice chancellor for Rural Education within the CCREE division. That motion was tabled and was not raised as an agenda item again.\textsuperscript{311}

The decision to allow the University to downgrade the vice chancellor’s position to the level of a dean was not necessarily a position universally held by all the Native leadership. In a letter to Philip Smith, Director of Rural CAP (Rural Alaska Community Action Program), dated October 17, 1977, University President Neil Humphrey assured him that there would be no loss of importance within the new structural alignment of the University—CCREE—and that the Rural Education Division would be headed by a vice chancellor and, therefore, would be able to compete on equal footing with the other two divisions.\textsuperscript{312}

President Humphrey’s assurances lasted as long as he did. In December of 1977, Humphrey resigned. Other Native leaders were not unaware of the importance of the reorganization and the subsequent downgrading of the vice chancellor’s position. In an article for the \textit{Tundra Times} newspaper of August 20, 1977, Fred Bigjim, a Native Rights activist and author, criticized the University for “choosing yet another reorganization in an attempt to resolve the problems of rural education.” He argued that organizational realignment of Rural Educational

\textsuperscript{310}Based on conversations with the late Fairbanks’ Senators, Don Bennett and Betty Farhenkamp, over a number of years.

\textsuperscript{311}University of Alaska Board of Regents Minutes (Anchorage: University of Alaska Archives, June 28, 1977, ff.).

\textsuperscript{312}President’s Files, Letter from President N. Humphrey to Philip Smith. (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, 17 October 1977).
Affairs was damaging enough in that the rural community colleges would now have to compete with the older, more established urban colleges for resources. In addition, the downgrading of the vice chancellor's position to the level of a dean was not in the best interests of the Native community. Bigjim concluded that, "A change in the organizational structure is not likely to ease feelings of conflict or improve cooperation between the University and the Native community." 313

While the rationale for combining the Juneau and Anchorage campuses was slightly different, the compromises made by the Native leadership and the Native members of the Board of Regents were essentially the same. Anchorage sought to have the campuses combine in the belief that the total student enrollment from the two institutions would place the new institution in a better position to compete with the University of Alaska Fairbanks. 314 For Juneau, this issue was one of institutional survival, as Juneau lacked sufficient enrollment to justify a senior campus, and in the minds of some a community college as well. 315

The compromise(s) made by the Native leadership on the Board of Regents came from the Subcommittee on Community Colleges, chaired by Sam Kito. The sub-committee agreed to support the combining of the Juneau-Douglas Community College and the University of Alaska Juneau into one Major Administrative Unit (MAU) and to seek accreditation for the new unit. Anchorage was not to be combined at this time, however. Instead, the Board of Regents, acting on the recommendation of the sub-committee on Community Colleges, sought to strengthen the Anchorage campuses by placing more programs and

315 University of Alaska, Board of Regents Minutes. The last two meetings of 1977 and all the meeting minutes of 1978 raise questions as to the advisability of continuing to support Juneau's demands for increasing funds.
thus personnel in one or another of the divisions and to consider removing Anchorage Community College from the CCREE administration and thus creating another MAU.316 What the Native leadership received in return for their political and public support was the right to hand-pick the new chancellor of CCREE.317

In 1977, at the suggestion of the Native leadership, speaking through the Native members of the Board of Regents, Pat O'Rourke, the president of the first rural community college (Bethel), was selected as the first chancellor for the Community College, Rural Education and Extension Service. O'Rourke had been one of the University's choices for the Vice President of Rural Educational Affairs when the position had been created in 1974. Now, in 1977, the University had brought together all the units most concerned with providing community and rural based education into one. The Native leadership was aware that the University community would not accept the appointment of another non-Ph.D. in a new senior level position. There were no Native candidates meeting the academic requirements, so O'Rourke was promoted as the logical candidate. The Native leadership believed that O'Rourke was the appropriate candidate to head the new division because of his background in rural Alaska, as well as the knowledge that he would owe his position to Native support.318 CCREE, like REA, was born of political compromise, and like REA would never fulfill its mission to

316While there are no documents in the University of Alaska archives detailing the work of the sub-committee on community colleges, there are ample references contained in the BOR's minutes, addressing the committees recommendations, between 1977 and 1980. Also see the Kito interview, Anchorage, 1990.
318Ibid.
the satisfaction of the rural residents of the state.\textsuperscript{319} It would also be the victim of political actions leading to its restructuring in 1985-87.

The above were concurrent issues, although subordinate in many respects to the larger issue of financial and managerial stability of the University of Alaska statewide system. Between 1976 and 1980, the University of Alaska had five new system presidents. Also, in 1977 the Alaska state legislature assumed control of the University's financial management systems for more than a year. The latter came about as a result of a legislative audit of the University's accounts, indicating that the University had miss-appropriated or lost several millions of the state's dollars.\textsuperscript{320} Thus the creation of the CCREE division necessarily required the active support of the Bush Caucus, as they were often the swing or deciding vote in the House and Senate. Without their political support, the new division could have never been made operational. This, combined with the fact that these rural legislators tended to have seniority in the House and Senate, gave them a great deal of perceived, if not real, power to influence the budget process. Therefore, their support was needed in order to obtain the funding required to establish a new administrative unit, especially under the circumstances the University was faced with in 1977.

The constant organizational turmoil, the turnover of the chief executives, and the political scrutiny and pressures under which the University had to operate from 1977 until 1980 created an atmosphere in which the establishment of new programs was perceived by many as a possible threat. In an attempt to restore stability and a sense of mission to the University system, the Board of

\textsuperscript{319}Ibid. See also, Willy Hensley, interview, Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska, 1990; and John Schafer, interview, Anchorage, Alaska 1990.

\textsuperscript{320}Conversations with Steve Cowper, former Governor, and at the time in question Chairperson of the House Finance Committee, Fairbanks, 1990. Also conversations with Bill Allen, Commissioner of Administration during this period, Fairbanks, 1991.
Regents conducted an extensive national search for a new president. In May of 1979 the University appointed Jay Barton as president.\textsuperscript{321}

Barton had been the academic vice president and provost at the University of West Virginia prior to accepting the presidency of the University of Alaska. In part, the rationale for his hiring was that there were structural similarities between the two systems, inasmuch as West Virginia consisted of a number of branch campuses scattered around the state. Additionally, Barton enjoyed a reputation as an individual who worked well with the West Virginia legislature, a talent sorely needed by the University of Alaska.\textsuperscript{322}

Barton's legislative acumen was soon put to the test. Six months after his arrival, he found himself embroiled in a political struggle for the control of one of the Rural Colleges. Chukchi Community College, located in the village of Kotzebue on Alaska's northwest coast, was the last of the legislatively established community colleges and had just received capital funding for a new building from the 1978 legislature. The central issue in this struggle was local control of the educational process. The Native legislators from the region, Senator Frank Furgeson and Representative Al Adams, believed that the University was failing to meet the educational needs of the region by refusing to offer courses that were more practical in nature (e.g., land management) and continuing to offer personal enrichment and general educational requirements leading to a baccalaureate degree. These sorts of course offerings had provided the impetus for the creation of the REA five years earlier, and they continued to be a source of contention between the University and the Native leadership. Secondly, Senator Furgeson and Representative Adams believed that the newly appointed Chancellor

\textsuperscript{321}University of Alaska, Board of Regents Minutes (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, 16 May 1979).

\textsuperscript{322}University of Alaska, President's files (Fairbanks, University of Alaska Archives, June 1979).
of CCREE was not attending to the rural areas of the state as had been hoped, in part because of the nature of the division itself. Rural Education was but one of three units, and the new Dean of Rural Education had only just arrived from New York state and had no background in Native education.323

Furgeson and Adams' solution to the problem was to propose the removal of Chukchi Community College from the University system and to place it under the Northwest Arctic School Board's control. The legal basis for this argument rested on an interpretation of the legislation enabling the establishment and control of community colleges. Furgeson and Adams' interpretation led them to believe that school districts had the authority to establish community colleges. Further, they believed that they, as elected representatives of the region, had the authority to move Chukchi from the University system and place it under the school district. This was seen as a means to give the region more control over the types of courses offered as well as the nature of those courses.324

By December of 1979, the situation had become serious because of the threat by Senator Furgeson and Representative Adams to remove Chukchi from the University system in the same manner in which it had been created, i.e., through legislative action. Chancellor O'Rourke flew to Kotzebue for several meetings between December 1979 and June 1980 with the two Native politicians and the superintendent of schools to try and negotiate some sort of agreement.325 While no transcripts of the actual meetings are to be found in the University archives,

323Al Adams, interview with Senator, then Representative, Anchorage, October 16, 1991. This theme is also present in most of the interviews with the Native leadership, in one form or another.
325President's Papers (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, 1980-81).
the events of the next eighteen months bear witness to the failure of Chancellor O’Rourke to resolve the issues.

As a result of the inability to reach a workable agreement, Senator Furgeson redlined\textsuperscript{326} the University’s 1980 operating budget request for Chukchi Community College; in other words, he removed the funding from the University’s budget and transferred the entire amount to the Northwest Arctic School District. President Barton and the Board of Regents reacted by asking Governor Hammond to veto the transfer, which he did.\textsuperscript{327} The net effect was that the University was left with a community college and no budget with which to operate it for the coming year. In essence, the college was closed. As for Senator Furgeson, he had made his point, that what the legislature could give the legislature could take away. The fact that all he needed was the support of a majority in both the House and Senate to eliminate the budget is testimony to the continuing political ability of the rural legislators. This should have provided the University with sufficient reason to examine the manner, content, and management of the CCREE division. In other words, the continual failure of the University to provide courses to rural residents in a culturally sensitive and relevant manner remained an issue ten years after the concerns had been initially raised by the Native leadership.

The conditions did not improve over the course of the summer and fall of 1980 and in February of 1981, the two legislators from Kotzebue introduced House Bill 219, which would remove Chukchi from the University’s control and place it under the management of the Northwest Arctic School District. A companion

\textsuperscript{326}This term is used in the Alaska Legislature to describe the removal of a budget line item, in other words, the funding was deleted from the budget.

\textsuperscript{327}University of Alaska Board of Regents Minutes (Fairbanks: University Archives, 26 June 1980). Also see Alaska State Legislative Digest (May 1980); see as well, the Legislative Affairs Summary of Legislation (June 1980).
House Bill, H.B. 220, provided an appropriation to the School District of the same amount of money as would have gone to the University to operate Chukchi. In addition, Senator Furgeson and Representative Adams informed the University that it was their intention to insure that the University’s request for funding for Chukchi suffered the same fate in 1981 as it had in 1980. Forewarned of the possibility of another publicly embarrassing confrontation, President Barton chose to withdraw the funding request for Chukchi rather than to challenge the Bush Caucus on the floor of the legislature.

President Barton then took action on two fronts: on the one hand he instructed the University’s General Counsel to seek legal advice concerning the constitutionality of the legislatively-created separate community college system; on the other hand, he instructed his special assistant to open communications with the Native leadership to attempt a negotiated settlement of the Chukchi issue.

The legal response to the question of whether the legislature could create a separate community college system came from Ed Merdes, a former state Senator. His interpretation of the state’s constitutional and subsequent legislative actions concerning community college legislation indicated that the legislature could indeed establish a separate system. According to Merdes, the legislative actions in the form of the 1953, 1955, and 1962 Community College Acts did not preclude the legislature from establishing a separate college, nor did the constitution of Alaska prohibit the legislature from taking such actions.

---

328 Michael Jennings, “Rural Education,” unpublished Master’s thesis, University Alaska Fairbanks, 1987. See Legislative Digest, (Juneau, June 1981). See also personnel files. I was special assistant to President Barton from 1980 to 1985, and Native affairs was one of my main areas of responsibility. And as such, I was a participate observer at meetings and hearings.

329 University of Alaska President’s Files (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Fairbanks Archives, 1980-81).

330 University of Alaska President’s Files, Letter from Ed Merdes, attorney at law, to Astrid de Perry, general council for the University of Alaska (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, 4 December 1980).
Left without legal recourse and believing that the University would not fare well in a legislative battle, President Barton was forced to select among three alternatives. First, he could acquiesce to the demands of Senator Furgeson and Representative Adams and radically alter the course offerings and course content by mandating that a more vocational-oriented curriculum be put in place. This choice did not appeal to either Barton or Chancellor O’Rourke. Second, Barton could allow Chukchi to remain closed, arguing that he was simply acting according to the desires of the community. This option was unacceptable to Barton, as he saw it as allowing the legislature to make academic policy, and they were not competent, in his view, to do so. The last possibility was a negotiated agreement where the University would agree to some of the demands of the Native leadership while retaining control of Chukchi.

Barton, not wishing to continue the conflict in the public eye and unwilling to try to do battle on the floor of the legislature, saw only one alternative as viable, to negotiate a settlement of the dispute. His main concern was the potential structural damage to the University system, should the separation of one community college from the system lead to other colleges following that example. In other words, the concern of the University of Alaska was the retention of the colleges and the maintenance of the University as the source of control. It was not providing alternative programs or delivery systems in response to Native demands.

---

331 Author’s personnel files. This interpretation comes from conversations with Barton from 1980 to 1985 and was a consistent line of argument.
332 University of Alaska, President’s Files. Internal memoranda from Michael Jennings to President Barton, titled “Chukchi Situation Paper” (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, 28 May 1981). The above is a condensed version of a much larger work, which was itself only one in a long series of papers on this issue.
333 The above interpretation comes from discussions between President Barton and the author over the course of several months, during 1981 and 1982.
With this in mind, Barton assigned his special assistant the task of establishing communications with the Native leadership for the purposes of reopening Chukchi. At the same time, Barton and his executive staff prepared a list of three acceptable solutions to bring to the negotiating table. They were: (1) that the University of Alaska would establish a statewide telecommunication network linking each village with the University centers for the purpose of improving educational delivery to rural sites; (2) that the University would support the establishment of a vocational/technical center located in Kotzebue and operated under the control of the Northwest Arctic School District; and (3) that the University would begin to examine the feasibility of combining or linking the various community colleges directly to one or another of the main campuses (Fairbanks, Anchorage, Juneau). The latter option would establish a single system with the necessary organizational structure to insure that the community colleges had the academic and administrative support to meet accreditation standards, or could be covered under a blanket accreditation from the major campus to which they were assigned.$^{334}$

From the University's perspective, the issue was the potential loss of all the community colleges. This stemmed from an interpretation of a section of (House Bill) HB 219 which would have established a separate Board of Governors for the community colleges and turn direct management of the colleges over to the school districts, thereby achieving a degree of local control. However, the University argued that this arrangement would lead to duplication of services and a confusing and complicated management of higher educational services. This

Support for this line of argument can be found in the Board of Regents Minutes of 26 June 1982, held in Anchorage. $^{334}$University of Alaska President's Files, Internal memorandum from Mike Metty, President of Nome Community College to President Jay Barton (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, 8 April 1981).
would result in a piecemeal approach in which the articulation between the various colleges and the University system would place rural students at a disadvantage when attempting to matriculate.\textsuperscript{335} The other major line of argument advanced by the University was that none of "these small rural colleges could meet the standards for accreditation, nor would they be able to offer a comprehensive program to the people of their service region."\textsuperscript{336}

The University's concerns for the structural maintenance of the statewide system, as outlined above, were not shared by the Native leadership, at least not by Senator Furgeson and Representative Adams. The Chukchi situation had become a matter of personal prestige for these Native leaders,\textsuperscript{337} and the resolution of the conflict between them and Barton was effected on a personal level. Barton's special assistant began an eighteen-month series of negotiations with the Native leadership which led to the reopening of Chukchi, but not without substantial loss of face on the part of Barton.

A series of seven meetings between the Native leadership and representatives of the University were held in Juneau in March and April of 1983. While the specifics of these meetings are interesting in themselves, it is not the major focus of this thesis. It is of importance to note that President Barton was not included in these meetings at the request of the Native leadership. This was a source of much embarrassment to Barton and a point of some pride within the Native Leadership, as they had only agreed to come to the bargaining table after

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{335}Michael Jennings, "Rural Education," unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alaska Fairbanks, 1987. Also see President's Files (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, 1980-81).
\item\textsuperscript{336}University of Alaska, President's Files (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, 1980-81). Italics added are not in the original. This is from a report from M. Jennings to President Barton.
\item\textsuperscript{337}Jennings, 45-47.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
receiving assurances as to the composition of the University’s negotiating team and the right to set the agenda.338

What is also of significance is the fact that the Native Leadership was still willing to try to bring closure to this dispute through negotiations rather than by political action. This preference of Native leaders to avoid direct conflict in favor of reaching some conclusion through or by consensus demonstrates that there was still a belief, on the part of the Native Leadership, that higher education was of some utility and that a middle ground could be found. They wanted the educational needs of the rural residents and the interests of the institution to be blended together for the benefit of each. The settlement reached at the conclusion of these meetings reflected the hope that an improvement in not only University/Native relations, but in educational provisions for Alaska Natives, was at hand.

There were three major institutional outcomes of the Juneau meetings:
(1) the University agreed to support the establishment of a vocational/technical school in Kotzebue under the management of the Northwest Arctic School District;
(2) the University of Alaska would increase its system of satellite communications by adding at least twenty-two new sites in rural Alaska over the next three years; and
(3) the University of Alaska Fairbanks would establish a summer’s honors institute—Rural Alaska Honors Institute (RAHI)—for Alaska Native youth and increase the tutorial and social support programs for Native students attending the Fairbanks campus.339 There was little difference between these items as agreed to at the negotiations and those identified as acceptable to the University

338Author's personal files. The author was not only a member of the team, but was also instrumental in bringing the Native leadership to the negotiating table. Also see author’s "Rural Education" (1987), 40.
339Author's personal files.
prior to negotiations; the notable exception being the creation of the summer honors institute (RAHI).

6.3 Summary

The significance of these events on the CCREE unit in general and Rural Education specifically, is that, as a result of these actions, the University administration began to plan for the restructuring of the CCREE division with the re-centralization of rural educational offerings returning to the control of the Fairbanks campus. This was the same arrangement characteristic of the University in the 1970's, with the management of the community colleges being assigned to the nearest major administrative unit (MAU). In other words, the closest four-year campus would assume authority for those community colleges within their geographical area. Those programs attending to rural Alaska (read Native) would be combined under a new college, The College of Rural Alaska, housed administratively within the School of Education on the Fairbanks campus.

By 1985, the University administration would set in motion a plan that would complete the circle. Just as all rural education programs had once been controlled from Fairbanks, the plan called for the return of control to the Fairbanks campus of the community colleges in Bethel, Nome, and Kotzebue as well as control of the telecommunications network and all other rural programs. Restructuring represented an even greater loss of local control, for it not only

340President's Files, "Rural Educational Delivery" report, from Mike Metty to Jay Barton (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, December 1982).
341President's Files (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Archives, 1983-84).
342While the restructuring was not complete until 1987, there was no doubt in 1985 that this was the outcome. In fact, the blue print for this model was written in 1983 by Mike Metty, president of Nome Community college at the request of Barton. This author was present at several of the meetings between Metty and Barton as this plan developed, 1982-3.
returned centralized control to an urban campus, but also, in the process, downgraded the chief administrative officer of the Rural College to the level of a dean. This ensured that the competition for economic resources and policy considerations would be that much further removed from the top levels of the University administration, and hopefully, from the political agendas of rural legislators.343 In the final chapter, I examine the broader social, economic, and political implications of events in Alaska and, finally, offer recommendations for future research.

343Author's personal files, 1984-5.
CHAPTER VII

INDIGENOUS CONTROL OF INSTITUTIONS OF LEARNING: ENDING THE CONFLICT

7.1 Current Approaches to Educational Change

I found my eight years as a member of the Board of Regents [of the University of Alaska] very frustrating because the University did little to respond to the needs of rural Alaskans when I was appointed and was only slightly more responsive when I left. I don’t believe it has become any more responsive today.344

It is only fitting that the pessimistic remarks which opened this study are returned to here. At the very least, the validity of the above statement, made by one of the more active members of the Alaska Native leadership during the time period examined, is more readily understood as a consequence of this study. While it can be said that the University of Alaska made an effort to respond to calls for educational change relevant to Alaska Natives, it is unrefutable that the University of Alaska system has failed miserably to respond adequately to the higher educational needs of rural Alaska Native people.

It has also been shown that the university, while at times attempting to work with those programs, has consistently failed to address Native needs. A large part of the reason for this failure can be attributed to the conflicting world views shaping each party’s understandings of the nature and purpose of education itself, and the way in which higher educational services ought to be provided for Indigenous people in Alaska.

Put differently, the major problem is that two unrelated approaches, informed by different world views and manifested in different organizational solutions to education, have characterized the attempts to provide educational services to rural Alaska Natives. The approach pursued by the Alaska Native leadership is characterized by placement of the bush or rural Community colleges in the three communities of Bethel, Nome, and Kotzebue. In these instances, Native leaders and/or their supporters were able to utilize their political knowledge, legislative experience, statewide stature, and prestige within the Alaska legislature to circumvent the resistance exhibited by the University of Alaska System and establish the institutions on an individual, case-by-case basis. Two assumptions underlying this approach were: 1) immediate material benefits would accrue to the villages in which the institutions were located, in the form of local employment in construction and related activities at least; and, 2) long term benefits would appear in the form of educational programs relevant to developing the economies of villages within these regions.\textsuperscript{345}

However, as one of those leaders instrumental in this approach, Willie Hensley, states:

Basically, the university system has never been attuned to Native needs and wants. We put the community colleges out there in an effort to provide education in the local community in hopes that it would become more sensitive to Native needs. I don't believe that has occurred. The Western view of education seems to be an end, I mean that non-Natives believe that education is itself a product, while Natives tend to view it more as a tool. It has to have use, application. The university is not really geared to produce courses that are more vocational. They are set up to deal in academic, abstract knowledge which is viewed as the product, while we see it more as a process to achieve other ends than just the acquisition of knowledge. The knowledge must be usable within our world view. This has, and continues to be, a real sore point between the university and the

\textsuperscript{345}Willy Hensley, interviews, Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska, 1990 and John Sackett, interview, Fairbanks, Alaska 1990.
Native communities, and I don't think the University will be able to address Native needs until there are more Natives in the system. In other words, a sufficient number of Native faculty, administrators and staff are required in order for the University to incorporate the alternate world view within the form and structure for educational delivery.

The University's approach was to centralize control of the educational processes within a western understanding which, by its very nature, precludes the Native world view. The reorganization of the University of Alaska statewide system in the late 1980's re-established the centralized control and direction of state sponsored post-secondary education. Clearly this represented movement away from, not toward, any locally controlled educational programming designed to meet the needs of traditional Native communities entering modern, technological society. This position, based on rejection of traditional values and behaviors as inappropriate in modern society, made it possible to ignore their importance to the development of that modern society, thus illuminating the catch-22 nature of Hensley's observation. That is, the system cannot be responsive to Native needs until more Natives are in that system. However, in this context such access and entrance requires a rejection of those Native needs and the values they reflect. This problem is experienced by Indigenous people everywhere. As long as the dominant society remains uninterested or uninvolved with territory controlled by Indigenous people, the pace and extent to which change occurs is controlled locally; however, when the dominant society becomes interested and involved in that territory, the modern world intrudes and changes both the territory and the people. Furthermore, such changes ignores the knowledge of and expertise in local conditions acquired by the Indigenous people

346 Willy Hensley, interview, Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska 1990.
over hundreds of years, resulting in negative rather than positive impacts on the Indigenous population. This point is perhaps best made in the observation of a Native elder concerning the changes in construction methods that had occurred in his village as a consequence of development and modernity:

Before the missionaries came . . . we lived underground in sod houses and laid our dead out on the tundra. Now we live aboveground and bury the dead, and I haven't been warm since.348

7.2 An Indigenous Approach to Education

An alternative approach is that adopted by Indigenous peoples worldwide, one which seeks to establish locally controlled institutions rather than replicate ones modeled on the Western university system. While this approach does not eliminate all of the problems associated with attempts to establish Native control of educational programs, it does allow for local rather than external control solutions to these problems. In addition, this approach provides a mechanism for establishing a reciprocal working relationship with the major campuses of the university, while still maintaining control at the local level. Unlike community colleges within a university system, Indigenous institutions have been able to adapt those aspects of "modern technology" (i.e., university programs) that meet Native needs, and reject those which do not.349

The approach taken by Indigenous peoples may offer the best means of providing Alaska Native students with educational programs designed to meet Native needs, blending elements of a university education into a lifestyle that is

influenced by virtually equal parts of traditional values and modern technology. This is precisely the synthesis necessary for Indigenous People's cultural and physical survival in this modern situation, and to all appearances can only be provided from the cultural perspective inherent in local control.

An Indigenous approach in the United States, such as a Tribal College, is dependent upon the availability of federal funding and the continuation of such financial support in order to serve their unique constituency. The similarities between the Alaskan situation and the situations of other Native American and/or First Nations peoples, and of Indigenous peoples within post-colonial states in general, suggest that some lessons can be learned from others' attempts to be innovative and to make educational programs responsive to cultural needs.

The colonial status of the territory of Alaska in general, and the neo-colonial experience of Alaska Natives since statehood in 1959, are well documented and need not be discussed here. However, like many developing and post-colonial states, the tendency has been for the authority—whether the state government in Juneau or the University of Alaska system in Fairbanks—to attempt to centralize control over important aspects of development. This has been the case in the area of post-secondary education in Alaska and has been an important issue when any major resource is perceived to be at stake. Tribalism is perceived to be as much a threat to the maintenance of the state by the authority structure (whether government in general or the university system in particular) as it is to the authorities of developing nations, and a quick perusal of Alaska newspapers


will indicate that fear of this threat is very much alive today. An Indigenous approach to post-secondary education does much to dispel these fears as unsubstantiated at best, and as obstacles to innovation in education at worst.

There are at least three lessons of importance to Indigenous education efforts to be learned from this discussion. First, an ability to participate in making educational policy within the institutional framework of the larger society does not necessarily lead to effective control, or even influence, over the educational programs delivered at the local level. Knowledge of policy-making processes, impressive experience within the legislative system, and political status enabled Native leaders to force the university system, to place community colleges in rural villages. This affected neither the content of the programs delivered by the professionals within the university system, nor the maintenance of even nominal local control over the physical plant within the villages. Put differently, rather than leading to innovative approaches in Alaska Native education, participation at this level effectively helped to stifle it.

Second, as long as the centralized authority does not provide innovative approaches to educational delivery, participation that leads to effective control of educational programs is necessary. In this case, participation is necessarily based on local resources, not upon the generosity of the dominant political system. Included in these resources are the value systems and the cultural experiences that help to define Native needs, those which the non-Native institutions find so difficult to address in an innovative manner. Money, as well as expertise and individual energies, are among the other resources upon which local control is dependent; obviously, genuine local control, and thus innovation, are unlikely without them.
Finally, and perhaps most importantly, innovation in education and local control of the educational processes do not imply anarchy or chaos for either the educational system or for the society as a whole. An innovative approach can lead to effective provision of post-secondary educational programs designed to meet Native or Indigenous people's needs in the context of modernization. Rather than leading to the de-stabilization of society, local control and innovation provide the means for groups to integrate themselves, to the extent this is possible and/or desirable, and thus to stabilize that society.

These are important lessons, especially when the sweeping changes taking place globally in this last decade of the 20th century are considered. The extent to which minority populations, whether Indigenous or not, have received just and equitable treatment from the central authorities of modernizing countries is of increasing concern in this context. In the same vein, knowledge of the extent to which industrialized countries achieved their status at the expense of Native American and First Nations peoples is increasingly recognized, and the extent to which vestiges of those relationships remain are of increasing concern in the world today. The question is, whether the tendencies toward centralization and concentration of authority (to provide services such as education) will lead to continued suppression of justice and equity for Indigenous peoples, or whether instead, the tendencies can be overcome so that participation, equal opportunity, and justice prevail.352

In most cases, the problem is that central authorities have usually been extremely slow to recognize these lessons, and to apply innovative approaches. The difficulty for Native/First Nations/Indigenous people then becomes one of

determining the resources available and how they can be utilized to accomplish local control and an innovative approach.

7.2 Implications for Future Research

It is clear in the literature that the issues of land and of education have been of paramount importance in both Native and non-Native cultures. However, the two policy positions (i.e., education and land) have been intimately linked in Native cultures yet treated as unrelated in a Western perspective.

This dissertation clearly demonstrates that, at least in the case of Alaska Native Leadership, an understanding existed as to the importance of higher education relative to the passage of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971. This understanding manifested itself through continual requests by the Alaska Native Leadership to the University of Alaska system for appropriate educational programs to be devised and delivered in order to provide a cadre of educated new Native leaders retaining traditional Native values, thereby insuring the continued retention of the land base.

The literature is replete with research on land policy and on Native American education; however, to my knowledge, this is the first study which examines the linkages between the two. Only in Western industrial society is education conceived as a product which is predicated on the assumption that the achievement of education will facilitate a member's economic and social mobility in society. The ability to compartmentalize and conceptualize issues such as land and governance as separate and distinct entities from education makes visible the glaring differences between Native and non-Native world views.

This study offers a different way of understanding the failure of university systems to address the needs of minority populations in general. To date,
universities have typically responded to minority needs through structural as opposed to substantive changes. In part, this is due to universities' adherence to hierarchical forms of organization as evidenced by ranking of faculty, academic programs, and the separation of programs from administration. This organizational manifestation is also representative of alternate world constructs. As this study suggests, the Native American perception of education as being an intrinsic part of the whole tends to be viewed by the university as an understanding which is less than that which is offered in a Western educational system. Thus, when entering Western educational systems Native American students are in effect asked to leave their ethnicity at the door.

Additional research is needed exploring the experiences of other minority groups from the perspective of alternate world views and social organizations in order to determine if similarities exist. Taken in concert, these studies would provide a major breakthrough in understanding how to better meet the needs of minority students.

Until this study, research impacting on Native Americans has been left to non-Natives, who in general, are lacking the contextual understanding to accurately depict the complex philosophical concepts within the Native world view or how these understandings are inter-related. Clearly, implications to be drawn from this study are a call for further research to be conducted directly by Native Americans in order to insure that their alternate world view is reflected in the findings. Such research would insure that the Native world view is actually portrayed and offers a Native vantage point for assessing the events reflected in the literature. Because this case study offers limited usefulness in terms generalizability concerning the educational experiences of Native Americans and/or Indigenous people in general, other studies need to be conducted in order
to provide a basis for generalization about the Alaska Native/Native American/First Nations/Aboriginal/Indigenous experience with Western Euro-American Educational systems. In addition, further research is needed on the relationship between land and education, and governance and education. As revealed in this study, an important approach for further research in this area would be to build on this discussion of alternate world views and the failure of structural responses to address the needs of Native Americans and other minority populations.

This study provides a baseline upon which future work in this area needs to be developed. Attention to curricula which acknowledges alternate conceptualizations or world views is necessary. In order to achieve this goal, attention must also be directed toward teacher preparation and inservice programs. Building from this study, the most obvious work that could be done is in the area of educational re-design. Such studies conducted by Native Americans on not only the structure of educational systems but also on related issues of teacher preparation, curriculum development/design, and shared educational decision making between educational professionals and the Native community offers concert alternatives to present educational delivery systems. Such research is needed to begin the process of reconceptualizing current education/educational structures to meet the needs of minority populations. As suggested by this study, such an alternative conceptualization offers the ability to humanize the educational enterprise and to improve retention/graduation rates for Native American students.
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APPENDIX A

SAMPLE OF INTERVIEW DATA
AN INTERVIEW WITH

WILLIE HENSLEY

By Michael Jennings
This was back before big oil when I pushed for what became Chukchi College in Kotzebue and back then we simply didn't have any real entry into the university system, that is any real power in terms of the regents and affecting their, I mean, trying to change academic institutions is one of the most difficult things there is.

So basically, to try to get something significant going within our own region we basically had to do an end run around the system. And that's not unusual in the sense that it's this whole move in the post secondary area is not much different than a lot of the other things that we've had to try to do with the systems that weren't responsive. And we've had to do this sort of thing in a whole variety of areas, (so its one piece of the strategy?) Ya well, just like with the pioneers homes when I got to Juneau in the sixties there was a specific clause that precluded Natives from being able to enter the pioneers homes. It was right in the statute. So I fiddled around and finally got it eliminated because it was obviously discriminatory.

Then that's how I got the pioneers home funded in Kotzebue, which eventually became the senior center. We don't run it as a pioneers home (that's sort of a discriminatory term in itself). That's right. So, the university system was...until you have people who have a mentality and consciousness of places outside of the traditional thought patterns of urban academic structure it is almost impossible to make any changes. And it takes a lot of force and a lot of effort to do that.

*So, the bush caucus...how did that work?* Well, actually the bush caucus at the time I got there was not a functioning entity on any major scale. I mean, there was a bush block before we got there and there was a few of us that got elected in the 60's and 70's, but it was only in the seventies and thereafter when the big bucks started rolling in, in the mid to late seventies--actually the pipeline wasn't done until the seventies, but only then, when there was a lot of big dollars at stake the bush caucus really effective. And we became effective, because the group was able to be the balance of power (I've heard it described as a third political party). Well, in a sense it has been, although the Republican-led effort to scuttle the subsistence priority amendment will make it very difficult for the
rural areas to make any deals with the "reps" to arrange power in the house especially...it is an effective group if it holds together. But it has had it's problems recently.

_I wish you would talk a little bit about what you remember about George Holman._ Part of this whole thing is that this is not a traditional interview, yeah. See, George was my roommate in my first session in Juneau back in the mid-sixties and he was first elected as well...of course, Sackett was also elected at that time, Johnny Westal of St. Mary's, I think Frank See was there from Hoonah, I think Ray Criss was there on the Senate side and George was a former BIA teacher. A lot of people don't remember that, but that's what he did, and he had, I mean he was a hard-working legislator back in the days when there weren't a lot of hard working legislators around. George and I more or less had to start from scratch 'cause neither of us had any experience to speak of. But George had a lot of dedication to his constituency which was basically villages...and we worked pretty closely together.

During those initial years until I worked in the senate in seventy, George had a part in almost everything we did, including what became the Alaska Educational Broadcasting Commission. In funding KYUK, which was the first one, he and I and George, Charles took a trip back to Montreal to look at the Canadian Broadcasting Systems programming network that they had for the northern part of the country. That was in the days before satellites, so we worked real hard to try to get communications into the rural areas and of course, Mike Gravel was involved in communications then too, which seemed at the time to be space age type stuff in contrast to what we had been used to up here. These satellites dishes and what not. Of course, George and I were involved in trying to get schools and high schools in the rural areas. At that time they were still shipping the high school students outside or to Edgecomb or to Oklahoma or Oregon and we began the
big push which resulted in the boarding home program and then, of course, we began pushing for high schools in the rural areas. I remember they were pushing very hard for a school in Bethel. Back in those days the BIA ran the schools out in the rural areas and the state was reluctant to do anything that cost any money because there wasn't enough money to run the state then.

So they had to come up with all kinds of justifications to build a state high school in Bethel. I, on the other hand, ended up lucking out and finagling three high schools within a fifty mile radius of each other...back in the pre-pipeline days. The only way we used to get money for these kinds of programs was generally by bonding, basically borrowing, so getting in a bond bill was a major proposition so my strategy in our area was I was trying to get some additional high school space in Kotz and Barrow, which I thought could be used as sort of a regional school in each location. My strategy was to try to fund that extra space through the state--in fact I had secured an extra million for Barrow and a million and a half for Kotz, which in those days was a lot of money, with the idea in mind of having the state _______the facilities, the classrooms, and have the BIA fund the operation (the teachers and whatnot). And I was beating them over the head pretty heavily, trying to get them to come into some cooperative agreement, and I think I was making some headway there. So I had that two and a half million dollars but one time why I was invited was a quarterly meeting of the Friends Church in our region in Narvik, which was one of the few real big meetings we had in those days. A number of people got together, a few hundred got together, so I invited Jim Harper, who ran the boarding home program to come up to basically talk about high schools and how important keeping kids in high school is--to try to convey that idea to the parents and, lo and behold, he sat there and said, "Well, everybody, we're going to build you a high school here in the Kobuk area. All you got to do is decide where to put it".
Well, I was shocked but I wasn't about to argue with him because I was on the Senate Financing Committee at that time and I knew there was no money.

I went back to Juneau and sat Harper down and Bob Issacs and ran construction...I said, "Alright, Harper, you promised my people a school. Now where is the money?"

Well, there was no money. What they were planning to do, strangely enough, was that they were going to take my two million bucks for Barrow and Kotz and they were going to try to build a dormitory in Anchorage for the boarding home program, just on their own. So said, "No way"...and what we did was set it aside for a Kobuk valley high school, and that's when they...That was the first time that I can recall wherein rural communities were polled and visited with and asked what kind of schools they would like to have, both in terms of design and curriculum.

They had a contract with some fellow to do that and it started with the big war between towns as to where the school would end up. Well, what we finally did was Ferguson and I got an extra million bucks in another bond so we ended up three and a half million dollars and ended up with a high school in Norvik, Selawik, and Kiana as a result of one bureaucrats screw up, right? But that was we had any significant amount of oil money. So those schools...

Prior to the Hootch case... Oh yeah, see so that was my, of course George Holman, I always maintained that the reason--that screw-up was the reason Hammond got elected Governor, because, see, George got real incensed at Governor Egan for stealing money that was supposed to go to his villages that presumably ended up in my villages and consequently he backed Hammond in that election. Was it Hickel vs. Hammond in the primary? And then Hammond won the primary and who'd he run against, Egan? So that's a little history of that area.
Kind of interesting...I didn't realize that...that way 'Course Chukchi College, I was so ticked off at the University 'cause, you know, they have...every time you provide any money for them, they swipe a whole bunch, a huge percentage off the top for all kinds of planning and design and god-only-knows what and the building they built was a disaster, so I never went in it for years because it was such a scrawny facility.

Did you decide to build it or did they decide to build it? well, I don't know, well, no, they--I got the appropriation and they built it, but they built a real inadequate facility.

Did they request it or did you initiate it? No, I initiated it. I mean, of course, that was the way it was with lots of other community colleges as well.

Did the impetus come out of the villages rather than out of the legislative representation? They always had a hang-up about this...they wanted their own visions sort of set into law. In the meantime, we began to have some clout in the board of regents because it was a focal point of some energy...

But then Sam got appointed...Sam and then Shaffer, then myself, Shively was there for awhile...

Morris was on...Morris is on now, and but still it's a constant struggle. When I got on the budget, I mean, onto the Board of Regents back in the mid eighties, maybe '84, I think they were still going around having these charettes, you know, meeting with the community and traveling en mass with their huge staffs of planners, designers and architects and curriculum specialists and basically saying "what would like to have here in this facility, this university?" until they just created these visions, these fantasies in their minds in they, you know, we were doing all these sketches, what they were doing, they were building these images in their heads about what they would like to have. That in my mind was way out of reason from a pure dollar standpoint. Well, in Southeast Alaska, it
was prior to the restructuring, and so you had Juneau and Ketchikan and Sitka all battling for students since there wasn't enough students...I kept saying, "where are the students?" to fill this 100 mil thing in Juneau and anyway, fortunately, I think the drop in revenue sort of brought people back to reality but in my mind not soon enough so the university had to sort of redo itself and of course, one of the strong contingencies was that we wanted the rural college to have a strong emphasis, we needed emphasis in the rural college.

_University is fulfilling that mission..._ I haven't paid as close attention to it since I was in the senate. I tried to insure that by providing more staffing when I was on the finance committee but I got bounced out of the conference committee and didn't get a chance to...I mean it's sustaining itself but I haven't been that involved to know whether or not they're really meeting that mission since they were restructured.

_Would you talk a little bit about how the determination was made to put one in Kotz, one in Nome, and one in Bethel, and nothing in Barrow and nothing in Fort Yukon...I mean, initially, in the early days._ Well, it was sort of dependent on whose priority was what, right? If a legislator didn't have a priority we wouldn't be pushing for something in somebody else's region because we didn't what their priorities were and if it didn't come through in the process then it didn't happen. Well, in our part of the world, I mean, education has always been one of my big interests and so we concentrated on that...

_You had Barrow as part of your electoral district..._ Yeah, that's true...but you see, well, if they did during my tenure, which was eight years, and that was long before the big bucks, it never came through to me in those early days, before the big dollars. I think it is testament to our efforts to get anything back then because there wasn't very much money and then, of course, later on the
borough got formed in the 70's and they did in fact try to form their own entity, right?

*It's still running but as a different name.* Yeah, the Yup'ik University of the Arctic...so they had the wherewithal, they had a humungous tax base there so they were able to maintain something...now they have some cooperative thing going with the University--that's why they didn't go something that was state funded.

*Any idea why we never requested any Indian Community College Act money?* I have no idea. I have talked with some individuals, some Indians about that, in fact, Senator Inoue's staff, Pat...and Alan Parker, but why that has never taken place, I have no idea.

*I always though it was kind of an anomaly, Morris was Commissioner and we were building community colleges and it just kind of...it seemed to me there was real opportunity there and we dropped the ball and went somewhere else.*

Could be, could...maybe we just didn't have enough educators then...We have more now because...we didn't have too many then...we just didn't have all the specialties we needed in the native community and I think the number of native teachers, native administrators, that are in the works...others that are getting more experience, I think there will be more concentration on that.

*Do you see the development of community colleges as an extension of the REA;as a way to develop rural Alaska...was that a conscious decision that was talked about by the bush caucus?* I think we weren't thinking so much in terms of development as we were in terms of social cohesion--not having to send students out at their tender ages. It was partly a human reaction, I think. The other's the fact that, of course the boarding schools have been used historically to deculturize young native people and maybe make them more alienated and so we just didn't see a great benefit in sending the kids out to the lower 48 or even to
southeast Alaska for that matter. Although, as I see it, I'm not so sure that the rural leadership and communities would have gone along with the whole Hootch approach that was taken as a result of that settlement. It wasn't has if the leadership out there kind of sat down and had a chance to really think about whether this was the kind of policy we should have. That is, can a child get educated with only two high school teachers in the village? So in my mind it might have been a different picture if it hadn't been an out of court settlement and the state said we're gonna build high school in every village of so many people with so many students. And I don't think it's sustainable, but nobody wants to face it. What was the big amount?

178 million... some huge amount but from an operational standpoint we're looking at a reduction of somewhere between six and eight per cent oil production per year, and the revenue picture is real grim. We're looking at maybe a billion less within the next ten years and completely subject to world oil prices and even beyond that, of course, less unless there is oil in the wildlife refuge it is going to be hard for us to sustain the kind of governmental costs we got unless we start talking in terms of raising revenues somehow.

Taxes... Yeah. So and nobody wants to face that.

I raise the question because Senator Sackett inferred that part of the discussion that went on amongst the bush caucus was the State's commitment once you build an infrastructure and he suggested I look at the bills that passed in terms of electrification, water, sewer projects, airports and road improvements that come in the same era as the building of the community colleges and rural high schools and there is the fact that they also provide jobs, and you're talking about five or six jobs in a village of 120 people, that a fairly major impact. So I was just wondering what your perceptions were that part of what John's recollections were. Well, see my involvement was prior to big oil and only a
couple of years beyond that. We were thinking in terms of academic terms, not so much in terms of employment, at least in my own mind.

It had more to do with implementing land claims and the needs of the corporations? Yes...when I got there a dozen years later in '86 we were just trying to hold our own back then and by then there were all these social problems that we were trying to deal with, and also I had a different emphasis in that couple of year session I had there and one was suicide prevention, the other was school performance, did you ever see my report?

No I haven't looked at it. You haven't looked at it and you got it?

No, I haven't seen it....How could you have avoided it? The thing that struck me was that here we were spending umpteen million and hundreds of millions over time on education and the learning of the students was dropping or staying the same yet here we were with huge construction, huge numbers of principals and administrators and teachers with rather decent salaries, and yet the kids weren't doing any better. I wanted to try and focus in on that and some of the things that were being implemented, including the creation of a special committee on school performances. Some of the things that I was suggesting were not really expensive propositions because it's not necessarily the number of dollars that affects what's going on in the classroom, people like to say that's the case..

Well, we went through that in the 70's...that is throw dollars at it... and then we had money to throw at it... Yep..so I concentrated on that subjection suicide prevention, on labor issues that I'm still paying for with the labor leadership.

That's always been an uneasy relationship with native leadership and labor. It ought to be a two way street then.

We made that argument during the pipeline, trying to get people to work, but we did not get a real supportive audience. I think the way labor leadership
was also wanting I think there is also some opportunities there --they're all in state of decline. Oh, boy, they are and the thing is that I'm being able to put this campaign together without them and some of them are realizing that and they've tried to make me out to be anti-labor when in reality I've had a strong labor record over the years and if I owed anybody in the my race for congress it was labor. But see, I disagree with them over the little Davis-Bacon wage scale. I never said to repeal it, said it has got to be rational, it's got to show the real prevailing wage rate, not some fantasy of some commissioner. Because to me the State shouldn't be required to pay any fore than the prevailing rate.

...can't understand name... always said in the 70's that you made alot of sense. Well, I got into this over Red Dog because I didn't want the wage scale to be so out of kilter that the whole State kind of focused in there and then it just made a whole lot more competition for own people in the region. So they're what trying to say is that WILLIE HENSLEYis only trying to be paid only $10 per hour land that's B.S. One of the points I made is that often time there is so little construction activity in a community that if the community had their way they would rather pay 20 people $10 hr rather than 10 people $20 hr.

*It's a whole different notion of community.* Sure. But they've never seen fit to accommodate our special problems there. At Red Dog it eventually worked out. We had to work very hard and closely with the Commissioner of Labor, once we got the Governor to agree to put this distressed economic zone under the local hire law, so that half the jobs would go to this zone by job category and then if there wasn't somebody skilled there, then they could bring up somebody from outside. So we had to do it that way. This is part of the basis for the thinking at least of we know what to do about trying to do........but what happens on the post secondary is that the system forgets it generally speaking...once they get them out of the schools they're not worth a dime to them anymore and the system
doesn't really care how well they've done, they've pushed them along, they're not really qualified to graduate, a lot of them, then the university has to ask for a whole bunch of money to bonehead this bonehead that, right? When they should have done it to begin with...

So the secondary school people, they don't know what they are doing to how they're doing it...we found that within our own region that we didn't know, that's why we started funding that NANA Dorm to try to keep some connection between us and our students and keep encouraging them. So there's lots to be done and more and it's going to be harder because there is less money and, but yet I sometimes wonder -- I spoke to the St. Mary's graduation one time before they disintegrated even back in the early sixties, there was some of the best of the best rural graduate came from St. Mary's. But when I was out there they had volunteer teachers, and their beds were as wide as this board and as hard. The room was just about this wide. It's not the dollars, somehow or other there has got to be something more than, I don't know what it is but they had something then that the public schools don't offer. Speaking of which, I ordered this, did you see this, ah, on to where the spirit...problems of the Arctic school, but today all my relative belong to Klukwan, and they're pulling up and here I sit on at large Doyon. So, but I really can't remember holding them hostage, forgot what dorm-- I think it was Moore Hall.

I think how I got into it was kinda funny because everybody likes to listen to the radio, but they went through and but in the back of my mind I've always seen something

*It was wonderful leadership.*

Unscheduled follow-up talk with Willy Hensley at UAF August 20, 1990 - Breakfast Meeting (7th Annual Inupiat Conference)
WILLIE HENSLEY: Your paper was interesting, why didn't you just ask your questions directly? I didn't think I gave you much you could use in our talk in Anchorage.

MICHAEL JENNINGS: Well, Senator, I just wanted you to tell me what you thought was of importance: you know the stories and people and events you thought were interesting to you.

WILLIE HENSLEY: To start with, the U of A never did us any favors, and has not done a very good job of educating Native youth--at least from our perspective. What help we got we found the dollars for and gave it to them with strings attached.

MICHAEL JENNINGS: By "we", who do you mean?

WILLIE HENSLEY: The Native leadership, specifically those Native who were in the legislature (Hensley, Sackett and Ferguson) and those who were appointed to the B.O.R., and those who were running the corporations.

MICHAEL JENNINGS: Why the big push in the early 70's for post-secondary ed. in rural areas and then little opposition to the restructuring in the late 80's?

WILLIE HENSLEY: Initially we believed we could convince the University to deliver useful education programs out in the regions, job skills, business skills and things that would be of use to the regional and village corporations. To help
us get up and running (after ANSCA); as time passed, we discovered that the
University was not going to provide those type of courses, so we shifted our focus
to elementary and secondary education (settlement of the Hootch case and the
creation of REAS's, they had the potential for greater influence over education
that the CC councils). Besides, other issues were demanding the time and energy
of Native leadership.

MICHAEL JENNINGS: What sort of issues?

WILLIE HENSLEY: We all know that ANCSA was designed to insure the
future of the corporations—we had very few educated leaders and almost no one
with any sort of corporate management background. We needed land planners,
finance people, resource people, but most important was the change needed in the
Act itself (1991--stock alienation ???? and land transference clauses) those and
the day to day operations of the corporations took ever increasing amounts of
time, energy and capital (both economic and political).

MICHAEL JENNINGS: So, did the C.C.'s in Nome, Kotzebue, and Bethel do what
you wanted them to and if so, what was it? If not, why?

WILLIE HENSLEY: That's a big question. Basically, the university system
has never been attuned to Native needs and wants; we put the C.C.'s out there in an
effort to provide education in the local community in hopes that it would become
more sensitive to Native needs. I don't believe that has occurred. The Western
view of education in the local community seems to be an end mean that non-
Native's believe that education is itself a product, while Native tend to view it more
as a tool—it has to have use, application. The University is not really geared to
produce courses that are more vocational. They are set up to deal in academic, abstract knowledge which is viewed as the product, while we see it more as a process to achieve other ends than just the acquisition of knowledge; the knowledge must be usable within our worldview. This has and continue to be a real sore point between the University and the Native communities and I don't think the University will be able to address Native needs until there are more Native in the system.

MICHAEL JENNINGS: If we could change hears a bit, I'd like to talk about the way Native leadership goes about making decisions.

WILLIE HENSLEY: Each corporation is a bit different in its management style. Some, like Sealaska are much more western in structure and philosophy than NANA, which has tried to blend the traditional use of elders and the western corporate model mandated under ANCSA. So I don't think I can speak for the whole Native community.

MICHAEL JENNINGS: What I'm interested in, Senator, is how the leadership works with each other, such as the Bush caucus or the AFN board, as it or they relate to the non-Native policy folks, such as the State, the University or the Feds.

WILLIE HENSLEY: As you know, Michael, we talk to each other. In the old days we held retreats once or twice a year where we worked out which regions needed or wanted what. Sackett, Ferguson, myself and others who served in Juneau tended to know what was economically feasible within the State budgets and we built on that. Depending on their regional needs and the strengths of the people from the regions, different people would assume the lead; for instance
Sackett was the budget person; John served on Senate Finance for almost 20 years and therefore could push for funds for projects in various rural areas. Other people did other things; myself, I was good at getting projects going, making deals and setting things up for the other people to run or manage, so I tended to assume a more visible public role. The point is, we tried to avoid confrontation, we tended to take a longer range view which helped us avoid conflict within and without the leadership. The other ???? was we presented a united front. We worked out strategies in private and stuck together publicly, and we had the seniority and votes to get what we wanted.

MICHAEL JENNINGS: I know you need to get over to the conference, but if you could just answer a couple of more questions, I'd appreciate it. First, Why Nome, Bethel, and Kotzebue, why C.C.'s there and not Barrow, Ft. Yukon or Sandpoint?

WILLIE HENSLEY: Basically, it was because of the priorities of each region. I've always been a big supporter of education. That's why Kotzebue got a C.C. George Holman was under some pressure from AVCP to improve social and economic conditions in Bethel, so he held the state budget hostage until the University and the urban legislators, particularly Anchorage, agreed to give him a C.C. Nome was also a case of local demand. The ??????? hammered Frank Ferguson and the BOR for one until they got it.

MICHAEL JENNINGS: But other places also tried to get one and still don't have one--Barrow, for instance.
WILLIE HENSLEY: Ya, well, Barrow always had it's own money, it started it's own University and is currently running a resurrected version of Inupiat University--the NSHEC, so Frank and I didn't worry too much about them. They could afford to build their own, which they did. As for other sites, I can't remember specifics, but basically it was always a matter of state budget limitations and the interest of the particular rural legislators and whether they were willing to do battle with the University and the State to get one, or whether they would rather address other priorities for their regions.

MICHAEL JENNINGS: Last question--was the ultimate reason for putting C.C.'s in rural Alaska education or economic, or what--and what future do see, given the '88 restructuring?

WILLIE HENSLEY: I think we talked about that a bit already, but basically , yes, we though in the early 70's that we could get the University to provide an education that would be culturally sensitive if we put them in rural schools, but the people who came to teach in the C.C.'s bring other understandings of the world with them and try to recreate their view of what Native's need, not what we tell them we want or need, so in that sense the C.C.'s were a failure. On the other hand, by their building they insured a long term commitment, on the part of the University and State to rural Alaska. So in part, they were part of an economic infrastructure that provided the basis for further development--road, power, sewer and water, etc....which now exist in those villages with C.C.'s while other rural communities still lack these basic services.

As for what I see of the University after restructuring, it appears that little has changed. Things are back to being run from UAF. There are still no Natives in policy positions in the system, very few in academic or teaching (faculty)
positions in the system and not much interest in rural education on the part of the administration. WE just hired another president from the east coast to run the show and so it appears that things have come full circle, back to the future, so to speak--perhaps subsistence will provide the unifying point needed to energize the Native community.

MICHAEL JENNINGS: What do you mean?

WILLIE HENSLEY: We did much better when there was a common threat to our land., we worked together as a community. I think the threat to subsistence may provide, in the 90's , the unifying force that land claims provided us in the 60's and 70's.

MICHAEL JENNINGS: What about education?

WILLIE HENSLEY: I think we'll focus more on elementary and secondary education than university. We need to start turning out better graduates from high schools before we worry too much about the UAF. Besides, NANA spends about $70,000 a year on scholarships to send our children outside to major universities in addition to funding a dorm on UAF for NANA students there, to insure a warm, comfortable environment. I really do have to go now...let me know if you need anything else.

End of Interview--Willie Hensley
AN INTERVIEW WITH

SAM KITO

Michael Jennings
October 28, 1990

Anchorage

What I'm looking at is the formation of the rural community colleges. I'm doing a policy history and what I'm interested in is the Native leadership involvement, not rally looking at the institutional's response because I think it's already biased. My basic line of argument is that there would be no C.C. system if the leaders hadn't pushed it. I'm interested in at one level, what was going on in AFN and the regional corporations; your position on the Board of Regents, and how it evolves into and how the bush caucus was instrumental over the long view over 1972 to 1988 and why there seems to be very little resistance to the U's restructuring.

I guess the issue of U of A and rural C.C. has been an issue that developed during the time frame you talked about. 1972 to 1974 was a major indication that the Univ. wasn't responding to the educational needs in the post secondary areas of the state. The Board of Regents believed they had a way of resolving that issue under the leadership of Dr. Hyatt at the time. What they did was create a position that Elaine Ramos was in, which was VP for Rural Education. As such, the VP for rural education was a director level position that did not sit in on any deliberations of the president's cabinet. Therefore, it was a step away from the decision making and the development of monetary and budgetary plans for the university.

When I was appointed to the board there was a concentrated effort by myself and when John Shively was appointed we worked in concert with each other to find a way for the university to get into rural ed.
What we did was first to review what was on going at the U and found out that there was basically a minimal amount of budget allocated for Native studies and that on the main campus the rural ed. position was held by Elaine, the VP, was basically an extension of the main campus of Fairbanks.

So what we did to accomplish change was to create on the Board of Regents a committee that was called the Community College Committee. What we intended to do with that committee was two focuses. The community of Anchorage was in turmoil because they had what they called the two plus two system, and in southeastern there wasn't enough students to drive a four year institution and a C.C.

What we did was to force the issue and the Board of Regents then created the C.C. subcommittee which I was named the chairman, I'd have to go back in the records or you could do that to find out who was on the committee, but our motivations were to address the issue of rural ed. and at the same time to solve the problems in Anchorage and Juneau.

So we were able to piggyback ourselves to a major re-organization of the system and be able to accomplish what we wanted which was a C.C. system in rural Alaska.

The first issue, not the first issue, but I'll take them in three phases: how we dealt with the Juneau issue was to create a combined system that is now the UAJ and the UAJ was a combination of a C.C. and a 4 year institution. In retrospect I think that was an error on our part because what it did was open the doors for the same system to be implemented 15 years later in Anchorage when they decided to merge a 4 years system with the two year institution. There are not enough students even now that more money is spent transferring to Juneau to keep it accredited, so that the cost for education is exorbitantly high. So what Juneau
should have is a C.C., in my opinion, now. So you go back and figure out, do you make mistakes and that was a mistake, to create the combination in Juneau.

The next issue I'll talk about is the creation of UAA. In order to create the Anchorage C.C. as an independent institution, we spoilt the U that existed in Anchorage, which was a two-plus-two system, whereby we created a full fledged C.C. that was called the Anchorage C.C., and we created the 4 year institution that was called the UAA. Two totally separate entities, with their presidents and chancellor of the C.C. and the chancellor of the UAJ. At this time we were able to then create the UA rural C.C. system with its own chancellor. That system was one where there was some conflict because we had a VP for Rural Ed., but in creating the full system, we created a chancellorship position for all the C.C.'s and then we wrote into the budget, I don't know the time frame, we created the vice-chancellor and we had a commitment from the president, at the time the Vice Chancellor would in fact be--would represent the Native rural interests of the state.

You can realize our dismay when we found out that that position went unfilled even though it was budgeted for a number of years afterward.

So the commitment, to the rural C.C. delivery system was there but it was always one that they did not fill to lose control of it. So the first chancellor was a good chancellor because he was from Fairbanks; and that was Pat O'Roark. If you can see the rise of Pat O'Roark over period of time started from we on the board had a lot of confidence in him because he started in Bethel and moved his way to chancellor the Rural C.C. system and then on to chancellor of the UAF. When one of the problems we've had with the Fairbanks campus is illustrated by what has happened to the whole system as we move into the 80' and 90's when Pat O'Roark, who was a champion for rural education, became enmeshed in the internal politics of the University system. Now we come back to 1990 in a delivery system
for rural ed. that emanates from Fairbanks, which is the same thing that we fought fourteen years ago. We're right back where we started.

The delivery system, even though you now have a system that's called rural education if you look at it, it all comes out of Fairbanks. The rural college and it's all driven out of Fairbanks and it is the same thing that we moved away from and it is the same thing of a non-responsive system. It's ironic that the chancellor of Fairbanks is one that received his learnings and education in the system. As we took the system apart to further provide for rural education opportunities and that was his rise in the ladder.

Now he runs it again but he runs it like you're looking at a rear view mirror, that his rise in learning and the whole process is run out of the same institution that he had to fight against when he was in Bethel, because there was no input for policy from the local level. I would say that even now the system says that they may want changes but they are not going to get them.

Another illustration would be the transferability of credits from one institution to another. It doesn't work.

None of the systems will come up with a primary system that says if you will go to a college in the first two years in Bethel or Prince William Sound that those credits will transfer to any other institution in the State. What they consistently go back on and rely on is the articulation guide that says this is a guideline for all the deans and all the directors of the programs to review and make a determination whether or not these credits transfer. Which means you don't know.

That's not an integrated system in my view. Even though now we take the new system and put it under the UAF and they still can't transfer their credits in the same institution under the same chancellor. At any rate that was, but we did create a rural CC system and we were able to force three decisions, two of which
have been turned around in the past few years to the detriment of rural education, and that is the integration of UAA and Anch. C.C. and the creation of the rural Ed. system that emanates from the UAF.

The only one of the three that still remains is the UA Juneau and to this day, I do not believe it is serving the needs of Southeastern Alaska, especially the rural communities as much as it did when they were a C.C. in southeast Alaska.

Time heals and the great outcry for the great restructuring of the system wasn't felt because they were pretty smart in dealing with communities to provide for their needs. The University was smart. The Univ. went into SE. Alaska and they hired probably the greatest person to be able to develop the SE system under the new structure, Marshall Lind, and if you look at the staff, it's a coalition of people who have a very strong allegiance to Marshall and they, who has had a lot of bush experience, in building coalitions. So it was become a feeding system. Everything is SE Alaska feeds Juneau even though they all think they are getting the piece of the pie. If you ever look at the pie, the feeding is done in Juneau, and the other communities are back to, I'd say probably more on a community schools basis than a community college.

Out of it will rise another movement some time in the near future pushing for C.C. throughout the state and I don't think the end result is they are going to be denied. I think that the U. system is now finding they are in deep trouble with their negotiations with the teachers union and arbitration about how they created the system.

It is ironic that the question now, is now that they integrated the system and they thought that they could just do away with the bums, the bargaining unit members, a....arbitrator overturned that...I find it ironic that, being on the board, watching the system that I helped craft that I thought was good for rural education falling apart. Given the opportunity now to represent an organization
that I had some difficulty dealing with at the time, was the bargaining unit members, when I was on the board, I now represent in Juneau.

My mission for them and with them from another point of view is to preserve the mission of the community college system in the State of Alaska. It's ironic I find myself doing it on behalf of the union that is the only organization left that still has a statewide system constituency based in community colleges, or with the ideals and the ideas of community colleges. So people were kind of surprised that an ex-board of regent member could end up lobbying for the preservation of community colleges with the unions, but I think that what they are is the beginning of the new drive for a community college system. I think eventually another system of community colleges will emerge. When people find that students get out of high school, that their desires of having their student go to school is not going to result in them choosing to go to a four year institution. If you talk to parents, natives, too, AFN board members, the first question you ask them is what is your child going to do; they are going to say "my child is going to college."

in state or out of state? Out of state or in state, they will always say they are going to college. It is not realistic to make decisions on what you want, but it is on what happens. You find that 35% of students go to college, but what happens to the other 65%?

We lose a lot of them.

We lose them, too. I guess the idea is that you need a system that can make the transition like C.C.'s can do because they can shift their programs very fast and that's what we need. We need to be able to have more programs on a community basis, that allows a person to get enough education to function in the environment that they choose, which may be Nome, Kotzebue, Barrow, Bethel or wherever it is.
Do you think that UAF has ever understood? No. I think for one time they did, when O'Roark was president or chancellor of the Rural C.C. system. There was a real set of values in responding to this type of an educational opportunity, but it went away when he went away. Now, he has it back again, but it three levels lower so that he gets a glancing view of the rural system while he focuses on the big picture. The other example of lack of initiative on the part of the University of Alaska was Senator Sackett and Senator Ferguson and Rep. Adams. I worked with them with Willie Hensley to put the RAHI program together. That was when O'Roark was just newly a chancellor up there. Open for ideas so we came up with this idea and this program, with Chukchi. We got his attention and we went in to create an attitude on the campus up there with the rural Alaska Honors Institute. That's been a very successful program and I'll be the first to admit that. But my problem with it is that it hasn't shown any growth since the initial infusion of money which was $750,000, it's come into a line item where they do bring students from all over the state. It is an exemplary program but there hasn't been any growth. It's still the RAHI, and there are no other ideas that have come from it and even more than that, I find it just totally objectionable to me.

Willie says that the university has always been real good at...if the native community decides to want something they turn around they say "you go find the money for it," and we give them the money for it, then they have a tendency to siphon off a bunch of it. Well, they, even after they implement they siphon it off. You know this RAHI program is one that...just as an example, we put $750,000 we created an institution, but because that was the basis for running it, was the rural education, what's the name of that program?

Alaska Native Studies. Yeah. The problem is that the ANS doesn't, its not interdependent with the University. It is a "stand alone" program and the problem with a stand alone program is that the students have some difficulty
when you position them out here and say, "Okay, all you natives stand over here." But I think that instead, what they should have had was an interdisciplinary program.

That was what I...my BA. is in Alaska Native Studies. But you should have been able to work within all the other systems. Instead of being our here all by yourself so that you dealt with everybody at arms length because there...

It's the old BIA separate people...that's what it amounts to. Just let you know that with that background and knowledge I did go and spend three years at APU as director of their ??? and created their Alaska Native Institute program. What we did was create, on a budget of $50,000 an institute and we created an Alaskan Native Studies program, but we worked with every department in the University so we could consolidate a degree in programs that had a relationship to Alaska Native issues. You could graduate with a degree in Alaska Native Studies. But you could also graduate with a degree in economics. We created it on $50,000 a tutoring and counseling program. We didn't hire...We created volunteer tutoring and counseling programs. By this we meant we never used a professional counselor. I had my deputy, who was the only full time person under me, 'cause I was just part-time. That's all the money we had 'cause they wanted to pay me something, so I took some of it, but not very much of it. The full paid staff member was my assistant who didn't have a college degree, but was more of a person who was able to communicate with the kids. But she never interfered with kids. She was a traditional guidance. What we did was taught the peer counselors how to spot the problems. We didn't do what the university of Alaska does, go out and buy them a car to transport them around town and make them dependent on the transportation system. We gave them the bus schedules and told them to use the buses. We taught them how to help each other, if one of them was downtown and one of them went and got drunk or went out and partied, to go down and help
them out and if it continued it got brought to our attention, but we didn't hear it on the first problem. You'd be surprised how they because dependent on each other and supported each other.

Then our tutoring money, which was $4000, we put into the tutoring program for the whole university. We meshed it in there. We took our smartest and put them in to the tutoring program so we had natives tutoring non-natives and non-natives tutoring natives and this way it wasn't "Hey, you dumb natives, we've got this tutor over here," or "you go over here and they'll take care of you".. You go over here and you're not a dumb native, what you are is a student then.

So there are times when you want to bring them together, like the fifth floor of the Gruening Building, but that's the time when do that is during the cultural times, when you develop the ties. Then you invite people outside into your community on a social level but not on a...you work in both environments in an academic level. That's what the university of Alaska has missed.

I'd like you to talk about the leadership, both the corporate leadership and the bush caucus in relationship to the university. I'll quickly tell you that the retention of students at the APU, fourth year retention was higher than the average at the university for native students that matriculated as freshman.

Bush caucus. Bush caucus has been involved with the university issues as long as I've been around and they are really the driving force for change in the institution. External pressures make the institution change, not internal. It has consumed many natives that have gone into the system. Because, they can't fight the change, the resistance to change in the university. So the bush caucus has been a fundamental force in allowing for change to happen in the university system. Drive it with the budget first and policy changes later. You drive it in the second year by putting the money into the base, into the university base and you force it into the base and they are required to keep it. I think if you go here or to
Anchorage and talk to Kathy Johnson, you'll find out how, after the second year they are able to funnel money out of a system. Because, we've just raised an issue with Morris Thompson who is on the boards of regents now, about them taking some of Della Keats money and moving it over to hire a minority for all minorities, not native minority which the money was published for, but to hire a Vice or assistant director in human affairs or something like that, which we find out was a response to some pressures from the black community. So now we got to go fight another battle, the black community and the university says "we want more money," so they take it from the native program.

So it is an internal battle, and when you get in there you can't fight them off, because you don't have anybody driven high enough in the system that will respond to you. So you train somebody else and you train Pat O'Roark from a community college professor all the way to the chancellor of UAF and you have somebody who knows the system and knows your system and they know their system and you end up having to fight them even though he will deny there is a difference in educational philosophy or goals, but there historically is.

And AFN has probably not spent enough time on educational issues, but they have become a smaller staff. What they have done—have relied on the political process for change so they end up working with the bush caucus.

*So there is a lot of consensus building and then they get with the bush caucus and then they go to the university. Barton never understood that. That's right. He stayed there much too long for rural education. But the real devastation happened when O'Dowd came. The end result is...to cause the demise of a system and walk away and think you have accomplished something is not a believer.*

Whoever supports what was done to the university in the last three years does not support a community college system, in my view.
INTERVIEW WITH

JOHN SCHAFER

By Michael Jennings
What is your recollection of the development of the Community College in Bethel, Nome and Kotzebue? I think prior to the development of the C.C. you had rural resource centers or whatever they were being called at that time. It is my understanding that was set up through the legislature. The key players from the bush were Sackett, Hensley, Ferguson. Outside the legislature, Sam Kito, Sam had been involved in education for some time by then, at the local level in Fairbanks and then statewide. Eventually then on the Board of Regents.

Getting from rural resource center to C.C. status was done by rather...I wasn't involved in a lot of that happening late, when Kotzebue's request to become a C.C. was here in town. At that point the board of regent, I had just gotten on the board, developed the policy that no more C.C.'s would be started. The administration was against anymore C.C.'s and really were not even supportive of the ones they had. At that point what I did was get somebody to work with what happened in Valdez, they were also interested in a C.C....and had the wherewithal, the financing to not have to depend of the University system to have a C.C. So when they were turned down, I encouraged the city manager to solicit proposals from outside of the state to establish an outside C.C. that was affiliated with an outside university. Then bring that back to the Board of Regents. He actually did that. There were three colleges that were interested.

Brought back to the Board of Regents. They decided to waive their policy and a motion was made to establish C.C. in Valdez at which time I had one of my friends to amend the motion to add Kotzebue, and by then it was impossible to not vote for the motion. So Valdez and Kotzebue got their C.C.'s.

To my knowledge they were the last that were established, because the University system has been trying to play with C.C.'s, really unsuccessfully, until recently when they combined the C.C. and the University system. Between the Anchorage C.C. and the University system it made them difficult to work with
other C.C.'s because they were working with the same union, so it made it difficult for them to do that.

It has been the native leadership's position that college services should be as close to the village as possible. That's what has kept the C.C. system alive in my estimation, not just in the Native communities but in non as well.

Just the one comment on the bush caucus. The bush caucus was actually started as the ice block prior to the bush caucus by non-natives from the Nome area, who were...

*Thoughts as to why the Borough requested a C.C. early on?* Well I know I know something about it, but not to the extent...at the time I was getting a C.C. for Kotzebue, at least that was my goal...Barrow wasn't interested. They didn't want anything to do with the University system. What they wanted to do was establish their own university. Which they did.

*This was Inupiat U.* Yeah. They worked that for awhile. by the time that had failed, they had a desire for a C.C. after that. Probably did but by then I was off the board.

It is an interesting political anomaly that Kotzebue from a political science standpoint... Well, Frank Ferguson would not have been able to do that if he could have pushed for the C.C. There was a lot more support, he wasn't that powerful. He had to have been capable of holding hostage the University budget in order to get something he wanted,

*As Hohman did...* Right. But that wasn't all the case every year. In those times he could do that be he would not push for anything in Barrow that he did not have the majority support, and the majority could be where he thought was important.

If they split then he could get away with not supporting it, which is what I would assume the case was. Frank actually did his best to take care of those people...
up there. They had a lot of money and they really never asked for very much and when they asked for so much that it was difficult to provide. They were on a scale of operation that is different than the rest of the bush put together.

When they needed something they needed millions, as opposed to a few hundred thousand like the rest of the villages.

*In conversations with other folk it has been indicated that the establishment of community colleges in rural Alaska has served a multitude of purposes.*...*Has indicated that at least for his part of his contention was to build an infrastructure and the best way to do that was to build a C.C. and about the same time period the REA's come about. A lot of accompanying legislation that then became possible because of that. A lot of water, harbor, airport improvements, etc.* Were you part of the leadership? I was not involved in that type of planning. In a smaller sense we probably fed that from the Nana region. Actually, that's what we were doing from there as well and fit into that plan. That would be something that Ferguson would have sat down with Sackett on, the only reason I got involved at all was because Gov. Hammond saw that he had a big problem with the University that he had. An unknown deficit and they didn't seem to be able to solve it, and one of them was to be able to get me on the board. And I said I would sit on it until we solved the fiscal problem. So that's how I got on there and I was on there for a year and a half, and when the problem was solved I got out. It was during that period that I had an opportunity to get community college status for Kotzebue and I did. But that was an aside. So I guess in a sense I've been skirting the areas you've been talking about, the planning for all this.

We'd planned for a C.C. for Kotzebue. That was always our local goal and that fit into Sacketts plan for the rest of the state. Not going through that planning with them I ended up assisting them in achieving some of that by being on the regency board, being able to take advantage of that. But I don't know about
the statewide planning, I didn't get involved with that. Except to the extent that we would discuss these issues at AFN. We'd have leadership retreats every year. We'd discuss all issues. But education wasn't an area that I worked in or was interested in.

Was it important to the leadership? Yes, it was. But there just others. In our region, Willie Hensley has always been the education guy. He's the one that worked with and pushed on a statewide level, so he would, if they needed a guy who was not in the legislature to come in they would have conferred with Willie, not me.

Talk about the NANA Spirit Movement... Frank Ferguson and two others. Those were the two guys who were actually talking and working out a plan to incorporate a C.C. Chukchi with the high school and the vocational center, and the disagreement occurred, and somebody, I can't recall, from the Kotzebue position, ?????, didn't pick up his position, he reneged on something and not told him, which is why ???? Barton and Ferguson. The two guys who created it...were O'Roark and White. We basically had a couple of people which we had to change, before we change that around. It was easy to change because Ferguson was not directly involved in the party more. Both of those people could have caused it. 'Cause I had to go in and undo it, put it back together again. It wasn't hard once George was gone, and I had dealt with Pat before.

I was working for Barton at the time and I was being shuffled off to Juneau a lot. I think that I worked with both. I know George, too. O'Roark to, after he reneged on a deal he made with us when I was on the Board of Regents. Sam Kito and I were able to work that out. I guess that they were both involved in bad faith negotiations.

The spirit movement. What we tried to do in Nana was to evaluate the settlement and even though we were involved to a great deal because Willie was
involved in the negotiations right from the start, right through the passage of
the act. He had first hand knowledge, and our attorney, who was from DC., also
had first hand knowledge. The rest of us kind of stayed home and worked the
meetings up here. When we got done with the act, we didn't know what we had.
The Natives did not know what we were after. Specifically. We knew we wanted
land rights. But we didn't know the difference between 10 mil and 80 mil. Who
are we to know those kinds of things. If any of the Native leadership said that
they knew at the time. Who are we to know those kinds of things. If any of the
Native leadership said that they knew at the time, they were lying. 'Cause none of
them had any concepts like that. We didn't know the difference between a mil
and a bil dollars. Sure, we had some idea but we didn't have those kind of details.
We were trying to do some stuff and we accomplished some it and we lost some
things in the process. And we all knew that. The act passed and even the AFN
meeting to vote on the act was phony. Two hours before the meeting had started
the President had already signed the act so it was already law. But they had
worked it in Washington by a radio link that you were talking to the President
before he signed the bill...

This was the meeting out at AMU? Yeah.

So all of that was, we had a big fight, who was supporting it and who wasn't
for nothing basically. But we had it. We could not have turned it down because
we did get something. We sat down and evaluated that act out in NANA. We spent
three days, just the board and the lawyer and a communication consultant, who
we brought in, because we had to go back out and try and explain this s...to our
shareholders. We didn't know how.

So we sat down and went through this thing word by word. When they got
done we said "What are they trying to do to us. This act is written to fail." So we
said, "OK, we have to live with it, how can we get around so it works for us."
Some things we couldn't fix ourselves, we couldn't do something that would change because it was the law. So we had to get back and change it. So right off the bat, we had a list of things we needed to do. The most important of which we could look like we had lost our aboriginal rights to subsist off the land...for this was fee simple land we were going to get. In most cases it wasn't enough, because we had used about three quarters of Alaska to subsist and they had given us one tenth, that wasn't enough, we couldn't continue our lifestyle like that. Next thing we went to work on was to get some amendments to the act. Back then, this was '72, we couldn't get any support from any of the other regions. It took some of them 3 or 4 years of political bickering before they finally got a board that could sit down and do what we were doing. There had to be some catch-up's. it was '76 before we finally got support enough from regions to start working on amendments, except those ones that everybody knew that were triggered by deadlines. That we had to change right away.

What we did was try to do that. In our board we looked after that we looked after our operations, we went to retreat, with selected board members and staff and sat down. We had Lee Gorsuch was through his parent company working for us at that time, were the consultants we brought in for that.

The founder of his consulting company was an old guy who had been in charge of mobilization of industry to support the company in W.W.II and a consultant to countries in third world nations he could develop economically. He thought his approach was the kind of approach we could take. Not strictly a business approach, a holistic approach. Look at the whole country, the Nana region and tribe. We worked with him for a day and a half, then we threw the system out and started from scratch and built essentially what Nana is today.

That was back in '73, I think. Next year all we did was go out and...we had a lot of opposition anyway, just like everybody else. In that process, we looked at
ourselves, not as a normal corporation, right from the start, rally a tribe having corporate standards that we had to maintain to maintain the most important aspects of culture. The land and that sort of thing.

We said, "OK, that's what we're going to do." A lot of consensus building...A lot of meetings. We were always having meetings. We had these eleven separate tribes essentially that we were dealing with within NANA. We had to build consensus amongst all of them because in our area the village had to be treated like a separate tribe. We worked with them that way. To the extent we could we delegated right off the bat. A lot of board authority to primarily IRA councils, that's what we used. Councils are the backbone of our land selection committees. Then after we got land they're the ones that reserved veto power, which we even put into federal law, when we merged our villages with NANA. the had veto power over development on their former lands.

That's unusual given the structure of the other corporations. Right. We were trying to maintain this nativeness in our corporation. After ten years of this, trying to take a holistic view of this we had also developed Maniliuq, the native non-profit corp. for services in the area, the had the REAA's thanks to Frank Ferguson. The people in Kotzebue voted to keep the BIA so we had to administratively kick them out because the BIA did not want to stay, we cut a deal with the Dept. of Education even after the Kotzebue people voted to keep them. So we ended up doing things like that but we worked on and set up these entities would handle certain aspects of the holistic approach we were taking. The tribal education and other things, we divided up the responsibilities and then I had to establish a system where we could talk and work together and make sure we're all heading in the same direction.

We had to call our region ????? I don't usually come up with new ideas, I just go find somebody almost everything has been tried before. In this case HUD
was trying to invent this wheel and they had a new program that they were trying called "regional strategies" and they were going to try it. They had a test place someplace in Pennsylvania that they were trying to hold people together. So we tapped it it and they gave some funds to the state and particularly what it was we got all players together for whatever reason ?? ally, and would go over all the plans the villages had developed with the town meeting style of approach where all the organizations got together and had a public meeting and they decided what things were important for them. I really wasn't a very supportive system.

For instance, Ferguson and all the other legislators didn't like it. 'Cause, we were taking away their pork barrel ability, or some of it. We were setting up priorities for them, as opposed to them doing it from Juneau where they could extract favors in return which was the political spoil system at the time. Eventually, they saw the benefit to it and went along because we could really support them when they were going to go fight for legislation because we had all this consensus built already and we could go prove it. Initially.

We brought this together and we had the heads, we had this little committee, that was in charge of the strategy and it consisted of myself and the president of Maniluq and the head of the school district. The key players in the region. We would orchestrate the strategy that allowed us to share goals and support each other even with funds, support a program. We started all that and we were able to take, after the first ten years of the program, and go back and take a look at what we accomplished. So we did. We took a holistic look, not although from my standpoint, well, lets take a look at what we're responsible for, etc. Education of shareholders through our scholarship program, job opportunities. We pulled all this together and my, god, we're failing. Things are worse then they were ten years ago. We can develop the statistics. In fact, there
were some studies going on that were done with regional strategy that showed that although we were making some progress in some areas, primarily those areas that NANA could specifically apply time, money and resources to, and some health areas, everything else was worse. Going to pot. So we said, "Wait a minute, something's wrong here."

I started to take a look at what could be done and asked all these people doing the studies, they were a bunch of well-qualified social scientist's doing the work, plus we had contact with some other and asked them the question "What's wrong here? They keep giving us their institutionalized answers, that you need some more of people like them to come in and develop these programs. We say we already got one. And it isn't working. And they say you got to have more. Wait a minute...Pour good money after bad.

In '76 we started elders conferences up there and had one going again. A good opportunity to ask the elders what they think. Well, I asked them what's wrong. They said we have a lack of values. People aren't learning values and not living values. That's it. We asked them what are the values. Then we went into what ended up being about a two day conference where they tried to tell us what were our traditional values. And then we went into a four month period where we had to try to translate from Eskimo to English.

And some of it was not totally translatable. We ended up with 17 values and some of them basic human values and different values and the same thing you find in most cultures, that are culturally oriented. Some things were important culturally, like losing the language, and added them back in. Then we tried to build a program which was difficult. The only role models we had were rural development projects, internationally, which is like that. Since I was doing business in Korea I latched on to the ...Dung program which is values and very successful at it. Only three values which made it easier. They were basically
modernizing their entire rural economy and they were very successful at it. But our people wouldn't accept foreign aid so we didn't do very good but we did develop this program can inupuit ????? or as we call it, the Eskimo Spirit program. The program had several components. A major component of it was to establish elders councils in each village and each region and figuring out what it was they were responsible for and getting them to operate. NANA underwrote the cost of that and still does.

Like those consultants? More than that because we figured that again, and that's why I gave you such a long background, and we were looking at this tribe again, so actually the tribal stuff or the state or the federal government as far as we're concerned. Because we chose to take the long view and the long view is as far back as...

end of tape...tape runs out at this point