

Science Conference . . .

(Continued from page 1)

These charges drew an angry response from British Petroleum's Alaska Manager F. Geoffrey Larminie, who said Engler presented a "simple, rather bias definition of man. Take out oil, and you have a view of man." In his words, Engler was "a cynic and a pessimist" and his presentation was "a catalogue of original sin."

Larminie had praise for Alaska's liberal petroleum regulations. "They have a great deal of virtue," he said. "A body of case law on which to base precedent just doesn't exist." He predicted the decade of the seventies to be "the decade of the economist."

State Representative Gene Guess, Chairman of the Legislative council, commented that legislators were aware of the history of exploitation in Alaska and stated, "we will have to become educated, and more sophisticated."

Somewhat irked by the highly opinionated discussion, Guess warned, "Saying that something is all bad, or all good, is the wrong approach."

The opening symposium Tuesday shifted the focus of the conference to "Strategies for Social Change" in which the issues, problems, and needs of natives in the area of social change was discussed.

Chairman of the panel was Prof. George Rogers of the University of Alaska's Institute of Social, Economic, and Government Research. Panelists included Jack Conway, Center of Community Change, Washington, D.C. Prof. Norman Chance, Director of the University of Connecticut's Anthropology Department; and William H. Jacobs, Director of Alaska Legal Services.

Cast in the role of discussant, and the only native to participate in the conference, was Tlingit and Haida Council President John Borbridge.

"You cannot talk about one Alaska," Rogers stated. "You must talk about two Alaskas. The gap is growing and there is need for change."

"Most White Alaskans practice some form of race discrimination," said panelist Norman Chance. Pleading for restructur-

ing of the system in which "the rich are getting richer, and the poor are getting poorer."

Chance also said that the concept of the American melting pot must be adapted so that Alaskan natives can maintain the right to subscribe to their unique cultures and "be different."

Panelist William Jacobs sought to concern himself with the plight of the poor natives. "The situation in the bush is just drastic," Jacobs said.

Jacobs lacked the expertise of John Borbridge, who discussed the development of the regional concept as a solution to structuring rural natives into the Alaskan economy.

Where Jacobs discussed the failure of agencies to effectively provide relief to rural impoverished, Borbridge pointed out that regional development envisioned by native leaders in seeking a solution to land claims could effectively structure natives into both economic and political significance.

What was shamefully lacking throughout that portion of the conference which concerned itself with Alaskan natives was that non-native panelists could discuss what non-natives could offer to natives, not what the first Alaskans envision for themselves.

Non-natives discussed natives as if they were abstract and remote, so that the conference might well have been held in New York or Washington. The conference overlooked what could have been its most valuable resource: native expertise.

The most significant conclusions concerning that portion of the conference came from observers, rather than participants. Rep. Willie Hensley, of Kotzebue, was one native observer present.

"It is proper that the 20th Alaska Science Conference discuss change in the Arctic. It is proper that consideration be given to the effect of change on the Eskimo and Indian people," Hensley said.

"I am, however, perplexed and hurt by the obvious lack of Eskimo and Indian panelists and speakers. Who is more involved

with this change than the native people themselves? Who can speak more dramatically about change and hopes?" he queried. Hensley said that, in omitting native participation, the conference planners "do no good by aiding in promoting the idea that native people cannot speak for themselves."

A Tuesday evening meeting of the Fairbanks Native Association resulted in a resolution which chided conference planners for their "short-sightedness" in omitting natives.

Sole native participant John Borbridge stated, "Using any number of criteria, it was a stimulating, very provocative conference. In other evaluation, conspicuous by their absence, are two basic aspects that would have contributed to making the conference even more significant.

"In one area, natives, their conditions, their political institutions, and other facets of their lives were the subject of much discussion and study. This could have been significantly enhanced by native participation.

"Secondly, the time was most appropriate for a meaningful dialogue for those that study and for those being studied. There are a number of native spokesmen on various levels of native leadership who are very capable of speaking on a number of panels," Borbridge said.

This opinion was shared by not only the Alaskan native leadership present, but also Eskimos and Indians from Canada and the continental U.S. Sensing this, conference programmers defensively argued that participants must be expert in some discipline.

Natives responded by charging that panelists were as qualified to discuss contemporary native issues as turn of the century anthropologists who concerned themselves with measuring skulls.

Native observers suggested that, rather than a self-confession of non-native exploitation of Alaskan natives, more meaningful topics could have included the application of native expertise toward management of properties and monies derived from a land settlement.

Other topics could have included the role of Indian Title as a basic premise to the land claims; or, of special interest to non-natives, the impact of a land solution on the Alaskan economy.

There were papers presented in some of the rather obscure panels that were of greater significance than opinionated discussion in the larger symposia.

The paper presented by Jane Wallen, Director of the Alaska State Museum, deserved to spearhead a panel on ways in which the unique cultures of Alaska's native peoples could be taught and revitalized.

University of Chicago Graduate Student Grace Wolf's account of native efforts to seek a just land claims solution was hampered by the imposition of a 15 minute time limit.

It is worthy of being distributed for the education of the non-native population and could well serve to quiet their alarm at the prospects of a settlement.

Others, such as Laurel Bland's paper on adult education, are worthy of considerable consideration. The majority of presentations, however, if they did not dwell on non-native guilt for the native predicament, conformed to outdated anthropological methods.

State legislators are as much confused about the outcome of the conference as native observers. A paper, presented by ISEGR Economist Gregg Erickson warned that under current regulations, oil companies stand to make huge profits in Arctic Slope development and that next month's

Fine Haul—

Arctic Area Commercial Salmon Catch Greatest

In terms of numbers and weight, the 1969 Arctic-Yukon-Kuskokwim area commercial salmon catch is the greatest ever recorded with late season coho and chum salmon fisheries still underway.

Preliminary figures released by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game in late August show a catch of 157,500 kings; 100,000 cohos; 9,900 reds; 88,200 pinks and 353,000 chums,

totaling 708,600 salmon of all species.

The Arctic-Yukon-Kuskokwim area is that portion of the State north of Bristol Bay and the Alaska Range and is the largest management unit in the State. This season 1,100 commercial fishermen, nearly all Eskimo and Indian residents, were distributed throughout the area from Goodnews Bay north to Kotzebue Sound.

The largest and economically most important salmon fisheries are located in the lower Kuskokwim and Yukon Rivers which accounts for the majority of the area's king and coho salmon harvests.

According to Ron Regnart, area biologist, very few salmon are canned in the area with a production of only 14,000 cases this season. However, over six million pounds of salmon have been processed to date for the fresh, frozen and cured markets. Nearly all of the area's catch, except king salmon, is purchased by Japanese firms for shipment to Japan.

Subsistence salmon catches are currently being tabulated by several Department survey crews. Subsistence salmon catches have declined sharply in most fishing districts during recent years. For example, in the early 1960's the area's subsistence harvest averaged at least one million salmon annually.

The declining dependence upon subsistence fishing, not salmon abundance, has largely influenced recent harvests. There are more opportunities for native residents to obtain cash incomes and they are expending less effort in fishing for their personal use.

Commercial utilization has partially taken up the slack as a result of the reduced subsistence harvest. Regnart explained that this has allowed the area's commercial salmon fishery to increase in production and economic importance during the past few years.

lease sale will be disappointing in the amount of revenues which would result.

The Erickson presentation led to a petition requesting postponement of the lease sale and a reassessment of state policy. Most legislators present considered Erickson's paper as a reversal of advice to them from academic sources. Confused, they admit a postponement of the sale would be unlikely at this late date.

The most vocal, if not violent, confrontation in the conference came Wednesday with an attack on conservationists by Senator Ted Stevens. "I am up to here with people who tell us how to develop our country," he said. He termed proposed regulations on petroleum development as "stupid."

Stevens said that early activity on the North Slope at Navy Pet. 4 and Umiat did not damage the land but even "enhanced it." Conservationists replied by stating the piles of oil drums, trash, and the torn up tundra still remains.

Sierra Club Vice President Dr. Edgar Wayburn of San Francisco said of Steven's speech, "Senator Stevens has made one of the most convincing speeches in favor of conservation that I have ever heard."

The most publicized presentations, spurred by opinionated commentary and vocal confrontation, left those who may have been empowered to act—legislators and state officials—bewildered. Those who were never consulted—the Alaskan natives were bewildered . . . and angered.

Bradner Hits AEC . . .

(Continued from page 1)

Bradner said scientists confess to know little about the earthquake making process, but recent theory suggests that a major quake may begin when it is triggered by a smaller earthquake.

He continued: "Dr. James D. Brune, in a report to the meeting of the American Geophysical Union last April, revealed the initial tremor of the 1964 Alaskan earthquake was 6.5 on the richter scale, and was followed by the large 7.8 magnitude tremor."

Dr. Brune contrasted this with underground nuclear blasts of 6.2 on the richter scale in Nevada. Underground blasts are planned at Amchitka as much as 40 times more powerful than those in Nevada, Bradner pointed out.

The Fairbanks legislator also produced the following statement from the AEC's own published report on safety of underground nuclear testing:

"The Amchitka test area merits special mention because it is located near one of the earth's most seismically active regions. Inasmuch as earthquake mechanisms are not completely understood, no absolute statement can be made about the possibility of triggering an earthquake of magnitude in this area."

Bradner also said Dr. Kenneth S. Pitzer, President of Stanford University, who was a former AEC research director, and former Chairman of the President's Scientific Advisory Council, who had full access to all AEC studies, recently urged that tests be delayed in Nevada and Alaska pending an independent inquiry by qualified scientists.

Bradner said the AEC has been soft-selling an unwary Alaska public on safety at the Amchitka site, being developed for super-sized explosions, and termed the situation ironically tragic since Alaskans were only recently devastated by the very natural catastrophes that these explosions might cause again.

"The AEC has not, and cannot," Bradner charged, "assure Alaskans that the Amchitka super tests are seismically safe."

"At present the AEC is being permitted to hide behind the alleged remoteness of the island but those in Alaska, Hawaii, Crescent City, and Japan, that have suffered the instant terror of a tidal wave, know that "remoteness" is pure fiction in the face of a 500 mile-an-hour earthquake triggered tidal wave.

Bradner said until the AEC can assure the safety of the Pacific Rim community that the Amchitka tests should be delayed.

Why Natives Drink . . .

(Continued from page 2)

ilities for the small and remote villages and towns.

Alcoholism of natives should be studied because it is evident that there are more alcoholic criminals in Alaska per capita than in each of the other States and it becomes more evident that most of these alcoholic criminals in Alaska are natives. Furthermore, you'll find that the majority of crimes that are committed by the natives were done under the influence of intoxicating liquor. It wouldn't surprise me a bit if these crimes would not have been committed if they had been sober. In fact, I'm sure the majority of them would not have committed them. Why?

Being a native, I see natives as being very conscious of their speech and actions when sober, considerate and helpful when needed, non-aggressive toward fellow man. Because of the very culture which is now vanishing, brought them up that way. Material communism, socialism, group welfare, whatever it was, it worked for them so they passed it on to the next generation. They are tranquil and passive, they are readily influenced by their environment. They had to accept nature as it presented itself to them or vanish. The effect of alcohol has been a devastating one. Once consumed, a new personality arises which at most times is very contrary to their upbringing.

You can never undo the harm done by the introduction of alcohol to the native people. Re-education should be made towards the ill effects of alcohol through lectures by prominent medical people, through A.A. members who have experienced the effects and recovered, through the economic point of view, or what ever means that can be effective and great deal more emphasis on the preservation of the native culture—material and nonmaterial.

I am very much for certain amount of acculturation of the native people. I believe it can be done and still preserve and maintain the native culture. Being the citizens of the United States of America, the most prosperous and powerful nation, and whose English language is in the process of becoming a universal language, we have no choice but to conform to it and still retain our culture. The well being and success of future generations necessitates it. It is going to be difficult and it is going to take time.

This is an opinion of one person, not applying to every native, not binding, made not to offend anyone but in hope someone is listening, in hope that someone will understand. It does not have to be taken literally, but a great deal what I have said is more than opinion—it's true.