SES no.004; Introduction

SENRI ETHNOLOGICAL STUDIES 4 1980

Introduction

YOSHINOBU KOTANI
National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka

WILLIAM B. WORKMAN
University of Alaska, Anchorage

The vast expanse of Alaska, physically isolated from the continental United States and first controlled by the Russians, came only by historical accident to fall under American sovereignty. Sparse populations, severe climatic conditions and remote geographic position in combination led to a long period of neglect of Alaska under American rule. As we shall see, this neglect extended to anthropological studies. Anthropological research by trained scholars got off to a late start in Alaska in contrast to the situation in neighboring Arctic Canada, Greenland and even the remote expanses of Siberia. Of all Eskimo peoples, with the possible exception of those of Siberia, the Alaskan Eskimos were the last to become known in detail. This situation is demonstrated by the superficial treatment of Alaskan Eskimos and the casual and scattered sources utilized in E. M. Weyer's classic *The Eskimos* as late as 1932 [WEYER 1969]. Even today the traditional cultures of most Alaskan Eskimo groups cannot be said to have been described in satisfactory detail. Alaska's geographic position, complex history and periodic neglect have made it a fertile field for foreign investigators and much useful work has been done by scholars from other lands.

Although no absolute distinctions can be made, the nature of motivations underlying interest in Alaska Natives and other arctic peoples has varied over time. Under Russian rule, which never extended over all of Alaska and which terminated in 1867, practical considerations, not altogether unmixed with scientific curiosity, can be said to have been dominant. In those times one learned selected aspects of the native peoples' languages and explored facets of their cultures in order to be able to travel safely, to administer, to evangelize, to exploit effectively, and to judge the possibilities of expanded trade. Examples of such work and the scope and limitations of such knowledge are to be seen in the official history of the Russian American Company [TIKHMENIEV 1978], the ethnographic notes compiled by Von Wrangell, one of the governors of the colony [VANSTONE 1970], the remarkable travel account of the explorer Zagoskin [1967] and even in the admirable work on the Aleuts by the famous Russian Orthodox missionary Ivan Veniaminov [1840]. Such practical motivations carried over into the early American period, most graphically in the work of Schwatka [1885], which is essentially the report of a military spy to his superiors. Even in more recent times we have works whose primary goal is the provision of information to

shape social, educational, and, increasingly, economic policy [ANDERSON and EELLS 1935; FEDERAL FIELD COMMITTEE FOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING IN ALASKA 1968].

With the development of anthropological theory late in the last century, the northern peoples came to interest some scholars because they were thought to provide windows into the past. For a time, western interest in the Eskimos was enhanced by viewing them as living survivals of the late ice age hunting cultures of Europe who had withdrawn poleward with their prey, the caribou, at the end of the Pleistocene [SOLLAS 1911; summarized in BANDI 1969 : 1 ff]. As late as the 1920s it was necessary to seriously, if negatively, consider the possibility of a relationship between Eskimo and Upper Paleolithic art [DE LAGUNA 1932–33]. As Professor Gamo reminds us in his first paper in this volume, the original Japanese interest in Eskimos was triggered by the mistaken belief that Eskimos were physically and culturally related to the prehistoric occupants of the Japanese Islands.

A third, more legitimate, reason for both scholarly and popular interest in the northern peoples in general and the Eskimos in particular has to do with their resolute and usually successful adaptations to some of the most severe environmental stresses ever confronted by the human species. This interest and admiration was not totally lacking even in the early days of contact between Europeans and New World northern peoples. Ethnocentric seamen were greatly impressed by the skillful manufacture and capabilities of kayaks and other elements of Eskimo material culture; blasé Elizabethans and other Europeans marveled at the skills of the small men clad in skins who were sometimes transported to Europe, and northern travelers in general were duly impressed by the ability of indigenous peoples to survive and even thrive in barren places where Europeans, unaided, faced certain death.

We believe that the present popular interest in the northern peoples has been shaped in the western world by the factors discussed above, enhanced by a heavy dose of "back to nature" romanticism, a generally heightened ethnic consciousness created by contemporary events, and, in some cases, a vague sense of the growing political and economic power of the northern peoples, which has already been expressed in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 and similar legislation impending in Canada.

The upsurge of interest in Eskimos in Japan is also rooted in part in factors already discussed, but the motives seem to be more complex and various. These additional motives include the geographic propinquity of Alaska to Asia and the generalized physical similarity between Eskimos and Asians. A number of popular works and achievements in recent years have focused this interest as well. These include Naomi Uemura's well-publicized trip by dogsled from Greenland to Nome [UEMURA 1976] as well as his later venture to the north pole, a popular journalistic account of the Canadian Eskimos by Katsuichi Honda [1976] and a novel by Jiro Nitta dealing with Frank Yasuda, a Japanese who spent most of his adult life with the Eskimos, and who died in Alaska as the founding father of the Alaskan community of Beaver [NITTA 1973].

No detailed history of anthropological investigations in Alaska exists, although most specialized papers briefly review the appropriate literature on the area or topic of concern. There are several summaries which treat an anthropological subfield in some detail; for example, archeology [LARSEN 1961; BANDI 1969: 35 ff; DEKIN 1973] and Alaska Native languages (see the paper by MIYAOKA in this volume). Until recently, anthropologists have not been greatly concerned with tracing the history of their endeavors on a regional basis, but the dearth of such statements on Alaskan work probably indicates that the history of Alaskan anthropology is both uneven and short. Few theoretical breakthroughs of general interest have been generated and, despite the fact that Alaska is about one third the size of the entire continental United States, proportionately few American anthropologists either work there or follow the results of work there with any particular enthusiasm.

Since the Russian occupation of Alaska predated the origins of modern anthropology, works of anthropological interest were obviously recorded by men without formal training. In addition to wide-ranging travelers' accounts such as that of Zagoskin previously mentioned and synthetic accounts such as that of Von Wrangell, we do have Russian accounts describing a single area or people in some detail. A creditable example of such work is Davydov's report on Kodiak Island [1977], but the outstanding example is Ivan Veniaminov's monumental study of the Aleuts of the Unalaska District [1840] based on ten years' residence and fluency in the Aleut language. Despite its early date and Veniaminov's outstanding performance in the role of a missionary priest to the Aleuts, the scientific interests, understanding and basic humanity of this great scholar allowed him to transcend the limits of his time and circumstances and to produce the first fairly complete, balanced and modern monograph in the annals of Alaskan anthropology.

Late in the Russian period, the Finn, Holmberg, traveled extensively in southern Alaska and produced a useful report on Kodiak Island and adjacent areas [1855]. This early contribution by a foreign traveler was the first of a number of similar endeavors which were to follow in the early American period.

The decade that followed the transfer of Alaska from Russian to United States' sovereignty was a period of general neglect of the new territory by the United States government. For the remainder of the 19th century such anthropological research as was undertaken by United States citizens was carried out by men trained in other fields. With the exception of Schwatka's spying mission previously mentioned, the heroic explorations of Lieutenant Allen [1887] and other military personnel, and the census duties of the enigmatic Ivan Petroff [1884], this anthropological work was undertaken quite incidentally to other duties. Thus the geologist Dall found time to undertake an ethnological synthesis [1877a] and to make pioneer archeological investigations in the Aleutians [1877b]. The classic accounts of coastal Alaskan Eskimo material culture were written by party members or naturalists attached to surveying, meteorological and other projects [MURDOCK 1892; NELSON 1899; RAY 1966].

Foreign travelers, often commissioned to collect material for European museums,

were also active at this time, with Krause preparing one of the very few balanced monographs on a specific Tlingit group [1956] and others such as the Frenchman, Pinart [1873], and the Norwegian, Jacobsen, traveling under German auspices [1977] ranging more widely. Scientific archeology featuring an innovative regard for stratigraphy got off to an unusually promising start through the basic work of Dall in the Aleutians [1877b] and testing by Jacobsen in Kachemak Bay [1977], but with the exception of Jochelson's work in the Aleutians early in the 20th century [1925; 1933], little useful archeological work was accomplished until the late 1920s.

The first work in Alaska by trained anthropologists was carried out early in the 20th century by Swanton, among the Tlingit of southeastern Alaska [1908], and Jochelson, working under Russian auspices, in the Aleutians. The first focused and fairly complete monograph on an Alaskan group by a trained anthropologist appears to have been Cornelius Osgood's publication on the Kutchin Athapaskans [1936] with the first equivalent work on an Eskimo group that of Margaret Lantis on the Nunivak Island Eskimos, which was based on field work carried out in the 1930s [LANTIS 1946]. The late 1920s and 1930s witnessed considerable anthropological activity with Osgood [1966] and others and Robert McKennan [1959] active among the Athapaskans, and the Danish ethnologist, Kaj Birket-Smith, working with the American, Frederica de Laguna, on salvage ethnology among the Chugach Eskimos and Eyak Indians of Prince William Sound [BIRKET-SMITH 1953; BIRKET-SMITH and DE LAGUNA 1938], to name but a few.

Scientific archeology also came of age at this time with Frederica de Laguna's *Archaeology of Cook Inlet, Alaska* [1934] taking slight precedence over Henry B. Collins' monograph on St. Lawrence Island [1937] as the first fully modern report. Froelich Rainey began investigations in the Alaskan interior [1939] and explored the immensely significant Ipiutak site at Point Hope, in collaboration with Helge Larsen [LARSEN and RAINEY 1948]. They were aided by J. Louis Giddings, who was to become one of Alaska's most distinguished archeologists after the war. This useful work coexisted with the appalling depradations of the physical anthropologist, Aleš Hrdlička, on the archeological record on Kodiak Island [1944] and in the Aleutians [1945] and the perhaps more excusable rough and ready tactics of Otto William Geist on St. Lawrence Island [GEIST and RAINEY 1936].

Anthropological fieldwork came to a virtual standstill during the Second World War and many publications on pre-war work were long delayed. Starting in the late 1940s there was an upsurge of anthropological undertakings in Alaska which has continued with fluctuations down to the present, but which lie outside the scope of this very sketchy survey.

The late start of detailed ethnological studies in Alaska was particularly unfortunate since the north was swept by massive cultural change before records could be made of many now-vanished ways of life. Epidemic diseases, the inroads of the fur trade, European whaling in northern Alaska, commercial fishing, various gold rushes, missionary evangelism and expanding European settlement were the principle factors involved. Acculturation had proceeded far enough in most areas that modern

workers by and large have been able to bypass use of the native languages. Attendant loss of information gives the typical Alaskan ethnographic monograph a certain "thinness" when compared with the best works carried out in the vernacular in Greenland, Canada and Siberia.

The late start of scientific archeology in this vast area was also detrimental and to this day far too few trained workers are available and far too many parts of Alaska are archeologically unknown. Many significant advances have been made since the 1930s and the pace of excavation and publication has increased markedly since the middle 1960s, but recent restrictive regulation of excavations, vastly accelerated development, and ongoing natural attrition of the data base have led to an enormous and continuing loss of data. As archeological interpretations and analyses have become more complex elsewhere in North America, some northern workers have yielded to the temptation to make generalizations which at times far outdistance the meager data base. Certain difficult problems, for example tracing the development or origin of ethnologically known peoples in the prehistoric record, have seldom been attacked in a disciplined and data-oriented fashion.

Foreign investigators, especially the Danes, Kaj Birket-Smith and Helge Larsen, participated significantly in the foundation and development of modern anthropological work in Alaska. Other major contributions have been made by the Swiss archeologist Bandi [1969], the Norwegian linguist Bergsland [1959] and the Soviet ethnohistorian Fedorova [1973], to name but a few. In this perspective, the relatively recent Japanese involvement described by Professor Gamo in this volume is impressive in the number of scholars involved and the scope and duration of the work, being matched only by the Danish efforts in the 1930s.

The basic purpose of the various symposia sponsored by the Taniguchi Foundation is to bring together younger scholars from Japan with those from other lands. The symposia provide ample time for formal and informal discussions in pleasant surroundings in the hope that lasting contacts will be made and a useful interchange of information will take place. Both in Japan and in North America, specialists in various fields of anthropology (in the inclusive North American definition) tend to work separately and even to lose contact with each other. The organizers of this symposium hoped to achieve an interchange on several levels by bringing together representatives of several national anthropological traditions and various specific interests, united by an active concern with some facets of the Native cultures of Alaska. The arctic and subarctic, where there is unusually strong continuity between archeological, traditional and contemporary cultures, was a promising field for such an integrative approach. The utility of the approach is for the reader to judge, in part on the basis of the papers that follow, although regrettably we can provide only a few summary highlights of the lengthy and interesting discussions that accompanied the formal papers.

The shortcomings of the symposium and this publication are related to their

strengths. Beyond a few suggestions and general guidelines which the participants were free to follow, modify, or reject, no attempt was made to assign topics. By and large the invited participants presented papers which reflect, in varying degrees of detail, their current research interests. Given the size and organization of the symposium, the resultant publication is in no way intended as an encyclopedia of Alaskan anthropology. There are obvious geographic, temporal and topical gaps in coverage. For example, southeastern Alaska receives only passing mention (despite the fact that one of the participants is of Tlingit descent) and there is no detailed archeological consideration of the Aleutian Islands and the Bering Sea coast. No attempt was made by the editors to inforce uniformity of interpretation and the discerning reader will note areas of substantial disagreement between several of the authors. Such disagreements highlight the nature of things as they are in a complex area with a modest data base.

Certain topics are discussed in several of the papers. Both Burch and Townsend express discontent with the utility of the concept of the *tribe* as an appropriate unit for ethnological analysis in their areas, concluding that the term *society*, when carefully defined, is more useful for their purposes. The problem of the relationship (if any) that pertains between subsistence adaptations, linguistic and cultural boundaries, and perceived ethnicity is addressed by most of the authors by implication and by several explicity, as is the related problem of the advisability of trying to recognize ethnic units in the archeological record. Anderson, Dumond, Kotani and Workman confront the difficulties in attempting to articulate the paleoenvironmental and archeological records with varying degrees of optimism. It appears to us that further emphasis on cultural and environmental interactions could be a strong bridging theme serving to further unify the interests of the prehistorian and the ethnologist. For example, the differing resource potential of the shores of the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas, described by Worl, have definite implications for both traditional and prehistoric settlement patterns. It would seem that this situation could be studied archeologically with regard to the stability and duration of the environmental factors that brought it into being. To return for a moment to the general problem, it appears that neither the archeological nor the paleoenvironmental records are understood in enough detail in most parts of Alaska to allow us to progress beyond statements of the obvious. We believe that much progress will be made when this situation is altered.

We will now touch briefly on some of the highlights of individual papers. In his first paper, Gamo places Japanese investigations in Alaska in the broader context of a greatly expanded postwar overseas research effort by Japanese anthropologists. He also provides an interesting sketch of the development of anthropology in Japan. Most of the individuals mentioned will probably be unfamiliar to western scholars and some may be surprised at the speed with which professional associations were founded in the Meiji period.

Dumond provides a wide-ranging synthesis which serves as a useful context for some of the more regionally oriented papers which follow. In tracing grand con-

tinuities in arctic prehistory he makes a number of provocative suggestions which should stimulate further discussion and thought. Among these is his suggestion that the early Holocene adaptations of Paleoarctic tradition peoples focused on the boreal forest and North Pacific coast environments, but were unable to successfully exploit the Holocene tundra and that the ancestry of the Pacific Eskimos, Aleuts and Northwest Coast Indians are linked in this way. He mentions the possibility that an exclusively interior Eskimo subsistence pattern may have existed at least 1,000 years longer than is usually thought; he also wonders if perhaps the Eskimos might have been almost overburdened with material goods. His discussion of what he terms the genius of northern Athapaskan subsistence adaptations with their emphasis on knowledge, rather than hardware, has obvious points of comparison with Nelson's paper later in the volume.

Workman's paper on the prehistory of southern Alaska is basically a summary of existing knowledge and a guide to a diffuse literature. The heavy dependence on unpublished manuscripts reflects the current status of the field rather than the author's love of obscurity. The North Pacific Maritime co-tradition is suggested as a taxonomic entity of sufficient flexibility to accommodate new and reordered data, and an attempt is made to relate certain regional topographies to cultural history. Calibration studies of ethnographic material of known provenience are suggested as a possibly fruitful approach to recognition of ethnic groups in the archeological record.

The work of Okada and his colleagues at the huge and important Port Moller site on the Alaska Peninsula provides a case study of the problems associated with attempts to make ethnic identifications on the basis of archeological materials since the site is located near the ethnographic Aleut-Eskimo frontier and experienced influences from several areas throughout its history. Available radiocarbon dates suggest that the site contains an extensive third millennium B. C. occupation, which contributes to the significance bestowed by its size and richness, since this span of years is very poorly represented in the archeological record. (As an aside, it should be noted that preliminary reports on each of the three field seasons have been issued in English, with exemplary speed.)

In a related paper, Kotani presents a preliminary analysis on the paleoecology of this site, the size of which is perhaps related to access to an unusual variety of terrestrial and marine resources. He makes the interesting suggestion that there may have been a widespread interval of sedimentation and sand dune formation between 3000 and 1500 B. P. along the Bering Sea shore of the Alaska Peninsula, documentation of which will require further geomorphological studies in this poorly known area. Hopefully the completed faunal analysis (quantified data are not yet available) will contain clues as to why the occupation of this rich site was apparently episodic rather than continuous.

Townsend's paper on North Pacific Rim societies aggressively downplays the significance of traditional ethnic categories such as Aleut, Eskimo, and Indian, and favors grouping those ethnically diverse peoples who shared complex rank-oriented social orders. She also discusses in some detail the difficulties involved in describing

North Pacific societies in terms of abstract definitions and typologies created to describe other polities. She makes the useful point, sometimes overlooked but amply attested to in the descriptive literature, that in Alaska raiding and trading were related activities in that both were mechanisms by means of which objects could flow beyond the boundaries of formal alliance systems. Incipient social stratification is noted for the Aleutian Islands where land resources were finite. This observation raises by implication the question of what course social and political organization would have taken around the Gulf of Alaska if the coming of the Russians had not terminated this experiment. Would there have been evolution toward a more complex, stable level of political organization; would there have been cycles of increasing complexity followed by collapse; or would less obvious developments have occurred?

In his second paper, Gamo provides the first report in English on his valuable research on the basic principles of social organization and cultural change on Nelson Island. Important principles of band organization include initial uxorilocal residence and ties between band leaders and the husbands of their sisters and daughters (the *nigau* relationship). As the author notes, groups formed in this way would be small. Further consideration and study is needed to determine if this mechanism of band formation was as widespread and significant in Alaska as the author's data suggest.

Miyaoka provides a survey of the postcontact history of Alaskan native languages and the interactions of their speakers with the policies of various non-aboriginal administrators and educators over the last 200 years. The paper provides a useful, insider's view of the successes and problems of current bilingual education programs and other attempts to revitalize or maintain these prime symbols of cultural pluralism in the modern world. A fundamental question, apparently unanswerable at present, is whether or not relatively small subordinate speech communities can endure prolonged contact with large superordinate ones.

Nelson's paper on Alaskan Athapaskan subsistence systems makes a number of points which are sometimes overlooked or underemphasized even by specialists. Among these are seasonal darkness as a powerful environmental stress factor (along with the more familiar extreme cold), especially among people who lacked efficient illumination systems such as the Eskimo oil lamp. Nelson emphasizes the importance of wood in northern Athapaskan culture both as building material and as fuel. This is a point of profound difference between Athapaskans and some Eskimos, for the latter appear to have pared their dependence on wood to a bare minimum as a building material, and depended on the oil lamp for light and heat. He also emphasizes the flexibility of Athapaskan subsistence adaptations (related to cyclic resource fluctuations in the harsh boreal forest environment) and underscores the significant contribution made by Athapaskan women. Although he notes that ideology previously may have restricted female participation in big game hunting, it appears likely that the Athapaskan woman's direct contribution to the group food supply was of a different order of magnitude from that of her Eskimo counterpart. Athapaskan data also contribute to the study of the impact of the fur trade on owner-

ship of exploitation areas, with an interesting distinction developing among the northern Athapaskans between trapping for pelts (individual ownership recognized) and the hunting, sometimes of the same creatures, for food (where collective rights prevail). Finally Nelson puts due emphasis on the significance of ideology in the practical realm of subsistence pursuits. Many might agree that ideology is one of the most difficult and at the same time most interesting domains of culture to deal with, one that has practical behavioral as well as philosophical implications [BURCH 1971].

Anderson's review of the archeological record in northern Alaska takes a more cautious and skeptical approach to Holocene cultural continuities than does Dumond's. The reader will note other points of difference in the details of interpretation of the evidence between these two authors. Agreeing with several other authors, Anderson feels that the time-honored "Eskimo or Indian" model for categorizing archeological remains is grossly oversimplified, especially in view of the fact that at times more than two distinct traditions seem to have coexisted in interior Alaska alone, and in his view (shared with Dumond) the ancestors of the Athapaskans cannot be traced back beyond the beginning of the Christian era in the north. He argues persuasively for the need for more detailed study on the stylistic level of extant archeological collections, and he makes a reasoned argument regarding the need for more long-term projects restricted to limited areas. Current recognized centers of cultural development reflect the presence of such sustained work more than they reflect the absence of archeological potential in areas where investigations have not been conducted.

Burch's paper on traditional Eskimo societies in northwestern Alaska shows that, given caution and patience, useful ethnographic reconstruction as far back as the 19th century can be achieved in some areas. The substantial ethnographic appendix, while concise, should be of value to all interested in the area and the history of its Native peoples. The death toll of societies reflected therein is a sad and moving document. His paper demonstrates convincingly that the classic Inland-Coastal model of northwest Alaskan Eskimo society is a gross oversimplification based on the demographic upheavals of the contact period rather than on the realities of the aboriginal past.

Finally, Worl's paper on the contemporary whaling complex in northwestern Alaska provides useful information on the organization and costs of this significant and culturally valued activity. Data such as these, when combined with historic information and the archeological data, should provide a baseline for detailed study of the sort recommended by Anderson of the whaling subsistence subsystem over the last 2,000 years. Finally, her paper raises interesting and significant questions regarding the nature of the interaction of these deeply rooted cultural values with today's nutritional needs, modern politics, resource conservation and government regulation.

The emphasis during the formal and informal discussions associated with the symposium was on the current situation, the problems and the future of the Alaska

Native peoples. Several participants presented short papers to serve as a basis for discussion. Here we can only attempt to indicate the general nature of these discussions, which the participants found to be most profitable.

Significant cultural continuity with the past in subsistence pursuits, family structure and political organization was noted in some parts of Alaska, contrasting with parts of southern Alaska where ethnic identity appears to be often a matter of feeling not signified by such markers as traditional occupations, facility in a Native language, or even long-term residence in a particular area.

There was considerable discussion of the impact of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 on Alaska Native life. Old regional and cultural animosities or differences had to be settled or at least glossed over in order that the desired legislative settlement could be obtained. A number of regional corporations were created by the resultant legislation. Concern was expressed about the impact of the forced imposition of these western legal and commercial entities on the Native scene. Several commentators expressed the opinion that, whether by intent or not, the corporate structure provides a very effective mechanism for the introduction of massive cultural change and the termination of the special relationship that has long existed between Alaska Natives and the federal government.

Echoing some of the points made in papers dealing with traditional Alaskan Native cultures, there was much discussion of the probable future nature of ethnic identifications in Alaska. Feelings of an "Alaska Native" cultural identity were fostered by the united front necessary to achieve settlement of the land claims. This identity, which certainly is without deep roots in the past, may tend to break down to some extent if, as seems inevitable, conflicts develop between the various corporations. Development of a meaningful regional or corporate identification is a distinct possibility, but classic tribal identification appears weak and vague in many areas, as it apparently also was in the past. The villages have become significant units for economic and political purposes under the provisions of the act, a development whose effect is enhanced by the penchant of government agencies for dealing directly with the villages, where possible, rather than with the corporations. In many areas there is a very strong and deeply rooted feeling of identification with particular villages which predates these recent developments, indicating that the villages may be significant reference points in ethnic identification for a long time to come. It was noted that flexibility in ethnic identification and social organization was an aboriginal trait over much of Alaska. We should therefore expect the criteria and boundaries to continue to shift, however convenient it might be for anthropologists and other categorizers if the case were otherwise.

Importation of non-indigenous technological items such as fire arms, mechanized boats, airplanes and, most recently, the snow machine and television, and imposition of alien social, economic and educational forms have irrevocably changed rural Alaska Native life from that of a generation or two ago. Introduced diseases and, in recent decades, a population explosion have had and continue to have far-reaching consequences. Stresses generated by these and other factors have led locally to

distressing problems with alcohol abuse, malnutrition, poor physical and mental health, and a high incidence of suicide and violent death. The holistic approach of anthropology may in some cases allow an understanding of the genesis of some of these problems and the giving of useful advice on a local basis concerning limited mitigation.

The reservoir of talent embodied in Alaskans of Native descent cannot fail to be increasingly significant both within and beyond the boundaries of the state. A goal to strive for is the involvement of more Alaska Natives in anthropological endeavors in other than menial capacities or the anonymous role of informant. Here anthropologists can profit from the example set by our linguistic colleagues described in Miyaoka's paper in this volume.

With regard to the role of anthropologists in Alaska Native affairs it was agreed that we are not prophets or seers, nor can we predict with certainty what the future will bring. We must continue to give advice to those who request it based on what the individual scholar considers to be the responsible use of his or her expertise. We can rest secure in the knowledge that others with equal conviction will give sometimes conflicting advice. We can console ourselves in measure with the thought that sometimes even the most academic research may have unforeseen practical applications and that an honestly derived description of the past may prove of great value and interest to generations unborn.

The editors hope that the Japanese involvement in Alaskan anthropology which provided the happy occasion for this symposium will not only continue but also expand. There are both practical and theoretical reasons which render this desirable. Alaska is a huge and anthropologically underdeveloped area with only a small number of active trained anthropologists, while Japan has an impressively large reservoir of anthropologically trained manpower. Given modern communication systems and Japan's commitment to overseas anthropological research, the distance between Japan and Alaska is hardly an insurmountable barrier. Actually the Japanese are better prepared and able to face Alaska's traditionally high prices and the substantial expense engendered by difficult logistics than are many Americans. Finally, political realities indicate that in the foreseeable future certain North Pacific nations such as Japan and Canada will be in the best position to take the lead in badly needed international cooperative research on problems of mutual interest.

Turning to scientific considerations, Japanese participation in Alaskan work in collaboration with North American scholars insures a useful cross-fertilization in approaches, theoretical assumptions, techniques and technology. Although the cultural histories of Japan and Alaska do not appear to have been closely linked at any time in the past, the two areas do share certain significant parallel developments which invite comparative studies on the processual level. Environmental problems faced by the late Pleistocene hunting cultures of northern Japan must have been broadly similar to those faced by Native Alaskans of the more recent past. In both

areas independently we find the evolution of capability to exploit sea resources occurring during the Holocene and in both areas it would be profitable to study the impact of changes in the relation of land and sea and recurring volcanism on human cultural adaptations.

Differences as well as broad similarities also raise interesting questions. For example, the Jomon cultural tradition endured over much of the Japanese Islands throughout most of the Holocene. In no comparable area in Alaska do we find such cultural stability and continuity. How is one to explain either the stability of Jomon or the bewildering complexity of the prehistoric record in Alaska in comparative terms?

In conclusion, we hope that the Japanese investigations in Alaska to date are just the beginning of a long and fruitful involvement and that this symposium is the formal beginning of a period of ongoing cooperation and interchange of information between Japanese and North American scholars who share an interest in the histories and cultures of the North Pacific.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALLEN, Henry T.
1887 *Report on an Expedition to the Copper, Tanana and Koyukon Rivers in the Territory of Alaska in the Year 1885.* Washington: Government Printing Office.

ANDERSON, H. Dewey and Walter Crosby EELLS
1935 *Alaska Natives: A Survey of their Sociological and Educational Status.* Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

BANDI, Hans-Georg
1969 *Eskimo Prehistory.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

BERGSLAND, Knut
1959 Aleut Dialects of Atka and Attu. *American Philosophical Society, Transactions* 49(3): 5–128.

BIRKET-SMITH, Kaj
1953 The Chugach Eskimo. *Nationalmuseets Skrifter Ethnografisk Raekke* VI. Copenhagen.

BIRKET-SMITH, Kaj and Frederica de LAGUNA
1938 *The Eyak Indians of the Copper River Delta, Alaska.* Copenhagen: Levin and Munksgaard.

BURCH, Ernest S., Jr.
1971 The Nonempirical Environment of the Arctic Alaskan Eskimos. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 27(2): 148–165.

COLLINS, Henry B., Jr.
1937 Archaeology of St. Lawrence Island, Alaska. *Smithsonian Institution, Miscellaneous Collection* 96(1): 1–431.

DALL, William H.
1877a On the Distribution and Nomenclature of the Native Tribes of Alaska and the Adjacent Territory. *Contributions to North American Ethnology* 1(1): 7–40. Washington: Government Printing Office.

1877b On Succession in Shell Heaps of the Aleutian Islands. *Contributions to North American Ethnology* 1(1): 41–91. Washington: Government Printing Office.

DAVYDOV, Gavriil Ivanovich

1977 Two Voyages to Russian America, 1802–1807. Collin Bearne (trans.), Richard A. Pierce (ed.), *Materials for the Study of Russian History* No. 10. Kingston: The Limestone Press.

DEKIN, Albert A., Jr.

1973 The Arctic. In James A. Fitting (ed.), *The Development of North American Archaeology*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, pp. 14–48.

FEDERAL FIELD COMMITTEE FOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING IN ALASKA

1968 *Alaska Natives and the Land.* Washington: Government Printing Office.

FEDOROVA, Svetlana G.

1973 The Russian Population in Alaska and California: Late 18th Century–1867. Richard A. Pierce (ed. and trans.), *Materials for the Study of Alaska History* No. 4. Kingston: The Limestone Press.

GEIST, Otto William and Froelich G. RAINEY

1936 Archaeological Investigations at Kukulik, St. Lawrence Island, Alaska. *University of Alaska, Miscellaneous Publications* Vol. 2. Washington.

HOLMBERG, H. J.

1855 *Ethnographische Skizzen über die Völker des russischen Amerikas.* Helsinki: H. C. Friis.

HONDA, Katsuichi

1967 「カナダ・エスキモー」(Canadian Eskimos). In K. Honda, 『極限の民族』(Peoples in Extreme Environments). Tokyo: Asahi Shimbunsha, pp. 1–152.

HRDLIČKA, Aleš

1944 *The Anthropology of Kodiak Island.* Philadelphia: Wistar Institute of Anatomy and Biology.

1945 *The Aleutian and Commander Islands and Their Inhabitants.* Philadelphia: Wistar Institute of Anatomy and Biology.

JACOBSEN, Johan Adrian

1977 *Alaskan Voyages 1881–1883: An Expedition to the Northwest Coast of North America.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Translated by Erna Gunther from the German text of Adrain Woldt.)

JOCHELSON, Waldemar

1925 Archaeological Investigations in the Aleutian Islands. *Carnegie Institution Publication* No. 367. Washington.

1933 History, Ethnology and Anthropology of the Aleut. *Carnegie Institution Publication* No. 432. Washington.

KRAUSE, Aurel

1956 *The Tlingit Indians.* Erna Gunther (trans.). Seattle: University of Washington Press. (Translation of original 1885 edition.)

LAGUNA, Frederica de

1932–33 A Comparison of Eskimo and Paleolithic Art. *American Journal of Archaeology* 36(4): 477–551; 37(1): 77–107.

1934 *The Archaeology of Cook Inlet, Alaska.* Philadelphia: University Museum.

LANTIS, Margaret

1946 The Social Culture of the Nunivak Eskimo. *American Philosophical Society Transactions* n.s. Vol. 35, pt. 3: 153–323.

LARSEN, Helge
1961 Archaeology in the Arctic, 1935–1960. *American Antiquity* 27(1): 7–15.
LARSEN, Helge and Froelich G. RAINEY
1948 Ipiutak and the Arctic Whale Hunting Culture. *American Museum of Natural History Anthropological Papers* Vol. 42. New York.
MCKENNAN, Robert A.
1959 The Upper Tanana Indians. *Yale University Publications in Anthropology* No. 55. New Haven.
MURDOCK, John
1882 Ethnological Results of the Point Barrow Expedition. *Bureau of American Ethnology, Ninth Annual Report.* Washington: Government Printing Office.
NELSON, Edward W.
1899 The Eskimo About Bering Strait. *Bureau of American Ethnology, Eighteenth Annual Report.* Washington: Government Printing Office.
OSGOOD, Cornelius
1936 Contributions to the Ethnology of the Kutchin. *Yale University Publications in Anthropology* No. 14. New Haven.
1966 The Ethnography of the Tanaina. *Yale University Publications in Anthropology* No. 16. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files Press. (Reprint of the original 1937 edition).
NITTA, Jiro
1973 『アラスカ物語』(An Alaskan Story). Tokyo: Shinchosha.
PETROFF, Ivan
1884 *Report on the Population, Industries and Resources of Alaska. Tenth Census, 1880.* Department of the Interior, Census Office. Washington: Government Printing Office.
PINART, A.
1873 Eskimaux et Koloches, idées religieuses et traditions des Kaniagmioutes. *Revue d'Anthropolgie* 2: 673–680.
RAINEY, Froelich
1939 Archaeology in Central Alaska. *American Museum of Natural History Anthropological Papers* 36(4): 351–405. New York.
RAY, Dorothy Jean (ed.)
1966 The Eskimo of St. Michael and Vicinity as Related by H. M. W. Edmonds. *Anthropological Papers of the University of Alaska* 13(2): 1–143.
SCHWATKA, Frederick
1885 *Report of a Military Reconnaissance in Alaska, made in 1883, by Frederick Schwatka.* U. S. Army, Department of the Columbia. Washington: Government Printing Office.
SOLLAS, William J.
1911 *Ancient Hunters and their Modern Representatives.* London: McMillan and Co.
SWANTON, John R.
1908 Social Conditions, Beliefs and Linguistic Relationships of the Tlingit Indians. *Bureau of American Ethnology, Twenty-sixth Annual Report.* Washington: Government Printing Office.
TIKHMENEV, P. A.
1978 *A History of the Russian American Company.* Richard A. Pierce and Alton S.

Donnelly (trans. and eds.). Seattle: University of Washington Press. (Translation of two volume work published in St. Petersburg in 1861–63)

UEMURA, Naomi

1976 『北極圏一万二千キロ』 (12,000 Kilometers across the Arctic Circle). Tokyo: Bungei Shunju.

VANSTONE, James W. (ed. and trans.)

1970 The Inhabitants of the Northwest Coast of America, by Ferdinand Petrovich Von Wrangell. *Arctic Anthropology* VI (2): 5–20.

VANIAMINOV, Ivan E.

1840 *Notes on the Islands of the Unalaska District.* New Haven: Human Relations Area Files. (Trans. by B. Keen and A. Kardenelowskai from the original published by the Russian American Company in St. Petersburg)

WEYER, Edward Moffit

1969 *The Eskimos: Their Environment and Folkways.* Archon Books. New Haven: Yale University Press. (Reprint of 1932 edition)

ZAGOSKIN, Lavrentiv A.

1967 Lieutenant Zagoskin's Travels in Russian America, 1842–1844. Henry N. Michaels (ed.), *Arctic Institute of North America, Anthropology of the North: Translations from Russian Sources* No. 7.