

A Tribalography of Alaska Native Presence in Academia

Jessica Bissett Perea

The past is not a burden; it is a scaffold which brought us to this day. We are free to be who we are—to create our own life out of our past and out of the present. We are our ancestors. When we can heal ourselves, we also heal our ancestors, our grandmothers, our grandfathers and our children. When we heal ourselves, we heal Mother Earth.

—Rita Pitka Blumenstein (Yup'ik)

Our work belongs to our ancestors and the next seven generations.

—LeAnne Howe (Choctaw)

Of the many issues facing Alaska Native communities, none are more pressing than the very real and dangerous double-erasure of Native agency: first, by historical colonial powers, and second, by contemporary “post-racial” discourse. Such systemic erasures continue to threaten an ongoing Alaska Native self-determination movement by sanctifying the problematic “present absence” of diverse Native voices and perspectives.¹ Viewed one way, an acknowledgment of our “present absence” recalls the historic erasures of Native peoples via colonization that remain structurally embedded within government and public institutions. As scholar and activist Andrea Smith argues, “Native peoples are a permanent ‘present absence’ in the U.S. colonial imagination, an ‘absence’ that reinforces at every turn the conviction that Native peoples are indeed vanishing and that the conquest of Native

JESSICA BISSETT PEREA is an assistant professor of Native American Studies at the University of California, Davis. She completed her PhD in Musicology from UCLA in 2011 and was awarded a UC President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship in Music at UC Berkeley from 2011–2013. Her innovative dissertation research and dedication to community outreach were recognized with a 2010 Alaska Native Visionary Award.

lands is justified.”² The cultivation of critical Native perspectives is crucial in order to challenge concrete policies that continue to deny Native communities basic human rights. Yet, viewed another way, “present absence” raises questions surrounding contemporary erasures of Native peoples by a “post-racial” discourse that claims racism and discrimination were eradicated by the civil rights movement. Active denials of past and present racial and ethnic subordination depends upon actively forgetting—an amnesia that links equality with erasures of difference—or worse, a purposeful or willful ignorance endemic to what science historians have called “agnotology.”³ Ongoing controversies surrounding subsistence legislation or Alaska Native Corporations’ involvement with the federal government’s 8(a) Business Development Program offer just two examples of how agnotologic racism remains active on local and national stages.

According to the 2010 Census enumerations, Alaska Native peoples now constitute 19.5 percent of the total population in Alaska (up from 18 percent in 2000) and are by far the largest and fastest growing ethnic group within the state. Yet Alaska Natives continue to be underrepresented in higher education, especially within graduate school programs. According to Michael Jennings’s critical study of the University of Alaska (UA) system, “only twenty-four college degrees were granted to Alaska Natives from 1895 to 1950, and between 1950 and 1967 only 101.”⁴ Ray Barnhardt and Bryan Brayboy note that at the UA Fairbanks campus, Alaska Natives comprise 16 percent of the student enrollment, but only 3 percent of the faculty.⁵ A 2008 study on UA Alaska Native graduates found that a primary challenge they faced attending college was an absence of role models in their families or communities.⁶

Given these circumstances, the goals of this essay are twofold. First, I outline an applied theoretical framework, what I am calling a “tribalography of presence,” that accounts for the diversity of Alaska Native people’s presence and agency in academic institutions. I then provide a brief description and analysis of the Alaska Native Scholars Project, a work-in-progress focused on documenting a long yet obscure lineage of Alaska Native men and women who have earned research doctoral degrees (e.g., PhD and EdD). The Alaska Native Scholars Project highlights a diverse cadre of researchers, artists, and activists whose work contributes to what one might call an “archive of Native presence.”⁷ I conclude by considering the implications for further study and the ways in which an active continuation and dissemination of an archive of presence creates literal and figurative spaces for a range of Alaska Native priorities, policies, and practices that subvert the potential double-erasure of Alaska Native presence.

A tribalography of Alaska Native presence in academia is first and foremost a matter of social justice. As Dakota author and activist Vine Deloria Jr. pointed

out, whereas most other minorities in the United States fought for civil rights on the basis of inclusion, Native American people fought for civil rights on the basis of exclusion.⁸ Since Alaska Native and American Indian civil rights activists struggled for exclusion on the basis of difference, as opposed to fighting for inclusion on the basis of sameness, it is not surprising that Native American politics and issues are largely subsumed or rendered invisible in mainstream American historical narratives. What continues to make Alaska Native people's activism successful is our leaders' ability to acknowledge and respect cultural and historical distinctiveness while articulating and advocating for causes that affect us all—a balance between “strategic essentialism” and “strategic anti-essentialism.”⁹ Reorienting Alaska Native studies toward discourse that values a “universalism rich with particulars” enables a way out of the divisive either/or rhetoric that insists our ongoing Alaska Native self-determination movement cannot be served by entering into higher education.¹⁰

My theoretical approach applies an Alaska Native perspective to what Choctaw author and playwright LeAnne Howe calls “tribalography”—a dialogic methodology that offers critical interventions to historic and contemporary erasures that are simultaneously informed by the cumulative injustices of colonization yet guided by optimism for future self-determination.¹¹ Although Alaska Native peoples and cultures have been the objects of inquiry within numerous academic fields since the turn of the twentieth century, Alaska Native studies as a field has only formally emerged during the past two decades. Of central importance to this emergence is the role played by Alaska Native scholars, artists, and activists.

A tribalography of presence requires several methodological approaches, such as interweaving Native knowledge and wisdom with ethnography, historiography, and cultural theory, and has proven useful in my own research, teaching, and performance in the realm of music. My work with contemporary Alaska Native performance artists contributes to a growing body of scholarship produced by researchers dedicated to innovating theoretical frameworks that bridge ethnic studies and music studies in order to cultivate a more musical Native studies and a more Native music studies.¹² I am indebted here to the many indigenous researchers, Alaska Native scholars, and allies whose critical works and methodologies are overturning conventional practices in many academic disciplines.¹³ Like the aforementioned scholars and researchers, Alaska Native performing artists express and embody worldviews that reveal the fissures of disciplinary boundaries: music, dance, drama, history, linguistic and cultural anthropology, law, science, health, and wellness are inextricably intertwined as holistic practices.

I find that emphasizing the “tribe” in tribalography is particularly useful when writing and teaching about contemporary Alaska Native performance art

cultures, as it invites several productive questions: What is meant by “tribe”? Who is included in the “tribe”? What does a tribal methodology look like? How does it differ from non-Native or Western epistemologies and methodologies? From the start, then, any discussion of tribalography begins with a “question-centered” approach regarding its epistemological space, which necessarily requires an examination of relationships between and among Native and non-Native people and communities. For example, Comanche author Paul Chaat Smith’s most recent collection of essays, *Everything You Know about Indians Is Wrong*, invites readers to reconsider the power of popular and monolithic myths about Native American peoples by self-reflexively asking “who are we, and what happened to us?” As his provocative title suggests, Chaat Smith challenges both Native and non-Native communities alike to pose more questions, and thus dialogue, instead of using what he views as the more standard and closed “answer-centered” approach: “this is who we are, and this is what happened to us.”¹⁴

In addition to promoting dialogue, a question-centered tribalographical approach also helps to dispel notions of homogeneity by paying attention to the subjectivity or particularities of the people or communities under consideration. A question-centered model challenges neocolonial definitions and expectations in relation to Native stories, histories, theories, and identities.¹⁵ In a tribalography of presence this entails dialoguing with Alaska Native people about how they position themselves in relation to their families—broadly understood as including immediate, extended, adoptive, and imagined relations—and their home communities, and how that positioning resonates (or not) with dominant American narratives or discourse.¹⁶ This de-homogenizing aspect of tribalography falls under the project of decolonization in that it amplifies a range of voices that speak about the many ways there are to “be” a Native person.

Introducing tribalography in research and classroom contexts raises questions about the many ways in which the “tribe” in tribalography can signify. Native American people have redefined and re-theorized themselves for centuries using both colonial and indigenous terminology that reflects a diverse set of lived realities. Depending on the context, Native American individuals and collectives use terms such as *tribe*, *clan*, *band*, *people*, *group*, *community*, and *nation* interchangeably, but they do so in order to signal, create, and maintain personal alliances and communal relationships that often bridge temporal, geographic, social, and political boundaries. Thus, a tribalography approach illuminates a politics of self-determination that reclaims and indigenizes the very definitions and narratives that have served to “authenticate” and dehumanize Native people for centuries.

Recalling the theme of “universalism rich with particularities,” many Alaska Native worldviews hold the dual and often simultaneous processes of differentiation and alliance as crucial to one’s identity. For instance, Toksook Bay elder Chief Paul John describes how ancient Yupiit cosmology honors “the essential unity of humankind coupled with respect for cultural difference.”¹⁷ Likewise, Chief John further explains that the creator made all humans the same, but gave each “tribe”—a designation he extends to all ethnicities, including “the Kass’at” (white people)—their own customs, languages, and lifeways, or what he also calls their “inherited ways.” In addition to extending the tribal designation to non-Native people (an important point to make when teaching courses primarily populated by non-Native students), Yupiit cosmology positions tribal belonging as based on inherited lifeways informed by kinship or social relationships, as opposed to the essentialized and alienating race-based notions of “who counts” as a tribal person endemic to blood quantum ideology. In this way, whereas I use a tribalogy approach in the expected sense when working with Alaska Native performing artists, students in my courses are encouraged to think critically about the unexpected meanings the “tribe” in tribalogy can hold, which has resulted in engaged and thoughtful term projects.

By paying attention and listening closely to the ways in which individuals and communities identify and assert their inherited lifeways, a tribalogy of presence supports ongoing self-determination movements in three ways: first, it privileges indigenous perspectives and worldviews; second, it acknowledges a diverse range of inter- and intratribal processes of differentiation and alliance; and third, it advocates for agency and healing. I will discuss each of these moves in turn, particularly as they relate to understandings of self that are rooted in familial and community relationships.

PRIVILEGING INDIGENOUS PERSPECTIVES AND WORLDVIEWS

First and foremost, a tribalogy of presence creates a radically altered rhetorical and theoretical space that transfers control over representations and meanings to voices and perspectives from the tribe under consideration. In this view, Alaska Native and American Indian epistemological and philosophical frameworks are presented as consistent, articulate, coherent logics for knowing the world instead of illogical myths or fictions.¹⁸ In my own research and teaching I often draw upon the artistic output of Yupiit creative and performance artists, whose aesthetics and practices are inextricably intertwined with the central tenets of Yuuyaraq (the way of the human being), a governing worldview for everyday processes and protocols for Central Yup’ik peoples. I

am consistently returning to the work of the late Yup'ik scholar Angayuqaq Oscar Kawagley, one of the first Alaska Native scholars to explain how the significant difference between Yuuyaraq and Western worldviews lay in their respective "holistic" versus "incremental and componential" ways of thinking.¹⁹ The cultural differentiation here is critical, since the imposition of compulsory Western education upon Alaska Natives ranks among the most culturally devastating acts of the twentieth century. Yuuyaraq advocates for sustainability and balance among human, natural, and spiritual realms—a set of relationships that is best understood as multidirectional—and acknowledges the simultaneity of spiritual constancy and temporal flux, a cyclical understanding embedded within numerous cultural forms, such as naming patterns, marriage patterns, and ceremonial observances. Yuuyaraq is both ecologically and socially conscious and embodies highly developed senses of responsibility and reciprocity.

In the last decades of the twentieth century, Western scientists and researchers introduced phrases such as "Traditional Ways of Knowing," "Traditional Knowledge," and most recently "Traditional Indigenous Knowledge" (TIK)—all of which signal a gradual and growing awareness that indigenous peoples hold expertise on a variety of issues deemed critical to the future of humankind. This new awareness is especially palpable in terms of environmental concerns, where such expertise has gained purchase with government and academic institutions in our era of global climate change. This shift is a positive step, considering an otherwise long history of agnotologic racism, which dismissed or marginalized indigenous communities' direct experiences with, dependence upon, observation of, and interaction with the natural world.

More recently, Alaska Native scholars, activists, artists, and community members have offered important revisions to the aforementioned theorizations of TIK. For example, Alaska Native elders recently amended the phrase "Traditional Knowledge" to "Traditional Knowledge and Wisdom" (TKW). This change responded to the elders' view that a non-Native preference for accumulating knowledge without a corresponding development of wisdom was to blame for destructive imbalances that devalued Native ways of knowing. For elders, wisdom is largely experience-based and embodies "the willingness to delve into our own souls and put right what is askew in the human family. Environmental degradation, strife, and resource conflicts will not be solved unless these deeper issues are understood and addressed more profoundly."²⁰ Indeed, the conscious privileging and application of indigenous worldviews has concrete implications in terms of addressing issues facing our communities, including health and wellness, educational access and achievement, political engagement, economic justice, social mobility, and civil and human rights.

Yet Alaska Native and American Indian researchers and educators have to be especially cognizant of the types and styles of histories we tell. In my

experience, students and colleagues who are unfamiliar with Native American stories and histories often initially respond with ambivalence (at best) or guilt (at worst) when confronted with topics of physical and cultural genocide perpetrated by the United States government and settler society. All stories, histories, theories, and performances are imbued with ideologies and codes of behavior because they are a primary mode of organizing and conveying meaning behind human experiences. We must also be aware of the ethical implications of our stories, histories, theories, and performances, for once they are put out into the world, they may in turn be retold by our colleagues and students with unintended consequences.

In addition to paying closer attention to the form and content of the stories we tell, several authors implore us to reconsider the mutually constitutive and dynamic relationships Native stories facilitate between the storyteller and the listener.²¹ In “The Story of America,” Howe argues that

Native stories are power. They create people. They author tribes. America is a tribal creation story, a tribalogy. As numerous as Indian tribes, creation stories gave birth to our people, and it is with absolute certainty that I tell you now: our stories also created the immigrants who landed on our shores.²²

Howe’s work demonstrates the ways in which tribalogy reverses dominant colonial scripts, such as doctrines of “discovery,” manifest destiny, and the need to save the “savage” race, and instead showcases the generative power of Native stories that author America into being. Within the realm of theater and literature, Howe explains that Native stories become living characters, or agents, that engage with and influence their audiences. This engagement is achieved by presenting the experiences of Native families and communities in forms recognizable to both cultural insiders and outsiders: “Native stories, no matter what form they take (novel, poem, drama, memoir, film, history), seem to pull all the elements together of the storyteller’s tribe, meaning the people, the land, and multiple characters and all their manifestations and revelations, and connect these in past, present, and future milieus.”²³ While tribalogy originates from and is oriented towards Native stories, histories, theories, and performances, it is also grounded in an historical realism that necessarily includes our inter- and intratribal encounters, antagonisms, and alliances.

RECOGNIZING INTER- AND INTRATRIBAL PROCESSES OF DIFFERENTIATION AND ALLIANCE

Like other Native American stories, histories, theories, and performances, tribalogies are ultimately expressed as relationships with humans—families

and home communities—natural, and spiritual worlds, and always in relation to cultural encounters. Within my home discipline of music, Victoria Levine notes that “a chronicle of the writing of American Indian music becomes a history . . . of music making as well as a history of social encounter,” and that “the challenges of writing American Indian music therefore reflect the challenges of the encounter itself.”²⁴ The second advantage of tribalogy is that it acknowledges inter- and intratribal processes of alliance and differentiation. As an Alaska Native researcher and educator dedicated to engaging notions of polyvocality, I readily acknowledge the contiguity of Native and non-Native ways of knowing and being in my work. Broadly speaking, tribalogy is an intertribal and interdisciplinary method that weaves Native knowledge and wisdom together with historical, theoretical, and ethnographical approaches—a “middle way” for Native students and researchers.²⁵

I align with fellow scholars and activists interested in complicating institutionalized boundaries and hierarchies, especially those that highlight shifting notions of race, ethnicity, and mixed identities “on the ground.” In doing so, my research builds on a small but substantial body of work in Native American studies that grapples with the vexing predicaments of identity that diasporic, “mixed-blood,” and non-enrolled Natives have confronted for over four decades.²⁶ Although stereotypical understandings of “Nativeness” based upon biological, legal, and cultural signifiers can and do shape personal understandings of self, a tribalogy of presence seeks to better understand the gray areas of identities that are self-fashioned within the realities of cosmopolitanism.

Laguna/Sioux/Scottish/Lebanese American author Paula Gunn Allen engages in what she calls “mixed-breed or hybrid” works that outwardly acknowledge the ways in which Native lives in America have been and continue to be mixed or hybrid lives, that when explored in depth reveal a rich multilayered existence based on relations or alliances within and across human, natural, and spiritual realms. Yet Gunn Allen takes care to point out that hybridity in this case does not assume two pure progenitor races or worlds, as is commonly espoused by the “living in two worlds” ideology. While we are quite capable of identifying or deciphering elements of our lives and narratives that are “Native” as opposed to “Western,” it is important to extend self-reflexivity into realms of acceptance—that we are who we are due to the choices made in the past by our families and ancestors, as well as the choices we continue to make in the present. Due to prevalent romantic notions of an “authentic” Native past, Chaat Smith characterized the “walking in two worlds” myth as “ideological Vicodin” fueled by misplaced assumptions that continue to deny Native peoples the agency to self-identify and thus to self-determine.²⁷ As Gunn Allen wrote, “many if not most Indians live lives translated into quite another.

So ubiquitous is this fact of American Indian life that when translation fails, as it all too often does, a term to identify it has been coined: ‘fallen between two chairs’ syndrome, valorized and lamented in scores of novels, biographies, and academic studies.”²⁸

Yuuyaraq also recalls the theme of “universalism rich with particulars.” Yup’ik scholars have described Yuuyaraq in both micro/specific or macro/general terms. On the one hand, Yuuyaraq is undeniably Yup’ik, “drawn from having lived the life of a Yupiaq and having been tutored by the people who embody it.”²⁹ In terms of researching cultural expressions, Yup’ik author Kanaqlak George P. Charles notes that indigenous stories, remembrances, songs, and artist’s impressions should be understood as specific to the life experiences of the groups and individuals from whence they came.³⁰

On the other hand, comparisons to and alliances with global indigenous studies must also be taken into account. Yuuyaraq-oriented communities share certain values with other indigenous communities, such as an ecological emphasis on maintaining reciprocity, harmony, and balance among the human, natural, and spiritual realms. Cross-cultural comparisons thus can potentially augment our general understanding of Yuuyaraq.³¹ At present, there are numerous scholars engaging in what Howe identifies as tribalogy’s “cultural bias,” that is, applying the method only within Native American contexts. By extending tribalogy to both indigenous and non-indigenous contexts, I am drawing from Chippewa scholar Duane Champagne’s argument in “American Indian Studies Is for Everyone.” Champagne explained

an open and free forum for discussion among Indian and non-Indian scholars benefits everyone who seeks to produce accurate, substantial, and significant studies of Indian peoples ... Indian nations are human groups, part of the broad history of all humanity, and therefore can be compared with other groups in technology, cultural world views, history, and adaptation to global markets and expanding state systems, etc.³²

To be sure, Champagne’s inclusive stance has its share of critics who play into the divisive identity politics present within Native American studies circles (debates within the field of Native literature are often-cited examples).³³ Given the diversity of contemporary Native American studies departments, and the fact that most classes are primarily populated with students who do not identify as Native, I find Champagne’s inclusivity to be a useful theoretical stance to apply in my own research and teaching activities.

To challenge the inflexibility of blood quantum ideology I follow ethnomusicologist Beverley Diamond’s most recent work, which calls for an emphasis on alliances. She suggests “that studying music’s capacity for defining relationships may well be as significant in the 21st century as studying music’s role in

defining identities has been for the past few decades.”³⁴ For Diamond, music studies scholars need to listen more closely to musicians’ personal histories, motivations, and experiences in order to amplify how they each view their role as musicians and social activists in relation to their lived communities. This is especially critical for those artists who were raised in urban settings and/or travel between rural and urban communities and the resulting “double consciousness” of their lives that are “at once facing two or more cultures, past and present” in the search for and expression of a roots culture.³⁵ She poses that we study music as an expression of relationships (that is, to people, land, etc.) and “musical practices *as* theory not as objects to which we might apply theory.”³⁶

Diamond suggests “that a research emphasis on alliances—both the ones these artists make and the ones in which they are implicated—rather than on the distinctiveness of identity, can take us closer to understanding the vision of modern indigenous people and the patron discourses that need to be dismantled for that vision to be realized.”³⁷ An emphasis on allegiances thus results in a more nuanced understanding of identity formation, which acknowledges the dialectical relationship between processes of self-identification and social recognition. The emerging field of African Native American studies critically examines the salience of ethnoracial categories to heritage and self-understanding, especially with regard to individuals of multiethnic descent.³⁸ Choctaw/African American scholar Robert Keith Collins, for example, poses a seemingly simple yet grossly misunderstood question: “what motivates people in the United States to claim identities that are inconsistent with their skin color?”³⁹ Collins, whose research focuses on the lived realities of individuals of mixed African and Native heritage, developed his kinship approach due to his dissatisfaction with monolithic understandings of race that adhere to misplaced assumptions of homogeneity. As Collins explained

such misplaced assumptions of homogeneity divert attention away from the important processes of cultural change, it’s affect on individual lives within racial groups, and the active role individuals sometimes take to maintain an understanding of self indelibly divorced from race. It is in this diversion that the reasons why these individuals hang on to an understanding of self that is outside the common American ethno-racial scheme go ignored.⁴⁰

For Collins, traditional Native identity formation processes are figured genealogically and structured socially. I follow his lead by fusing Diamond’s alliance studies model with a research approach that concentrates on kin relations, which ultimately grants contemporary Alaska Native people—and thus their families and home communities—more power and agency by listening closely to the stories they tell themselves about themselves.

THE ALASKA NATIVE SCHOLARS PROJECT

I am a Dena'ina (Athabascan) woman and enrolled member of the Knik tribe, a first-generation college graduate and PhD recipient, and an active musician-scholar working at a research university nearly three thousand miles away from my ancestral homelands of south-central Alaska. I began what I am loosely calling the Alaska Native Scholars Project in 2010 while finishing my dissertation, in an effort to identify other Alaska Native men and women who had successfully handled the obstacles of completing a doctoral degree before me. Ray Barnhardt, professor of education at the University of Alaska, Fairbanks (UAF) was the only person I could find who had done any research on the topic of Alaska Native scholars. He compiled a working list of Alaska Native men and women who earned PhDs and EdDs, MDs and JDs, as well as MBA degrees, as part of a proposal he submitted to UAF in order to justify the need to support the establishment of an indigenous studies PhD program.⁴¹

I decided to work with Barnhardt's list of thirty-one research degree recipients (PhDs and EdDs), and for the first tribalographical stage my goal was to see how many more names I could add to the list in an attempt, as Howe describes, to pull together information related to this "tribe" of scholars—names, home villages or cities, universities attended, dissertation titles, work histories—in order to connect them "in past, present, and future milieus."⁴²

To date, I have added twenty-six names to the list (see table 1) and am currently planning to make the significantly more detailed version available on the Alaska Native Knowledge Network. This working list of earned doctorates will certainly expand, for there are at least two dozen more Alaska Native students who are currently enrolled in PhD programs in and outside of Alaska. In sum, this project responds to the following recommendation offered by Alaska Native students in the 2008 UAA study:

*Help young people find more role models who have successfully bridged the Alaska Native world and the Western world—who can, in the words of one graduate, "wear the traditional dress but also the professional dress for working in this world." Families and communities especially need to help boys and young men identify such role models, the study participants said. It's important to convey that college graduates can be strong, accomplished men who have not given up traditional ways.*⁴³

To contextualize the importance of the fifty-seven Alaska Native earned doctorates listed in table 1 above, I again will turn to the 2010 census enumerations. According to the "Race Reporting for the American Indian and Alaska Native Population by Selected Tribes," there are 138,850 individuals living throughout the United States who self-identified as descending from an Alaska

TABLE 1. ALASKA NATIVE MEN AND WOMEN WITH EARNED RESEARCH DOCTORATES (WORKING LIST)

Bold = currently works in UA system (or retired from UA system)

^ = previously worked in UA system

x = currently works in Alaska (not in UA system)

+ = currently works outside of Alaska

* = deceased

| NAME (CULTURAL AFFILIATION) | YEAR: DEGREE, INSTITUTION | FIELD |
|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. James Simpson (Athabaskan) | 1970: EdD, U of Washington | Education |
| 2. Michael F. Tillman (Tlingit) + | 1972: PhD, U of Washington | Fisheries Science |
| 3. *William Demmert (Tlingit/Oglala Sioux) + | 1973: EdD, Harvard U | Education |
| 4. * Louis Jacquot (Tlingit) | 1973: PhD, U of Oregon | Education |
| 5. * Paul A Goodwin (Inupiaq) | 1979: PhD, U of Alaska Fairbanks | Physics |
| 6. Robert D Streams (Alutiiq) + | 1983: PhD, Stanford U | Anthropology |
| 7. Elizabeth Parent (Athabaskan) + | 1984: PhD, Stanford U | Education |
| 8. Lora L Johnson (Alutiiq) x | 1984: PhD, Brown U | Classics |
| 9. Larri Fredericks (Athabaskan) + | 1990: PhD, U of Calif, Berkeley | Medical Anthropology |
| 10. John Weise (Yup'ik) | 1990: PhD, U of Oregon | Education |
| 11. Ted Wright (Tlingit) x | 1990: PhD, Pennsylvania State U | Political Science |
| 12. Dorothy Pender (Inupiaq) x | 1991: PhD, Stanford U | Electrical Engineering |
| 13. Jeanmarie Crumb (Athabaskan) x | 1992: EdD, U of Southern California | Education |
| 14. *Angayuqaq Oscar Kawagley (Yup'ik) | 1993: PhD, U of British Columbia | Education |
| 15. Brian Wescott (Athabaskan/Yup'ik) + | 1993: PhD, Yale U | American Studies |
| 16. Milo Adkison (Yup'ik) | 1994: PhD, U of Washington | Fisheries |
| 17. Jeanne Breinig (Haida) | 1995: PhD, U of Washington | English |
| 18. Edna Ahgeak MacLean (Inupiaq) x | 1995: PhD, Stanford U | Linguistics |
| 19. Catherine Swan Reimer (Inupiaq) + | 1995: EdD, George Washington U | Education (Counseling) |
| 20. Jay Corwin (Tlingit) + | 1995: PhD, Florida State U | Modern Languages |
| 21. Dolores Garza (Haida) | 1996: PhD, U of Delaware | Marine Science |
| 22. Shari Huhndorf (Yup'ik) + | 1996: PhD, New York U | Comparative Literature |
| 23. Maria Williams (Tlingit) | 1996: PhD, U of Calif, Los Angeles | Ethnomusicology |
| 24. Gordon Pullar (Alutiiq/Sugpiaq) | 1997: PhD, The Union Institute | Anthropology |
| 25. Denise Dillard (Inupiaq) x | 1997: PhD, Colorado State U | Counseling Psychology |

| NAME (CULTURAL AFFILIATION) | YEAR: DEGREE, INSTITUTION | FIELD |
|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 26. Phyllis Fast (Athabaskan) | 1998: PhD, Harvard U | Anthropology |
| 27. Mary Jeanne Longley (Inupiaq) × | 1998: EdD, Portland State U | Education |
| 28. Joyce Shales (Tlingit) × | 1998: PhD, U of British Columbia | Education |
| 29. Bernice Terpon (Inupiaq) × | 1998: PhD, U of Alaska Fairbanks | Cross-Cultural Education |
| 30. Rosita Worl (Tlingit) × ^ | 1998: PhD, Harvard U | Anthropology |
| 31. *Deanna Panitaraq Kingston (Inupiaq) + | 1999: PhD, U of Alaska Fairbanks | Anthropology |
| 32. Kanaqluk George Charles (Yup'ik) | 2000: PhD, U of Calif., Santa Barbara | Religious Studies |
| 33. Linda Crothers (Athabaskan) + | 2000: PhD, U of Calif., Santa Barbara | Psychology |
| 34. Sven Haakanson, Jr. (Alutiiq) × | 2000: PhD, Harvard U | Anthropology |
| 35. Steven Verney (Tsimshian) + | 2000: PhD, U of Calif., San Diego | Clinical Psychology |
| 36. Kamilla Venner (Athabaskan) + | 2001: PhD, U of New Mexico | Psychology |
| 37. Dalee Sambo Dorough (Inupiaq) | 2002: PhD, U of British Columbia | Law |
| 38. Lisa Rey Thomas (Tlingit) + | 2004: PhD, U of Washington | Clinical Psychology |
| 39. Alexis Buntan (Yup'ik/Aleut) + | 2006: PhD, U of Calif., Los Angeles | Anthropology |
| 40. Beth Leonard (Athabaskan) | 2007: PhD, U of Alaska Fairbanks | Cross-Cultural Studies |
| 41. Sarah (Hicks) Kastelic (Alutiiq) + | 2008: PhD, Washington U in St. Louis | Social Work |
| 42. Eve Tuck (Unangan) + | 2008: PhD, City U of New York | Education |
| 43. Cayenne Nikoosh Carlo (Athabaskan) + | 2008: PhD, U of Calif., San Diego | Neurosciences |
| 44. ^Jordan Paul Lewis (Aleut) + | 2009: PhD, U of Alaska Fairbanks | Cross-Cultural Community Psychology |
| 45. Kathryn Milligan-Mlyre (Inupiaq) + | 2009: PhD, U of Wisconsin-Madison | Microbiology |
| 46. Malia Villegas (Alutiiq/Sugpiaq) + | 2010: EdD, Harvard U | Education |
| 47. Nancy Jean Furlow (Tlingit) × ^ | 2010: PhD, U of Calif., Santa Barbara | Religious Studies |
| 48. Theresa John (Yup'ik) | 2010: PhD, U of Alaska Fairbanks | Indigenous Studies |
| 49. Roy F. Roehl II (Aleut) | 2010: PhD, U of Alaska Fairbanks | Education & Mathematics |
| 50. April G.L. Counciller (Alutiiq) | 2010: PhD, U of Alaska Fairbanks | Interdisciplinary |
| 51. Walkie Kumaggaq Charles (Yup'ik) | 2011: PhD, U of Alaska Fairbanks | Applied Linguistics |
| 52. Jessica Bissett Perea (Athabaskan) + | 2011: PhD, U of Calif., Los Angeles | Musicology |
| 53. Thomas Michael Swensen (Alutiiq) + | 2011: PhD, U of Calif., Berkeley | Comparative Ethnic Studies |
| 54. Kutraluk J.D. Bolton (Inupiaq) + | 2011: PhD, Stanford U | Anthropology |
| 55. Nadia Jackinsky-Horrell (Alutiiq) × | 2012: PhD, U of Washington | Art History |
| 56. Alisha Drabek (Alutiiq) | 2012: PhD, U of Alaska, Fairbanks | Indigenous Studies |
| 57. Tina Woods (Unangan) × | 2013: PhD, U of Alaska (Joint Anc/Fb) | Clinical Community Psychology |

Native tribe “alone or in any combination.”⁴⁴ According to a related American Community Survey, only 3 percent of the Alaska Native population reported earning a graduate or professional degree.

Of the fifty-seven research doctorate degree recipients, only eleven (19 percent) obtained their degree from the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, the only PhD granting institution in the system to date. This means that the overwhelming majority (forty-six people or 81percent) obtained their degrees from “outside” institutions ranging from prestigious private universities (such as Stanford, Harvard, Yale, New York University, and the University of Southern California) to large public research universities (such as University of California, Berkeley, University of California, Los Angeles, University of Washington, and the University of British Columbia). Until recently, most Alaska Native people interested in graduate degrees had to leave the state in order to obtain doctoral degrees, and not always because of programmatic offerings. Michael Jennings’ critical study chronicles the challenges Alaska Natives face within the University of Alaska (UA) system, most notably an absence of culturally responsive support networks.⁴⁵ Yet circumstances have taken a positive turn in the past five years, especially with the successful establishment of an indigenous studies PhD program at UAF in fall 2008 and the first full tenure promotions granted to UA–Anchorage professors Phyllis Fast (Athabascan) and Jeane Breinig (Haida), who also was appointed as associate dean of humanities, all in spring 2012. Moreover, at the time of this writing, nineteen of the thirty-three PhDs and EdDs who have made or are making careers in Alaska did so within the UA system (see names listed in boldface in table 1). Additionally, the remaining fourteen Alaska Native scholars who live and work in Alaska demonstrate the range of possibilities for careers outside of academia, working as executive directors and curators at regional cultural museums, executive directors and education directors of Native-operated nonprofit organizations, general managers of tribal councils, presidents of tribal colleges, and engineers in the state’s oil and gas industry.

However, two related stories necessarily must be told alongside that of the earned doctorates. First, attention must be paid to the so-called “brain drain” predicament that many would say is evidenced by the twenty-four Alaska Native PhDs and EdDs (approximately 42 percent) who currently live and work outside of Alaska. Returning to the 2010 census enumerations, of the 138,850 Alaska Native people living nationwide, 72 percent (99,561) live in Alaska and 28 percent (39,289) comprise one layer of an Alaska Native diaspora, a spectrum that ranges from Alaska Native people living in the state, but outside of their family’s home region (for example, south-western Yup’ik people living in south-central Anchorage), to Alaska Native people living internationally or outside of the United States. Table 2 below

provides a breakdown of the Alaska Native population in the United States, which the 2010 census further delineated as six general tribal groupings listed horizontally, featuring the top three states with largest number of Alaska Native populations. Out of the twenty-four who currently work (or did work) outside of Alaska, twelve (60 percent) of those men and women reside within the three states listed below.

TABLE 2. RACE REPORTING FOR THE ALASKA NATIVE POPULATION BY SELECTED TRIBES (2010 CENSUS)

| | | | General Tribal Groupings | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|---------------|-----------|--------|--------|
| Alaska Native Population Totals | | Alaskan Athabascan | Aleut | Inupiat | Tlingit-Haida | Tsimshian | Yup'ik | |
| | United States | 138,850 | 22,484 | 19,282 | 33,360 | 26,080 | 3,755 | 33,889 |
| 1. | Alaska | 99,561 | 16,665 | 11,216 | 25,687 | 13,186 | 1,939 | 30,868 |
| 2. | Washington | 12,730 | 1,222 | 2,870 | 1,365 | 5,733 | 956 | 584 |
| 3. | California | 4,907 | 697 | 1,107 | 1,019 | 1,571 | 190 | 323 |
| 4. | Oregon | 3,241 | 445 | 631 | 487 | 1,225 | 153 | 300 |

A tendency exists in many Alaska Native communities to wonder anxiously when these men and women might return home. Yet, one might argue that it is perhaps equally productive to highlight the contributions this particular diaspora is making in terms of articulating the issues and priorities of Alaska Native communities on national and international stages while working inside major academic, government, and Native American institutions: as professors and postdoctoral researchers at Western Washington University, San Francisco State University, University of California, Berkeley, Arizona State University, State University of New York–New Paltz, and University of Oregon; as directors and researchers in the National Parks Service, National Congress of American Indians, National Indian Child Welfare Association, National Science Foundation; and as clinical psychologists, actors, and screenwriters.

The second related story is also imbued with anxieties toward Westernized education, an anxiety that has been posed to me as “why should Alaska Natives get PhDs?” I openly and readily acknowledge that earning research degrees is only one of many paths that Alaska Native people can take toward creating better futures and healing communities. Thus part of my aim to document Alaska Native presence in academia also necessitates highlighting the rich and diverse cadre of fifty-six Alaska Native men and women who have been recognized by the UA Board of Regents (BOR) with an honorary doctorate degree (table 3).⁴⁶ The University of Alaska awards six types of honorary doctoral degrees, including:

1. Doctor of Laws (LLD) for persons distinguished in general service to the state, to learning, and to humankind (public service);
2. Doctor of Education (DE) for persons who have distinguished themselves in the field of education;
3. Doctor of Fine Arts (DFA) for persons who have distinguished themselves in the fine arts, including artists and musicians;
4. Doctor of Humane Letters (LHD) for persons who have distinguished themselves in the humanities;
5. Doctor of Letters (LittD) for persons distinguished in scholarly work of a somewhat restricted nature, usually conferred upon scholars in particular disciplines;
6. Doctor of Science (ScD) for persons who have made distinguished contribution and performed services in the sciences.

According to the university's website, honorary degree recipients are "chosen for their leadership roles in the governmental, humanitarian and scientific worlds, Alaskans and non-Alaskans have been selected for this distinguished honor over the years of the institution's existence."⁴⁷ Interestingly, whereas the UA system was established in 1917 and began selecting Alaskans and non-Alaskans for honorary degrees in 1932, Alaska Native people were not honored until 1968. This more than three-decade gap speaks volumes about the challenges faced by Alaska Native people in higher education "at home." Yet the consistent recognition of Alaska Native men and women as honorary degree recipients since 1968 does correlate with an inclusion of Alaska Native men and women on the UA BOR—another hidden history of Alaska Native presence within the UA system. BOR appointees are chosen by the governor and confirmed by the Alaska legislature. Sam Kito Jr. (Tlingit) was the first Alaska Native to serve on the board between 1975 and 1983, and was followed by other prominent leaders listed in table 4.

TABLE 3. ALASKA NATIVE MEN AND WOMEN WITH HONORARY DOCTORAL DEGREES FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

| NAME (CULTURAL AFFILIATION) | Yr: DEGREE, CAMPUS | ABBREVIATED CITATION |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|---|
| 1. Walter A. Soboleff (Tlingit) | 1968: LHD, UA | Grand President, Alaska Native Brotherhood (ANB) |
| 2. Archie Demmert (Tlingit) | 1970: LHD, UA | Educator |
| 3. Frank Peratrovich (Tlingit) | 1973: LLD, UA | Legislator |
| 4. Howard Rock (Inupiaq) | 1974: LHD, UAF | Founder, <i>Tundra Times</i> Newspaper |
| 5. Frank Auvne Degan (Yup'ik) | 1975: LLD, UAF | Co-founder, Alaska Federation of Natives (AFN) |
| 6. Nora Guinn (Yup'ik) | 1978: LLD, UAA | Magistrate and District Judge (first Native appointed) |
| 7. Alfred Widmark (Tlingit) | 1979: LHD, UAS | Leader; Alaska legislator 1961–62 |
| 8. Andrew Isaac (Athabaskan) | 1979: LHD, UAF | Traditional Chief of Athabaskan people |
| 9. William L. Hensley (Inupiaq) | 1980: LLD, UAA | Alaska State Senator 1971–1975 and 1987 |
| 10. Cyrus E. Peck, Sr. (Tlingit) | 1980: LHD, UAS | Magistrate; Member, ANB |
| 11. Mildred Horch Sparks (Tlingit) | 1981: LHD, UAS | Artist; Leader, Alaska Native Sisterhood (ANS) |
| 12. Emily Ivanoff Brown (Inupiaq) | 1982: LHD, UAF | Author; Alaska educator; Native leader |
| 13. Della Keats (Inupiaq) | 1983: LHD, UAA | Tribal Doctor |
| 14. Byron I. Mallort (Tlingit) | 1984: LHD, UAS | President, Sealaska Corporation |
| 15. Robert Cogo (Haida) | 1985: LittD, UAF | Linguist |
| 16. Joseph M. Kahklen (Tlingit) | 1985: LHD, UAS | Educator |
| 17. Mary Demientieff (Athabaskan) | 1986: LHD, UAF | Elder; Member, National Conference on Aging |
| 18. Harold Kaveolook (Inupiaq) | 1987: DE, UAF | Educator and community leader, North Slope |
| 19. Sadie Brower Neakok (Inupiaq) | 1987: LLD, UAF | Alaskan Magistrate 1960–77 |
| 20. Nathan Paul Jackson (Tlingit) | 1988: LHD, UAS | Chilkoot-Tlingit Woodcarver |
| 21. Sidney Huntington (Athabaskan) | 1989: LLD, UAF | Board of Fish & Game; Galena School Board for twenty-five years |
| 22. Austin Hammond, Sr. (Tlingit) | 1989: LHD, UAS | Leader Chilkoot people of Haines |
| 23. Eliza Jones (Athabaskan) | 1990: LittD, UAF | Scholar of Athabaskan languages |
| 24. Roy Huhndorf (Yup'ik) | 1991: LLD, UAA | President, Cook Inlet Region, Inc. |
| 25. Delores Churchill (Haida) | 1991: LHD, UAS | Basket and Blanket Weaver |
| 26. Frank See (Tlingit) | 1991: LLD, UAS | Hoonah Businessman |
| 27. Gilbert Truit (Tlingit) | 1992: LLD, UAF | Educator |
| 28. Mary Jane Fate (Athabaskan) | 1992: LLD, UAF | Activist |

TABLE 3. (CONT.)

| NAME (CULTURAL AFFILIATION) | Yr: DEGREE, CAMPUS | ABBREVIATED CITATION |
|---|--------------------|--|
| 29. Peter John (Athabascan) | 1994: LHD, UAF | Chief; Guest lecturer |
| 30. Esther Shea (Tlingit) | 1994: LLD, UAS | Instructor; research on lifestyle of Tlingit people |
| 31. Howard Luke (Athabascan) | 1996: LHD, UAF | Leader dedicated to teaching youth traditional skills |
| 32. Ellen Hope Hays (Tlingit) | 1996: LLD, UAS | Historian; First woman member of ANB |
| 33. Katherine Peter (Athabascan) | 1999: LLD, UAF | Linguist; works with Alaska Native Language Center |
| 34. Poldine Carlo (Athabascan) | 2001: LLD, UAF | Elder; Founding member of Fairbanks Native Association |
| 35. Nora Marks Dauenhauer (Tlingit) | 2001: LHD, UAS | Author; Commissioner of Alaska Historical Society |
| 36. Ethel Lund (Tlingit) | 2001: LLD, UAA | Nurse; Leader in Health Services at State and National |
| 37. David Salmon (Athabascan) | 2002: LLD, UAF | Elder; Chief of Chalkyitsik; Author; Guest lecturer |
| 38. Kenneth Utauayk Toovak (Inupiaq) | 2003: LLD, UAF | Cultural ambassador to researchers for sixty years |
| 39. Alfred Ketzler, Sr. (Athabascan) | 2004: LHD, UAF | Organized Tanana Chiefs Conf; AFN Deputy Director |
| 40. Erma Lawrence (Haida) | 2004: LHD, UAS | Author of Haida Dictionary |
| 41. Julie Kirka (Alutiiq) | 2004: LHD, UAA | President of Alaska Federation of Natives |
| 42. Jake Lesrenkof (Aleut) | 2005: LLD, UAF | Distinguished military career; Vice President of AFN |
| 43. John Pingayak (Yup'ik) | 2006: LLD, UAA | Educator |
| 44. Catherine Arta (Athabascan) | 2007: LLD, UAF | Linguist; Governor's Award for Arts in 1997 |
| 45. Herman Kirka, Sr. (Tlingit) | 2009: LHD, UAS | Elder; ANB; Land rights activist & scholar of Tlingit culture |
| 46. Annie Cungaayar Blue (Yup'ik) | 2009: LHD, UAF | Renowned traditional storyteller |
| 47. Marlene Johnson (Tlingit) | 2009: LLD, UAS | Leader, SE region & Rural AK Community Action program |
| 48. Chief Kangringuq Paul John (Yup'ik) | 2010: LHD, UAF | Tribal chief of the Nunakayyak Traditional Council |
| 49. Oliver Leavitt (Inupiaq) | 2010: LLD, UAA | Chairman of the Board of Directors of Arctic Slope Regional Corporation |
| 50. Katie John (Athabascan) | 2011: LLD, UAF | Elder; Land rights activist & scholar of Ahirna culture |
| 51. John Hoover (Aleut) | 2011: DFA, UAA | Artist; contemporary sculptor |
| 52. Rosita Worl (Tlingit) | 2012: ScD, UAA | President, Sealaska Heritage Institute |
| 53. John Borbridge, Jr. (Tlingit) | 2012: LLD, UAS | Elder; Activist instrumental in passage of Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act |
| 54. H. Robin Samuelson Jr. (Yup'ik) | 2012: LLD, UAF | CEO & Board President, Bristol Bay Economic Development Corporation |
| 55. Emil Norri (Athabascan) | 2013: LHD, UAA | Former commissioner, AK Dept Community & Reg. Affairs |
| 56. John Sackett (Athabascan) | 2013: LLD, UAF | Former Senator; founding chairman and president of Doyon |

TABLE 4. ALASKA NATIVE MEN AND WOMEN APPOINTED TO UA BOARD OF REGENTS

| NAME (CULTURAL AFFILIATION) | YEARS SERVED | NOTES |
|------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Sam Kito Jr. (Tlingit) | 1975–1983 | |
| John W Schaeffer (Inupiaq) | 1977–1979 | |
| Roy M Huhndorf (Yup'ik) | 1983–1991 | BOR Chair, 1985–1987 |
| Willie L. Hensley (Inupiaq) | 1984–1987 | 1980 Honorary Degree Recipient |
| Morris Thompson (Athabaskan) | 1989–1993 | |
| Mary Reeve (Yup'ik) | 1990–1991 | Student Regent |
| Mary Jane Fate (Athabaskan) | 1993–2001 | 1992 Honorary Degree Recipient |
| Marlene Johnson (Tlingit) | 2001–2002 | 2009 Honorary Degree Recipient |
| Byron I. Mallott (Tlingit) | 2002–2003 | 1984 Honorary Degree Recipient |
| Carl Marrs Jr. (Alutiiq) | 2005–2013 | |
| Robert Martin (Tlingit) | 2005–2013 | |
| Gloria O'Neill (Yup'ik) | 2013–2021 | |

As outlined in the brief citations of table 3, the fifty-six Alaska Native men and women recognized with an honorary doctorate come from a range of backgrounds, including respected tribal chiefs and elders, traditional healers, military and political leaders, prominent business men and women, linguists, scientists, judges, authors, educators, and artists, to name a few.

ADVOCATING FOR AGENCY AND HEALING

Taken together, these lists of earned and honorary doctorates offer a starting point to a more detailed tribalography of Alaska Native presence in academia that documents and contextualizes the perspectives and lived experiences of those individuals listed above—my current work-in-progress. My use of tribalography responds to the work of global indigenous scholars who call for indigenous communities to “research back” in order to reclaim control over the representations and continued survival of indigenous ways of knowing and being.⁴⁸ For example, Māori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* engages in an extensive critique of colonial paradigms of research and knowledge, and forcefully points out how institutionalized “regimes of truth” are situated within particular socio-cultural systems that must be decolonized. She argues that a prioritization of indigenous perspectives both enables indigenous peoples to represent themselves and their culture, and privileges their indigenous concerns, indigenous practices, and indigenous participation.⁴⁹ As Tuhiwai Smith rightly points out, indigenous researchers offer diverse perspectives that critique the underlying assumptions behind research by dominant colonial culture.

Indeed, returning to an earlier example, any project that centers Yuuyaraq as a guiding philosophy performs an important task of resisting conventional rhetoric and stereotypes that place Native culture in the distant past: it recalls that our traumas are very recent traumas. Yup'ik activist Harold Napoleon from the village of Hooper Bay was one of the first to write about Yuuyaraq in the early 1990s in his attempts to publically address intergenerational traumas wrought by physical and cultural genocide within Alaska Native communities.⁵⁰ Despite Native communities' eagerness to forget or suppress the past through *nallunguarluku* (pretending it didn't happen), Napoleon's work demanded an acknowledgment of our ancestors' traumas, which still reverberate through our bodies and across our communities. Yuuyaraq stresses relationality and simultaneity, and thus carves a space in the present to redress past wrongs.

It would be a mistake simply to think of Alaska Native scholars as merely acculturated Western thinkers: they have promoted and will continue to promote indigenous ways of knowing that create space for future generations of Native scholars within academia.⁵¹ The proliferation of neocolonial binaries propositioned as a "false choice"—assimilate or secede, inside or outside, modern or traditional—continues to deny Alaska Natives any semblance of agency in choosing whether or not to pursue higher education. This traditional/modern binary that pervades Alaska Native communities is typically uneven and viscerally felt and, based on my ethnographic research, this is especially true of urban Natives of the post-Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) generation.⁵² Thus I prefer Craig Womack's definition of traditionalism "as anything that is useful to Indian people in retaining their values and worldviews, no matter how much it deviates from what people did one or two hundred years ago."⁵³

As an inclusive and radical method, tribalography enables dialogues and projects that move beyond neocolonial narratives of genocide and the legacy of victimry and emphasize the more life-affirming narratives of empowerment, agency, and healing—what Chippewa literary theorist Gerald Vizenor calls "survivance stories."⁵⁴ Whereas familiar and productive resistance ideologies, represented by phrases like "we are still here," bring Native American and Alaska Native peoples into view, a diverse cadre of contemporary Native American scholars, such as those considered in this essay, are questioning old research paradigms and developing new ones that illuminate the ways in which *we have always been here and will continue to be here*. Native American narratives rooted in activism do not ignore traumatic histories. On the contrary, Howe noted, "acknowledging the wrongs committed against our ancestors is how we speak to future generations."⁵⁵ We must grapple with and acknowledge historic traumas in order to move beyond the sense of inevitability espoused by the expectations of conventional American history narratives that Native

Americans assimilated and disappeared. By listening closely to the stories that Alaska Native individuals and collectives tell themselves about themselves, a question-centered and person-centered approach can orient us towards the thriving presence of indigenous lifeways.

In 2003 Paula Gunn Allen wrote, “the Native Elders remind us that ours is the period of the Seventh Generation, when reconciliation between the races is called for.”⁵⁶ The social justice initiatives of our generation necessarily hinge on our visibility and audibility within an increasingly complex sociocultural matrix. Adhering to our ancestors’ emphasis on balance and complementarity both promotes healthy relationships among those involved in and affected by academia, and effectively removes barriers for future generations of Native students, researchers, and educators. It is from a life-affirming position of Native presence that we are able to consider a more liberatory range of possibilities. The inclusivity of an applied tribalogy approach instead aims to illuminate the numerous and multilayered social relations that shape contemporary Alaska Native identities. Native and non-Native, specialist and amateur, rural and urban dweller, tribal and corporate—all play a role in redefining the possibilities of Alaska Native studies as a field.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the following people for their guidance with early versions of this essay: Ray Barnhardt, Maria Williams, Sean Asiqluq Topkok, Gordon Pullar, April G. L. Counciller, Dalee Sambo Dorough, Shari Huhndorf, and the fall 2012 UAF Indigenous Studies Program Workshop participants. This essay is directly influenced by and dedicated to two recently departed colleagues: Angayuqaq Oscar Kawagley (1934–2011) and Deanna Paniataaq Kingston (1964–2011).

NOTES

1. Andrea Smith credits the phrase to a paper presentation by Kathryn Shanley, “Indigenous Intellectual Sovereignties: A Hemispheric Convocation” (University of California, Davis, April 8–10, 1998). Chippewa literary theorist Gerald Vizenor also noted, while writing about Thomas Jefferson’s comparative praise of Indians at the expense of African American slaves, that “the *absence* of the *indian* in the histories of this nation is an aesthetic victimry” (original emphasis). Gerald Robert Vizenor, *Fugitive Poses: Native American Indian Scenes of Absence and Presence* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 12.

2. Andrea Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2005), 9.

3. See Robert Proctor and Londa L. Schiebinger, *Agnology: The Making and Unmaking of Ignorance* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2008). I thank Thomas Michael Swensen for pointing me to this important work.

4. Michael Jennings, *Alaska Native Political Leadership and Higher Education: One University, Two Universes* (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2004), 81.

5. Ray Barnhardt and Bryan Brayboy, "New Degree Program Request, Submitted to the University of Alaska Board of Regents" (University of Alaska, Fairbanks, 2008).

6. Diane Erickson and Diane Hirshberg, "Alaska Native Graduates of UAA: What Can They Tell Us?" (Anchorage: Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of Alaska Anchorage, March 2008), 3.

7. Jessica Bissett Perea, "The Politics of Inuit Musical Modernities in Alaska" (PhD dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 2011), 14.

8. Vine Deloria, *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* (New York: Macmillan, 1969).

9. George Lipsitz, *Dangerous Crossroads: Popular Music, Postmodernism, and the Poetics of Place* (London, UK: Verso, 1994), 62; Gayatri Spivak, *Outside in the Teaching Machine* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 3–4.

10. George Lipsitz, "Midnight at the Barrelhouse: Why Ethnomusicology Matters Now," *Ethnomusicology* 55, no. 2 (Spring/Summer 2011): 186.

11. While Howe's creative projects certainly exemplify a "tribalography" approach, she explicitly addresses its development in the following articles: "Tribalography: The Power of Native Stories," *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism* XIV, no. 1 (Fall 1999); "My Mothers, My Uncles, Myself," in *Here First: Autobiographical Essays by Native American Writers*, ed. Arnold Krupat and Brian Swann (New York: Modern Library, 2000); "The Story of America: A Tribalography," in *Clearing a Path: Theorizing the Past in Native American Studies*, ed. Nancy Shoemaker (New York: Routledge, 2002); "Blind Bread and the Business of Theory Making," in *Reasoning Together: The Native Critics Collective*, ed. Janice Acoose, et al. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2008).

12. Two recent dissertations on Native popular music by Native scholars are Mescalero Apache/Chicano/German/Irish American musician scholar John-Carlos Perea, "Witchi Tai To': An Historical Acoustemology" (PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 2009), and Luiseno/Maidu musician scholar Alan Lechusza Aquallo, "Without Reservations: Native Hip Hop and Identity in the Music of W.O.R." (PhD dissertation, University of California, San Diego, 2009). Since graduating, both Perea and Aquallo have accepted faculty positions within American Indian Studies departments at San Francisco State University and Palomar College, respectively. Their appointments signal an important shift in Native studies given its historically law-centered emphases—which aimed to produce advocates for sovereignty related issues—by reinforcing calls for disciplinary balance by way of reintroducing humanistic perspectives and approaches.

13. Indigenous scholars: Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999); Craig S. Womack, Janice Acoose, Lisa Brooks, Tol Foster, Daniel Heath Justice, Phillip Carroll Morgan, Kimberly Roppolo, Cheryl Suzack, Christopher B. Teuton, Sean Teuton, Robert Warrior, and LeAnne Howe, eds., *Reasoning Together: The Native Critics Collective* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2008); Norman K. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln, and Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies* (Los Angeles, CA: Sage, 2008); Shawn Wilson, *Research Is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods* (Black Point, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing, 2008); Margaret Kovach, *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009).

Alaska Native scholars: *Angayyuqaaq* Oscar Kawagley, *A Yupiaq Worldview: A Pathway to Ecology and Spirit* (Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, 1995); Deanna M. Kingston, "Returning: Twentieth Century Performances of the King Island Wolf Dance" (PhD dissertation, University of Alaska,

Fairbanks, 1999); Shari M. Huhndorf, *Going Native: Indians in the American Cultural Imagination* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001) and *Mapping the Americas: The Transnational Politics of Contemporary Native Culture* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009); Malia Villegas, Sabina Rak Neugebauer, and Kerry R. Venegas, *Indigenous Knowledge and Education: Sites of Struggle, Strength, and Survivance* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review, 2008); Maria Sháa Tláa Williams, *The Alaska Native Reader: History, Culture, Politics* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2009); Ray Barnhardt and A. Oscar Kawagley, *Alaska Native Education: Views from Within* (Fairbanks: Alaska Native Knowledge Network, Center for Cross-Cultural Studies, University of Alaska Fairbanks, 2010); Joan Parker Webster and Theresa Arevgaq John, "Preserving a Space for Cross-Cultural Collaborations: An Account of Insider/Outsider Issues," *Ethnography and Education* 5, no. 2 (2010).

Music studies allies: Victoria Lindsay Levine, *Writing American Indian Music: Historic Transcriptions, Notations, and Arrangements*, vol. 44, *Recent Researches in American Music* (Middleton, WI: Published for the American Musicological Society by A-R Editions, Inc., 2002) and "Musical Revitalization among the Choctaw," *American Music* 11, no. 4 (1993); Elaine Keillor, "The Emergence of Postcolonial Musical Expressions of Aboriginal Peoples within Canada," *Cultural Studies* 9, no. 1 (1995); David W. Samuels, *Putting a Song on Top of It: Expression and Identity on the San Carlos Apache Reservation* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2004); Beverley Diamond, "Media as Social Action: Native American Musicians in the Recording Studio," in *Wired for Sound: Engineering and Technologies in Sonic Cultures*, ed. Paul D. Green and Thomas Porcello (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 2005); Anna Hoefnagels and Beverley Diamond, eds., *Aboriginal Music in Contemporary Canada: Echos and Exchanges* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2012); Beverley Diamond, "The Music of Modern Indigeneity: From Identity to Alliance Studies," *European Meetings in Ethnomusicology* 12, no. 22 (2007).

14. Paul Chaat Smith, *Everything You Know About Indians Is Wrong* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009), 29.

15. For a thorough and critical discussion on reframing Native American stereotypes as "expectations," see "Expectation and Anomaly" in Philip J. Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004).

16. Deanna Kingston's exemplary work illustrates how Ugiuvangmiut (King Islanders) position themselves in relation to their families and home communities through music and dance practices. See Deanna M. Kingston, "Siberian Songs and Siberian Kin: Indirect Assertions of King Islander Dominance in the Bering Strait Region," *Arctic Anthropology* 37, no. 2 (2000); Deanna Marie Kingston and Elizabeth Marino, "Twice Removed: King Islanders' Experience of 'Community' through Two Relocations," *Human Organization* 69, no. 2 (2010).

17. Paul John and Ann Fienup-Riordan, *Qulirat qanemcit-llu kinguvarcimalriit 'Stories for Future Generations': The Oratory of Yup'ik Paul John* (Bethel, AK; Seattle: Calista Elders Council/University of Washington Press, 2003), xxxviii.

18. Cherokee sociologist Eva Marie Garrouette calls this positioning "Radical Indigenism." See Eva Marie Garrouette, *Real Indians: Identity and the Survival of Native America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 113.

19. Kawagley, *A Yupiaq Worldview: A Pathway to Ecology and Spirit*, 111–12. See also George P. Kanaqlak Charles, "Cultural Identity through Yupiaq Narrative," in *The Alaska Native Reader: History, Culture, Politics*, ed. Maria Sháa Tláa Williams (Durham: Duke University Press, 2009), 57; Harold Napoleon and Eric Christopher Madsen, *Yuuyaraq: The Way of the Human Being* (Fairbanks: University of Alaska, Fairbanks, College of Rural Alaska, Center for Cross-Cultural Studies, 1991).

20. Libby Roderick, *Alaska Native Cultures and Issues: Responses to Frequently Asked Questions*, rev. 2nd ed. (Fairbanks, AK: University of Alaska Press, 2010), 36.

21. Joseph Bruchac, "Follow the Trickroutes: An Interview with Gerald Vizenor," in *Survival This Way: Interviews with American Indian Poets*, ed. Joseph Bruchac (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1987); Greg Sarris, *Keeping Slug Woman Alive: A Holistic Approach to American Indian Texts* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).
22. Howe, "The Story of America: A Tribalography," 29.
23. *Ibid.*, 42.
24. Levine, *Writing American Indian Music: Historic Transcriptions, Notations, and Arrangements*, xx.
25. Beverley Diamond, M. Sam Cronk, and Franziska Von Rosen, *Visions of Sound: Musical Instruments of First Nations Communities in Northeastern America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).
26. Jack D. Forbes, *Africans and Native Americans: The Language of Race and the Evolution of Red-Black Peoples*, 2nd ed. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993); Donald Lee Fixico, *The Urban Indian Experience in America* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000); Louis Owens, *Mixedblood Messages: Literature, Film, Family, Place* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998); Renya K. Ramirez, *Native Hubs: Culture, Community, and Belonging in Silicon Valley and Beyond* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007).
27. "Walking in two worlds is ideological Vicodin, and because we're the descendants of the greatest holocaust in human history, you can expect most of us to keep getting our prescription refilled for the foreseeable future." Smith, *Everything You Know About Indians is Wrong*, 36.
28. Paula Gunn Allen, *Pocahontas: Medicine Woman, Spy, Entrepreneur, Diplomat* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2003), 8.
29. Kawagley, *A Yupiaq Worldview: A Pathway to Ecology and Spirit*, 12.
30. Charles, "Cultural Identity through Yupiaq Narrative," 57.
31. For a pedagogical perspective on indigenous values, also see Verna J. Kirkness and Ray Barnhardt, "First Nations and Higher Education: The Four Rs—Respect, Relevance, Reciprocity, Responsibility," in *Knowledge Across Cultures: A Contribution to Dialogue Among Civilizations.*, ed. R. Hayoe and J. Pan (Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong, 2001).
32. Duane Champagne, "American Indian Studies Is for Everyone," *American Indian Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (Winter 1996): 181–82.
33. Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, "Who Stole Native American Studies?," *Wicazo Sa Review* 12, no. 1 (1997). See also Eric Cheyfitz, "The (Post)Colonial Predicament of Native American Studies," *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies* 4, no. 3 (2002); Arnold Krupat, *The Voice in the Margin: Native American Literature and the Canon* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989) and *Red Matters: Native American Studies* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002); Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, "The American Indian Fiction Writer: Cosmopolitanism, Nationalism, the Third World, and Tribal Sovereignty," *Wicazo Sa Review* 9, no. 2 (1993).
34. Diamond, "The Music of Modern Indigeneity," 171.
35. Beverley Diamond, "Native American Contemporary Music: The Women," *World of Music* 44, no. 1 (2002): 23.
36. Diamond, "The Music of Modern Indigeneity," 170.
37. *Ibid.*, 188. Diamond credits the concept of patron discourse to Van Toorn (1990).
38. Jack D. Forbes, *Black Africans and Native Americans: Color, Race, and Caste in the Evolution of Red-Black Peoples* (Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1988) and *Africans and Native Americans: The Language of Race and the Evolution of Red-Black Peoples* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993); Tiya Miles and Sharon Holland, eds., *Crossing Waters, Crossing Worlds: The African Diaspora in Indian Country* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006).

39. Robert Keith Collins, “*Katimih o Sa Chata Kiyou* (Why Am I Not Choctaw?): Race in the Lived Experiences of Two Black Choctaw Mixed-Bloods,” in *Crossing Waters, Crossing Worlds*, ed. Miles and Holland, 262.
40. Robert Keith Collins, “*Sapokni Pit Huklo* (Listening to Grandmother): Family, Race, and Identity in a Choctaw Community” (PhD dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 2002), 134.
41. Any discussion of professional doctorates (such as JDs and MDs) is beyond the scope of this study.
42. Howe, “A Tribalography,” 42
43. Erickson and Hirshberg, “Alaska Native Graduates of UAA: What Can They Tell Us?,” 4.
44. The 2010 Census designated the following six Alaska Native tribal categories: “Alaskan Athabaskan”; “Aleut”; “Inupiat”; “Tlingit-Haida”; “Tsimshian”; and “Yup’ik.”
45. Jennings, *Alaska Native Political Leadership and Higher Education: One University, Two Universes*.
46. Citation information available at <http://www.alaska.edu/uajourney/honorary-degrees/honorary-degree-recipient/>.
47. <http://www.alaska.edu/uajourney/honorary-degrees/>.
48. For example, New Zealand Māori scholars such as Linda Tuhiwai Smith have devised Kaupapa Māori research, a method that reclaims Māori peoples’ ability to name, theorize, and “research back.” See *Decolonizing Methodologies*.
49. Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 107.
50. Napoleon and Madsen, *Yuuyaraq: The Way of the Human Being*.
51. It is important to acknowledge that although they were not institutionally ordained as scholars, Native researchers—such as Francis La Flesche (Omaha) who collaborated with ethnologist Alice Fletcher for more than four decades—have actively shaped the direction of Native American music studies in the present.
52. See A. J. McClanahan, *Growing up Native in Alaska* (Anchorage: CIRI Foundation, 2000). McClanahan chronicles the struggles and successes of twenty-seven Alaska Native men and women who were selected based on a “representative sample of Alaska’s geographic regions” (e.g. the thirteen regions as defined by ANCSA) as well as “their potential as leaders” (e.g. “serving on a village or regional corporation board of directors, completing higher education, teaching or participating in activities to foster appreciation of Native culture”), at 14. This collection addresses the theme of balancing “ancient” traditions when faced with a rapidly progressing and industrialized reality that is indicative of urban living.
53. Craig S. Womack, *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 42.
54. Gerald Robert Vizenor, *Manifest Manners: Postindian Warriors of Survivance* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1994).
55. Howe, “Tribalography,” 124.
56. Allen, *Pocahontas*, 8.

